

CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

SECOND SESSION—TWENTY SIXTH PARLIAMENT

13 ELIZABETH II

VOLUME IX

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1964,
TO THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1964, INCLUSIVE

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

ROGER DUHAMEL, F.R.S.C.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1964

20220—577½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 16, 1964

The house met at 11 a.m.

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

ADDRESS OF LOYALTY AND AFFECTION FOLLOWING VISIT

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the spirit that animated the discussion initiated in the house on Wednesday afternoon by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) I move, seconded by Mr. Diefenbaker, that an humble address be presented to Her Majesty the Queen in the following words:

To
Her Most Excellent Majesty
Elizabeth the Second

By the Grace of God of the United Kingdom, Canada and Her other Realms and Territories Queen, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith:

Most Gracious Sovereign:

The Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled, wish humbly to convey to Your Majesty this expression of our deepest loyalty, affection and respect, and of our heartfelt appreciation of your recent visit to Canada.

The presence in our country of Your Majesty and His Royal Highness the Prince Philip on the occasion of the centennial of the meetings of the Fathers of Confederation held at Charlottetown and Quebec city warmed and moved the hearts of all true Canadians. Your messages will be an inspiration and guide to the Canadian people as we work together to achieve the national progress of which you spoke so movingly.

We pray that you may continue to reign for many years as our gracious and beloved sovereign.

Motion agreed to.

Whereupon the members of the house rose and sang

God save the Queen

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Diefenbaker:

That the said address be engrossed, and that a message be sent to the Senate informing Their Honours that the House of Commons had passed the said address and requesting Their Honours to unite with this house in the address by inserting therein the words "and Senate".

Motion agreed to.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

COMMUNIST CHINA—REPORTED EXPLOSION OF NUCLEAR DEVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and ask him whether he has received a report to the effect that the government of mainland China has just exploded a nuclear bomb; whether he has any official report to make to the house, and whether this event, if it has taken place, will have any effect on Canada's policy regarding the feasibility of bringing China as quickly as possible into the community of nations in order that some measure of control with respect to nuclear weapons possessed by China as well as by other countries may be implemented.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The hon. gentleman who represents Digby-Annapolis-Kings sent me a note a few minutes ago indicating his intention to ask this same question. There is a Reuters report to the effect that the government of mainland China has detonated a bomb. I have no official confirmation of this report.

It will be recalled, however, that about a week ago it was indicated both in the United States and here in Canada that there was a possibility that within a very short period the Chinese government would detonate such a nuclear bomb. At that time I took occasion to draw attention to the provisions of article IV of the partial test ban treaty signed in August a year ago in Moscow by three of the great powers and later adhered to by 102 nations.

If a bomb has been detonated in China it will add to the radioactivity of the atmosphere, with all its consequences. I would hope—the government of Canada would hope—that no country already adhering to the test ban treaty would use this event as an occasion to withdraw its support of the test ban provisions.

In response to the final part of the hon. gentleman's question I can only say that I

agree that this event confirms the desirability of mainland China itself supporting the test ban treaty.

Mr. Douglas: Does the Canadian government intend to initiate any steps to encourage the bringing of the government of mainland China into the United Nations by itself establishing diplomatic relations with the government of China?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I have nothing to add to what I have already said.

RUSSIA—POSSIBLE EFFECT OF CHANGES IN PARTY LEADERSHIP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): My question, likewise, is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that recent news reports indicate that many officials personally appointed by Mr. Khrushchev are today being removed from office, does the minister have any word for the house with regard to developments in the Soviet union and the possible effect of these events upon the general world situation?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this morning I had a visit from the ambassador of the Soviet union in Canada, who informed me that because of ill health Chairman Khrushchev has been relieved of the important responsibilities that were his as head of the government of the Soviet union. The ambassador took the occasion to state that I could be assured, and through me the people of Canada, that the foreign policy of the government of the Soviet union would not change. He also assured me that there would be no reversal of the policy of destalinization.

I would simply like to add that I intimated to the ambassador what I proposed to say in the house this morning; that it will be important to see if the new leaders will have the will to move forward toward a peaceful resolution of the basic issues such as disarmament, the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the division of Germany, which are so important in the future of our world. I can assure the new leaders that the Canadian government, and I am sure other western countries as well, will be prepared and indeed happy to work with them in patiently exploring and implementing peaceful and equitable solutions of these vital issues.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

UNITED NATIONS

PROSPECTIVE OTTAWA MEETING ON STAND-BY UNITS FOR PEACE FORCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I am sorry I was not able to get in touch with him to give him notice. Is the conference on peace keeping operations to take place in Ottawa on November 2 and 3, as set out quite fully in an article in the *Globe and Mail* this morning; and does that very interesting article written by Mr. Stanley Westall accurately set out the plans and prospects for this conference?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the article in question; therefore I am not in a position to comment on it.

Mr. Brewin: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, then, whether the minister would at some time make a statement to the house in respect of this conference. I would particularly suggest to the minister that he tell the house whether members of the opposition who are interested in this conference might be allowed to be present as observers. The conference is said in this article to be a low key conference, but perhaps that would not prevent members of the opposition being present.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, if I had a certain quality of humour I would of course say, in answer to the last comment of the hon. member, that this would be one good reason why the opposition should be present; but as I do not possess that type of sense of humour I will not make the observation.

Mr. Brewin: Will the conference take place?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I said in the house about a week ago, in answer to a question, that we fully anticipated that the conference would open on November 2. We had at that time unofficial information from some 11 countries of their willingness to accept formal invitations to attend. Formal invitations have now gone out, and I have no reason for believing that the conference will not take place on November 2.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

REPORTED STATEMENT BY JUSTICE MINISTER—INQUIRIES AS TO MATTERS DISCUSSED

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Min-

ister of Justice whether in the course of an interview on the C.B.C. yesterday, dealing in particular with the formula for the amendment of the constitution, he was asked a question to this effect: "Does this formula mean that the door is now open for an associate state?" And did he reply thereto in approximately these words: "You might put it that way"?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. I wonder whether, in the course of the relaxed and co-operative atmosphere which apparently prevailed in his discussions with the attorneys general, he discussed with them his views as to the necessity of finding a wider area if he is going to properly enforce the law with regard to restrictive trade practices; and did he ask any of the provincial attorneys general whether they were prepared to surrender any of their jurisdiction so he could secure this wider jurisdiction that he indicated he needs?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, the matter of the restrictive trade practices commission was not, of course, on the agenda at the discussion and was not part of the discussion. As to whether any part of the formula, once it has been enacted, will be of some use in this direction will be left to the interpreters of the formula.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): A supplementary question. What consideration was given by the premiers and the attorneys general to the proposal for the entrenchment of the bill of rights in the new constitution?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to the participants in the conference—I am not speaking just for myself when I ask for fairness—I think it would be a good thing for all members concerned to wait until the report on the deliberations and discussions has been published and circulated, because certainly most of the answers to these very interesting questions will be given in the text.

Mr. Fairweather: When will that be?

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): A supplementary question. I wonder if the minister would advise the house whether the formula which has been agreed upon by the minister and the provinces will contain provisions which will permit the acquisition of associate state status by Quebec or any other province or provinces in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the formula has nothing to do with the implications of the question just asked, and I think the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) can draw his own conclusions by reading the proposed formula, without having to ask my opinion on this matter.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Justice, who was somewhat more generous in the information he gave in the course of this interview yesterday than he is to the House of Commons today, if he was not asked whether the formula would permit of an associate state in Canada. I simply ask him whether he was asked that question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken that question was asked, even though I cannot remember exactly in what terms. Again, in this case I think the actual wording should be given in reply to the Leader of the Opposition.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am glad the minister suggests that. Now I would ask the Secretary of State whether he will secure from the C.B.C. a copy of the interview which was given yesterday by the Minister of Justice on the program "Aujourd'hui" and have it tabled in the house. We have the co-operation of the minister now.

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I will see if I can satisfy the right hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

TRADE

FAILURE TO INCLUDE FISHERIES REPRESENTATIVE IN MISSION TO CARIBBEAN

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 Trade and Commerce. In view of the importance of the fishing industry to the economy of Nova Scotia and the Atlantic provinces generally, and the necessity in view of foreign competition to constantly expand our markets, will the minister inform the house why a representative of the fresh and salt fishing industry was not included in the trade mission sponsored by

his department which leaves tomorrow for a three week visit to Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Trinidad and Barbados?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. The question was also put to me by one of my colleagues, and I am trying to ascertain the answer.

PENITENTIARIES

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL—REQUEST FOR TOUR BY MEMBERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice and ask the minister whether he would be kind enough to arrange, as early as possible and for as many members who may desire to participate, a tour of St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary so that all members may have a chance to see at first hand the deplorable conditions which exist there.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I think I succeeded in arranging a pretty successful tour the other day for the hon. member for Skeena. As to his question this morning, I will give it consideration.

KINGSTON, ONT.—INQUIRY AS TO NEW CONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Enns (Portage-Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Justice. Has a final decision yet been taken on the construction of the proposed new complex of buildings for penitentiary facilities at Kingston? If this has not yet been done, will he make plans to assure that he will get the most knowledgeable advice on the design and structure of these new buildings?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, as to the first part of the question I must say that a final decision as to the exact nature of the complex and as to the plans has not yet been made by myself. With regard to the obtaining of advice, I must say that already specialist consultants from the United States have given their advice on the matter of plans and designs, but I repeat that as far as I am concerned I have yet to make my final decision thereon.

Mr. Enns: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister intend to allow a parliamentary committee to have a look at the plans and inspect them? Is there going to be an opportunity to do this?

Mr. Favreau: I am seriously considering the question of a parliamentary committee on the matter of prisons and penitentiaries.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): May I ask a supplementary question. In view of the fact that according to the newspapers tenders have closed for the new penal institution at Springhill and there is an indication that there will be a delay of some six weeks before treasury board can approve the low bidder's contract, I wonder if the minister could look into this in the hope of speeding up the process of investigating these tenders and making an award at an earlier date.

Mr. Favreau: I will, Mr. Speaker.

INDUSTRY

BELLEVILLE, ONT.—STEPS TO PREVENT CLOSING OF FACTORY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry but in his absence I will direct it to the acting minister. What steps have been taken or what steps are contemplated to prevent the closing later this month of the International Precision Company at Belleville, Ontario, thereby making it necessary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Webb: —for some 70 skilled craftsmen to seek new employment?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is a question for the order paper.

Mr. Webb: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this is a very urgent question because later this month this plant will be closed and these men will be out of work.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Webb: What is going to be done about it? That is the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If I am not mistaken this question has been asked two or three times before.

Mr. Webb: I should like to give notice to debate this matter at the first opportunity.

TRANSPORTATION

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN C.P.R. SERVICE IN WESTERN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to

the Acting Minister of Transport. In view of the announcement by the Canadian Pacific Railway that they intend to reduce severely the passenger train service between Calgary and Lethbridge and between Lethbridge and Medicine Hat, would the minister consider requiring the board of transport commissioners to issue an order granting a little more time to the people involved to make representations to the board? I might say that this reduction in service is to become effective on October 21.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as I understand the act, the minister has no power to require the board of transport commissioners to take such action. However, I will draw the hon. member's statement to the attention of the board right away.

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister suggest to the railways at the same time that there be a moratorium on all passenger service cancellations until this matter has been thoroughly discussed on the bill which is going to be debated very shortly?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I can pass on the hon. member's statement to the railways, but I doubt that the two matters are related in a way that would warrant that kind of action being taken.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, there are several other supplementary questions, but perhaps I could give notice to debate this matter at the adjournment hour.

Mr. McIlraith: Not tonight.

NATIONAL PARKS

JASPER AND BANFF—INQUIRY AS TO DEVELOPMENT PLANS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources I should like to direct a question to his parliamentary secretary. Would he inform the house if the development plans for Jasper townsite to be announced in Jasper on Monday are based on the Oberlander report commissioned in 1962? If so, would he agree to table the report in the house, as was done in the case of a similar report for the Banff townsite?

Mr. John N. Turner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, when the announcement is made I think it will probably answer the hon. member's question. I will bring the second part of his question, having to do with the tabling of the report, to the minister's attention on his return.

Mr. Dinsdale: A supplementary question on a related topic. Is the minister aware that there is a movement under way by public spirited citizens to make all the lots between Caribou street and Wolf street in Banff townsite available to the government of Canada for conversion into a beautiful park open to all visitors to Banff national park? If so, will the minister bring this subject—

An hon. Member: Order paper.

Mr. Dinsdale: —to the attention of the Banff advisory council when he meets them next week? I ask this question Mr. Speaker, because I do not think the minister will be back in the house before he meets with the Banff advisory council.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister is aware of the situation and will be discussing the matter with the Banff advisory council when he is there.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can I take it from the remarks of the parliamentary secretary that the minister is meeting the Banff advisory council on October 23, or around that time?

Mr. Turner: Mr. Speaker, he has offered to meet the council, and I would hope that a meeting will take place.

SPORTS

INQUIRY AS TO GREATER SUPPORT FOR TRAINING IN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the fact that for the second time Canadians have unexpectedly won gold medals at the Olympic games, in bobsledding last winter and in rowing yesterday, is the government giving consideration to more support for athletic events in Canada, particularly in preparation for the Olympic games?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree that it is so surprising. We have a great many very excellent athletes who are competing in the Olympics and I am sure we are all very proud of them, particularly of the

two young men who in their second race together were able to win a gold medal for Canada.

The government, of course, is always considering improvement of the fitness and amateur sport program. As my hon. friend knows, each year another $1 million is added until the $5 million originally planned has been expended. It is obvious that even when the $5 million is reached this will be insufficient to provide all the money necessary for capital works or for other uses to which money might be put, but the fact is that the government is from time to time giving increasing attention to the possibility of expanding this program.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, what did the hon. member mean by "unexpected" when it is Vancouver that is involved? Our athletes have won a gold medal and a bronze medal.

Mr. Aiken: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that in both cases, the bobsled team last winter and the rowing team this fall, the participants had difficulty in getting themselves and their equipment to the Olympics?

Miss LaMarsh: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but that obviously did not deter them from carrying off the highest awards, and this situation is far from unique to Canada.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Justice advise the house whether the government is planning to give Hal Banks a gold medal for bail jumping?

LABOUR RELATIONS

MARITIME UNION TRUSTEES—APPEARANCE BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the pending S.I.U. elections I wonder whether the minister has now made a decision to bring the trustees before a standing or special committee of the House of Commons at this time, particularly since Mr. Banks has now shown up in New York and has his judicial thumb on some aspects of the election.

Mr. Diefenbaker: How do you know the government knows?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Portage-Neepawa.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

Mr. Enns: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice—

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, did the Minister of Labour hear my question? I asked him whether he was intending to bring the maritime trustees before a standing committee of the House of Commons, and I think it is an important question.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I heard the question. I answered it two days ago.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege with respect to a question I put to the Minister of Labour today. Briefly, I asked him was it the intention of the government to bring the maritime trustees before a special or standing committee of the House of Commons to be questioned on matters affecting the S.I.U.

The minister said he had answered this question two days ago. I have checked *Hansard* very carefully, and this is the first opportunity I have to bring the matter to Your Honour's attention. My question was entirely different from the question put to the minister two days ago by the hon. member for Winnipeg North and the hon. member for Kootenay West. The minister has tried to mislead the house. He has been evasive and, above all, he has been most arrogant in his evasion so far as this matter is concerned. It is arrogance of the worst kind.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

VANCOUVER—POSSIBLE USE OF FORMER R.C.A.F. BASE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): May I direct a question to the Prime Minister, because it is a matter covering several departments. It has to do with the Kitsilano reserve property in Vancouver. Is it correct that a statement has been made in this connection indicating that the government will lease 15 acres of the 26 acre Kitsilano reserve site for a 99 year period to the city of Vancouver for park use at one dollar per year; that the C.B.C. will lease the buildings on this property from the city of Vancouver for a period of 10 to 15 years at an annual rental of $52,000 per year, and that the balance of the 26 acre site, namely 11 acres, on which the defence buildings stand, will be purchased by Vancouver for $250,000?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I cannot confirm the details of the report to which my hon. friend refers, but as he knows there was a meeting a short time ago with representatives of Vancouver and as a result of that meeting an arrangement, which it is hoped will be mutually satisfactory, is being considered. We expect to be able to make an announcement shortly.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, may I ask—

Mr. Prittie: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond on a point of order.

Mr. Prittie: On September 30 the hon. member for New Westminster attempted to ask a question about the C.B.C. and the Kitsilano site. He was ruled out of order and was told to put it on the order paper. I suggest that if that ruling applied then, it should apply on this occasion.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I appreciate the fact that someone in left field has given some information, Mr. Speaker, but this has to do with an agreement which I understand was made—

Mr. Prittie: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have a valid objection.

Mr. Speaker: The right hon. Leader of the Opposition has a right to ask this question. He is asking for confirmation or denial of a fact, and the other question asked by the hon. member for New Westminster was one seeking detailed information, I believe.

Mr. Howard: Favouritism.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the hon. member for Skeena to withdraw that remark. I ask the hon. member for Skeena to withdraw the remark that the Chair has ruled on a favouritism basis.

Mr. Howard: I will gladly bow to your request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I wanted to ask the Prime Minister in this connection if he would consider having this question submitted to a committee of the house for consideration, in view of the fact that if this suggestion is implemented it will cost the people of Canada, through the C.B.C., $5 million or $6 million, and there is a property available downtown that would not cost the Dominion of Canada anything.

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, all these aspects of the matter have been and are being considered in regard to the proposed arrangement. If an arrangement can be agreed upon, as I believe it will be, I am sure this aspect of the matter will have been taken into consideration.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON REORGANIZATION OF MILITIA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): May I ask the Minister of National Defence if he can give the house a firm date upon which he will make an announcement concerning the second part of the Suttie report; because I am sure the operation of the militia is being seriously and adversely affected by the delay in an announcement of cut-backs in militia units.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): I am sure the hon. gentleman, after his long years of experience in this house, would never really suggest that such a course should be followed.

Mr. Lambert: May I ask a supplementary question. The minister may have noted that I asked him if he could give us a firm date.

Mr. Hellyer: I was surprised that the hon. gentleman asked that question, Mr. Speaker. I have already indicated that we will make this information available as soon as we can.

HARBOURS

BRITISH COLUMBIA—DEVELOPMENT OF SALT WATER PORT THROUGH ALASKA PANHANDLE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I should like to pose a question to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys and ask him whether he has any views to indicate to the house relating to a report that, because of a receding glacier, there is now a salt water port extending through the panhandle of Alaska into Canadian territory, and whether any plans for the development of such a port are being made.

Mr. Speaker: Surely the hon. member knows this is a question for the order paper.

Mr. Howard: On a question of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it is a question for the order paper. I posed it in all seriousness. If you suggest I put it on the order paper, I will.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member should know this is a typical question for the order paper.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

PURPORTED REPRODUCTION OF SECURITY INSTRUCTIONS ON ROYAL VISIT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): May I ask the Minister of Justice if he is now prepared to answer the question I put to him yesterday concerning the escape of confidential documents from department files to the press?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): No, Mr. Speaker, but I have asked for a report on this. I shall be able to answer on Monday, probably.

INVESTIGATION INTO ALLEGATIONS OF POLICE BRUTALITY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): My question is for the Minister of Justice. In view of the fact that the attorney general of the province of Quebec has ordered an investigation into alleged brutality by police in connection with the visit of Her Majesty the Queen, and in view of the fact that the federal government was in charge of security arrangements, is the Minister of Justice ordering a similar investigation?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): A report is forthcoming to me.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the minister if he or the superintendent of the R.C.M. Police have received any complaints in this regard, either from citizens or from the press corps who were in attendance at the royal visit?

Mr. Favreau: So far as I am concerned, in relation to the R.C.M.P., I have received no complaints about police activities. One must realize, first of all, that local policing is under the immediate jurisdiction of the local authorities and the Quebec attorney general, and it is proper that he should have initiated the investigation into the matter. In so far as the R.C.M.P. are concerned, no complaints have been received by the Minister of Justice but numerous congratulations have been received on the conduct of the R.C.M.P. in relation to the whole coverage of the Queen's visit.

[Mr. Howard.]

FISHERIES

NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING ESTABLISHMENT OF STRAIGHT BASE LINES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Fisheries arising out of a reply he gave me yesterday to a question on the matter of base lines for fishing zones. The minister indicated that negotiations have been going on with Norway and Denmark. My question arises out of my recollection that he indicated earlier that negotiations with the United States on this subject had been completed. I am wondering, inasmuch as Norway, Denmark and these other countries are not involved on the west coast of Canada, if he could not indicate that some action is being taken at an early date with regard to the proclamation of base lines for the west coast.

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): No, Mr. Speaker, no action will be taken until all negotiations have been completed.

PRIVILEGE

MR. KNOWLES—DISCUSSION OF FINAL ENACTMENT BY CANADA AFTER REPATRIATION OF CONSTITUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, which has to do with the relationship between the government and parliament. As hon. members are aware, on several occasions during the course of this session I raised the question of some final enactment by Canada as a sovereign nation in case a decision is made to repatriate our constitution. In particular I asked whether this matter would be discussed at certain recent conferences.

On Monday, August 17, as recorded in *Hansard* at pages 6909 and 6910, I put a question to the Prime Minister about this matter. In particular I asked him whether it would be discussed at Charlottetown, and he said that it would be. That answer is found on page 6910 of *Hansard*.

After the Charlottetown conference was over I asked the Prime Minister a question regarding it, which will be found on page 7608 of *Hansard* for Thursday, September 3. To be precise, I asked him whether this matter had been discussed. This was the answer of the Prime Minister:

That matter was mentioned, but it was not discussed in any detail. It will certainly be considered by the attorneys general and the Minister of Justice.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 30, I asked the Minister of Justice whether this matter would be on the agenda of the then pending conference of the minister with the attorneys general of the provinces. My question is found at page 8609 of *Hansard* for that date. It was a bit lengthy and I do not need to read it, but it was the same question; would the matter of Canada taking a final stand herself be discussed at the then pending conference. The minister's reply was also lengthy. He went into certain details, but he concluded with these sentences:

But I must say I am very ready to consider the matter and to raise the point at the conference as it has been raised by my hon. friend. This once more goes to show how useful these discussions are.

Twice by the Prime Minister and once by the Minister of Justice the house was given the assurance that this matter would be discussed at these conferences. Yesterday, as recorded at page 9073 of *Hansard*, I asked the Minister of Justice whether the matter had been discussed. The operative portion of his answer reads as follows:

No, Mr. Speaker.

I suggest that if the government had no intention of raising this matter at the recent conferences it could have told the house so, but what has happened is that the house was told on three occasions that it would be done. Yesterday we learned that it was not done. My point of privilege is surely quite clear. Parliament deserves better than this at the hands of the government.

SUPPLY

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

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

1. Departmental administration including fees for membership in the international organizations listed in the details of the estimates, $5,180,500.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Chairman, last evening at ten o'clock I was discussing a few unfair facets of the department's administration in their application to the national economy. About ten years ago a Liberal administration gave permission to the Del Monte company of California, a large food processing company in the United States, to buy out Canadian Canners, close down some canneries and thus cut off a large economic market for Canadian farmers. I mentioned this matter last night with particular reference to the riding of Prince Edward-Lennox, where many factories were closed down.

I also discussed the vast outflow of union dues to the United States. These matters seem to complement one another, the closing up of Canadian industries by U.S. financial interests and the multimillion dollar flow of union dues from Canadian industry to the United States. The minister mentioned the progress made by Canadian industry, but in doing so I think his eyesight was in reverse. What a wonderful thing it would be for Canada if we could rid ourselves of United States industrial colonialism.

I am not against unions and I realize their necessity to collect dues for their funds, but I submit the unions should be strictly Canadian in nature, investing their money at home and drawing interest on it in Canada. Once their funds pass beyond our boundaries they are nothing but a detriment to our country. Only a very small proportion is returned to Canada in the form of payments made to union employees whenever they are on strike, and I would remind members of the committee that strikes per capita are less frequent in Canada than they are in the great republic to the south of us.

How long will we have to put up with this economic system of industrial colonialism? Lately we have heard a lot about repatriating our constitution. I say let us repatriate those millions of dollars which are going out of the country in the form of union dues, and which are a detriment to our economy because they represent a good share of our adverse trade relationship with the United States.

One of the main causes of the high cost of living is the taxation of business and industry. Increased taxation of industry by the government is an impediment to the export of our manufactured products to other countries, especially to those countries which have a more frugal and less luxurious standard of living than we enjoy. I pause here to congratulate Canada in this regard. We certainly have a very high standard of living here compared with the other countries with which we trade and with which we enjoy a preponderance of trade in our favour.

Does Canada know just what the end cost of high living will be? Will the Canadian people allow their government to tax them into oblivion, to tax them and their industry into a state where they sit among their luxury items of high living beside silent machines

which will no longer feed them and no longer allow the people even a plain living, let alone a luxurious one?

In conclusion there is one further point I wish to bring to the attention of the committee. It concerns taxation. Retailers of our country are concerned with all aspects of income tax and general taxation because of their pervasive influence on the economy of Canada and their impact on the profitability of small businesses. The small businessman is in narrow straits at the present time, and I would remind the committee, despite all the progress which has been made and despite the rosy picture which the minister has painted, that 1964 seems to hold the record for the number of bankruptcies this country has experienced; and most of these failures have been in the area of small business. Small businessmen are concerned that the burden of taxation should not exceed their ability to pay while remaining dynamically competitive, and they are anxious to ensure that the burden of business income tax is distributed equitably among all those who are engaged in business.

I realize these remarks do not apply directly to the department whose estimates are before us, but I pointed out last night the close liaison which is necessary between the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Department of Finance, and that is why I bring these observations to the attention of the minister so that he may pass them on to his colleague, the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Aiken: I should like to discuss one single matter at this time. It touches the minister's department in three ways; first, with reference to the balance of payments in international trade; second, with regard to the government travel bureau; and third, with respect to the dominion bureau of statistics.

The subject I wish to mention, or one particular aspect of it, is the most alarming feature of our foreign trade at the present time, the state of the balance of payments on travel between Canada and other countries, particularly the United States. An examination of the figures provided by the dominion bureau of statistics discloses what I consider to be a real mystery which someone will have to analyze and solve very quickly. In 1960 Canada had a debit balance on travel with other countries amounting to $207 million, which was high. In 1961 this debit balance declined to $160 million. By 1962 it had gone down further to $43 million, and in 1963 the balance of the scales was tipped to the other side and for the first time in many years we had a credit balance of approximately $13 million. The trend was in the right direction and the trend was good.

Just who should take the credit is unimportant. I could say, I suppose, that the trend had been started in 1960 and had carried on through 1963. But I do not think that in the realm of travel, government influence through the travel bureau, which is mainly an advertising agency, accounts for everything. So we have to look somewhere else to explain the situation I am now about to outline.

What is the situation in 1964? We do not, of course, have the figures for more than the first half of the year, but the figures we do have are shocking. In the first half of 1963 Canada experienced a debit balance of $90 million on travel. In the first half of 1964 there was a debit balance in the amount of $145 million, a very substantial increase. In the first quarter of 1964 the debit amounted to $96 million, the highest for over ten years. If we look back to the first quarter of 1963 we find the debit of $67 million was the lowest debit balance in the first quarter of the year for seven years. The second quarter of 1963 showed a debit of $23 million, the lowest for more than ten years. Then, as I have stated, in 1964 this debit increased substantially in the first quarter. It more than doubled in the second quarter. We do not yet have the figures for the third quarter in 1964 because it is too soon to have these returns, but from what I can gather the indications are that the picture will be no better.

Certainly travel was discouraged by a number of factors, one of which was bad weather. However, there were other factors, as I intend to show. As I said, the figures present something of a mystery because when one looks at the number of vehicles travelling between Canada and the United States, the number of people travelling by bus, air and rail, one finds that the difference between this year and previous years is not very great. In the first half of 1963 the number of vehicles of U.S. visitors was 1,120,000. In the first half of 1964 it was 1,252,000. This represents an increase of 11 per cent. Likewise the number of Canadians returning from the United States shows an increase between 1963 and 1964, in the first half of each year, of 11.4 per cent. This is roughly the same as the increase in the number of vehicles entering and leaving. Likewise the number of short term visitors, people who go and come the same day, amounted

to 1,693,000 in the first half of 1963. In the first half of 1964 the figure was 1,794,000, an increase of about 6 per cent. In the same category, vehicles returning from abroad showed an increase of 8.3 per cent, slightly higher but not much. So this alarming deficit to which I have referred cannot be accounted for on the basis of the numbers travelling between Canada and the United States.

In connection with dollars spent, in 1962 for the first half of the year we were in deficit in the amount of $133 million; in 1963 it was down to $90 million; in 1964 it is up to $145 million. I am referring to the deficit between those who travel abroad and those who visit Canada. We cannot seem to find out where the problem lies. Certainly it is not in the number of people travelling. Can it be that there are more people travelling abroad than we have been able to entice to visit us in Canada?

As I say, Mr. Chairman, this is a serious problem. The trend was going very well and the situation had been improving for the last four or five years, but this year it has reversed itself and the deficit is again back in the upward direction. I do not think, for example, that for the first half of the year you can blame this on the weather because the damage to the tourist business in Canada, generally speaking, is done in the summer. While there was an increasing amount of winter travel, it was in the wrong direction in 1964.

I think one of the reasons is that we are not taking enough interest in interprovincial travel within Canada. This is not something that the travel bureau has in general interested itself in over the years. Being a Canadian organization under the federal government they have occupied themselves, and rightly so, with bringing people from abroad into Canada. But I think the figures I have just quoted indicate the obvious trend, and I suggest that we have to make a more definite effort to keep within this country some of these people who travel abroad.

I think a very excellent example of this type of thing was the confederation centennial conference in Charlottetown, this year. I was one who took advantage of the invitation from the province of Prince Edward Island to visit them with my family this year, in spite of the fact that parliament was sitting every day and had sat continuously since February 18. Despite this I managed to find a week end and a few days at each end of it to get away and visit this province. I think it was an excellent example of what we can do within Canada interprovincially; because a great many people who went to Prince Edward Island and whom I met there in a very short space of time said they had come because of the centennial arrangements in that province and the promise of good fellowship and a great welcome from the kind people in the maritime provinces and particularly in P.E.I. I think this also did a good deal for the other provinces of Canada which were in the line of travel.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, this is the answer, and I am raising the problem today to urge the minister, through the travel bureau and perhaps through government policy—because I think there will have to be a change in that policy—to make a greater effort to have Canadians spend their holidays in Canada. Often an affluent society, people who do well and make money, have the ambition to go elsewhere to spend their money. I have no doubt that this is part of the problem; that a great many of our people who have done well and have travelled either in their business or on holidays, have decided "I am going to take a holiday and I am going to Florida", or California or Europe or some other place outside Canada. This of course is something no one can prevent them doing; but I think the time has come when a sharp change in direction is called for if we are going to do anything about changing this deficit in travel account. The minister can go out and sell hard products that this country has to sell and at the same time be met with a deficit that is undoing all the benefit being created in other fields. In my opinion we have to take this aspect of the problem into very serious consideration.

There is one other matter I wish to raise, and I do so at this point because of the fact that I have always been interested in the tourist business and have a special interest in those people in the northeastern Georgian bay area who are operators of tourist establishments relying upon access by water, rental of boats, use of marinas and other water uses connected with the travel and tourist business. These people had a very bad summer this year. I am sure this will influence the figures we may get for the third quarter of the year. Many of them had very expensive operations to maintain, and they could not get their customers to the water to go boating; they had to send them to other places. Many people who heard of the low water problem

did not come at all; others came and stayed a much shorter period of time than before.

This is one factor, and it is a serious one. My reason for raising this question now is that the problem these people face in trying to attract clients for their businesses is caused by the low water levels of Georgian bay and lake Huron. This particular group for some reason is the most hard hit of all. I am given to understand that it has to do with their location, the prevailing winds, and so forth; but they were very hard hit.

It is possible to approach any department of government to get any assistance for these people. The Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources say "Well, there is not much we can do about it. We will try to get the water levels back, but this problem is not our affair". The Department of Public Works say "We will keep main entrances to navigation channels and main harbours open, but that is all we can do". The Department of Transport say "We are only concerned with major navigation, and not minor". So there is no particular place to which these people can go for assistance, though I must say that they will be encouraged to come here and present a brief to the committee on mines, forests and waters that is being set up.

I am raising this matter now because this is a group of people to whom the government should consider giving some special assistance. They are not asking for remuneration for loss of business; they are asking for some help in restoring the facilities that either nature or the government—or someone—took away from them. Whether they were taken away by natural causes, or by the deepening of the St. Lawrence seaway, or by any one of a number of other causes thus far suggested is immaterial. For a very small amount in comparison these people can be helped, and I hope the minister will take this particular group into account. This matter does require government consideration, not just the consideration of one department. There are various other groups who have also suffered this year, mainly because of weather and for the many other reasons which have been publicly stated.

I should like the minister if he can, or in consultation with his department, to tell me what has brought about this reversal of the balance of payments on travel account, and also to tell me what the government is going to do to correct it. There are two problems involved. One of them is money, which of course is always important in the balance of payments. The second is the travel industry itself, which as everyone knows is the third largest producer of foreign currency in Canada. I think we have to find out what is the reason for this reversal. It may be that too many people are travelling abroad. If so, I suggest the government should undertake a special campaign to encourage people to travel in Canada, and this is only one suggestion which could be made.

[Mr. Aiken.]

Having watched this matter very carefully for quite a number of years I had reason to feel, even as late as last fall, that we were making progress in the travel field and were creating something of benefit to the national economy. We were reducing this terrible deficit which had been hanging over our heads for a number of years; but then when the figures for 1964 started to come out they showed a very marked and tragic reversal. This does not mean, of course, that our travel business has fallen off; there has been an increase, a very satisfactory increase, in travel in Canada. But unfortunately at the same time there has been a greater increase in money spent on travel abroad. I think a crash program on this one subject is called for, and I hope the minister and his department will find the answer.

Mr. Gundlock: Mr. Chairman, if I may I should like to ask the minister a question having to do with wheat prices. May I ask him for the weekly prices of wheat, particularly in the 1963-64 crop year, and also for the dates of the major sales, including sales to Russia, Britain and China.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, I should like to add a few remarks, before the minister replies, relating to some of the comments made by my colleague the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. I think his were the first remarks on the importance of tourism in the Canadian trade and commerce picture, and I would not want this important aspect of Canada's economy to be neglected.

It is, of course, a well known fact that tourism is the largest single item in international trade, and it is only in recent years that the government of Canada has become fully aware of its importance to our trading position. As a matter of fact, for many years this economic factor was neglected in a shocking manner and the Canadian government travel bureau, which was founded in the 1930's, became the orphan of departmental branches. It rotated from department to

department because no one could appreciate its tremendous economic impact. It was not until it settled in the new Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources in the early 1950's that fresh appreciation of its economic significance was gained by the government. I think perhaps it was due to the fact that the whole concept of the establishment of the department of resources was to think in terms of the economic aspects of our resources and to begin planning in a co-ordinated and organized manner. The new awareness was also associated with the revolution of rising expectations which occurred following world war II and the lure of Canada's wilderness in an age of growing leisure time.

I was interested to hear the comments of the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka, who drew the attention of the committee to the rather encouraging change in the statistical position of Canada's tourist industry in recent years, when for the first time in many long years we came pretty close to having a balanced position on the international tourist account. He is aware, of course, as I am sure are the members of the committee, that this happy situation resulted from a vigorous stepped-up promotional program on the part of the Canadian government travel bureau. I think Canada is very fortunate in the men who are serving her in this bureau. In the few years I was associated with them as the responsible minister for northern affairs I began fully to appreciate their dedication to this important economic activity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I cannot give any explanation of the reversal in our international tourist account situation referred to by my colleague from Parry Sound-Muskoka. It might be that the United States market, upon which Canada had substantially depended until 1962, has reached the saturation point. Until 1962 the government of Canada exerted all its efforts in tourist promotion in the direction of the United States market, and there was a constant program of expansion of promotional activities. Perhaps the minister, when he replies, can give the committee some idea from his up to date contact with these statistics why it is that the position has reversed itself this year following the more favourable statistical position noted last year and for the past several years.

Perhaps he could also indicate just how far the program of expanding our tourist promotion activities in the United States market has been developed. I know there were plans afoot and some already implemented to extend and expand the bureaux in the United States. The opening which took place in 1961 in California, which has now become the most populous state of the union, was to be the forerunner of other similar developments in the United States market. I have not seen any official announcement with regard to the opening of an office in Minneapolis to cover the important midwestern United States market, but I know this is in contemplation. I am sure, as has been the case in the tapping of the California market, that it will make a large contribution toward redressing the unfortunate trend referred to by my good friend from Parry Sound-Muskoka.

I have been reading any statements on the subject of tourism that have become available, particularly from the minister's office, and I have been pleased to see that he is personally dedicated to the continuation of this development. I am also pleased that in a recent series of speeches in which he has referred to Canada's booming economy he has given top attention to the important contribution made by Canada's expanding tourist industry. He has also given credit where credit is due, to the "Diefendollar" which was brought into effect in 1962. I think this is one of the main reasons for the sudden, encouraging expansion referred to by my friend from Parry Sound-Muskoka. This had an amazing psychological impact on United States tourists who for several years had laboured under the disadvantage, more psychological than economic, of the artificially inflated Canadian dollar on the international financial market.

I am sure that the decision of the government party to continue the "Diefendollar", notwithstanding their rather strident and almost hysterical criticism while in opposition, indicates that they have put aside political considerations in the interests of economic and fiscal reality. I am also sure that if this is accompanied by a continuation and expansion of the vigorous promotional program begun a few years ago in the United States market we will once again see a surge forward and a continuation of the trend toward a more balanced relationship on international account.

There is one further question I should like to raise. In 1962 a five year plan was launched by an announcement at the annual conference of provincial and federal tourist organizations. The plan was geared to coincide with the celebration of Canada's centennial

in 1967. I notice that the minister now refers to it in his speeches as a three year plan, but back in 1962 it was actually known as the five year plan. There has just been a change in the numerical designation.

Mr. Sharp: Last year it was four years.

Mr. Dinsdale: It is a change in the numerical designation. I remember the optimistic prophecies envisaging a figure of $1 billion in tourist earnings by 1967, confederation year, which were made at the commencement of the five year plan. I wonder how we are progressing along the road to a realization of the $1 billion target. I am on the side of the optimists in this regard. I think it will be quite easy to realize this figure so long as the government continues the vigorous promotional campaign which accompanied the launching of the program in 1962.

To my mind an integral part of the success of such a promotion is a rapid development of the new market in Europe. The decision was made to move into tourist promotion in the European market for the first time in 1962. If it is true, as the figures for the current year seem to suggest, that we are reaching the saturation point in the United States market, it is all the more urgent that we move forward with all possible speed to expand the program in Europe. We only have three years left in which to prepare Europeans for their friendly invasion of Canada in 1967.

The first opening occurred in London in September of 1962 and was to have been followed by similar openings in Paris and the capitals of other major European countries. I hope this program is going forward just as fast as is physically possible. I know there is a feeling of dedication among the officials of the Canadian government travel bureau, and I know that if support is available from the public treasury there is no limit to their dedication and enthusiasm with regard to the realization of the ambitious $1 billion target first announced in conjunction with the five year plan.

Become I resume my seat I should like to pay tribute to the private enterprisers in the important field of tourist development. The Canadian tourist association has played a major and expanding role in realizing the importance of tourism to the Canadian economy. I can understand the anxiety of the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka with respect to interprovincial tourist trade, and there is no group more conscious of the economic importance of this aspect of tourism than the Canadian tourist association. It is a theme that I think might well be pursued as it has been pursued in the past; and in view of the statistics indicating a reversal of the trend this year it might be taken as one of the important topics to be considered at the annual federal-provincial conference on tourism which, according to the usual schedule, should be just around the corner.

Mr. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Chairman, in entering the debate at this time I am sure it will be appreciated that, as a member of parliament from British Columbia, my primary interest in trade development is in its effect on the economy of western Canada and the Pacific province in particular. Mine is not a narrow, regional interest, but rather in the substantial effect such trade development could have on the nation and the effect the accelerated development of the Pacific region could have on the growth of the nation as a whole.

I know that the minister has shown an awareness of the importance of Pacific policies. He was recently in Japan, and he knows the value of the sales of western grain to China and other Pacific markets. However, I wonder if he has not found, as he has turned his attention to the development of trade and commerce in that region, that we have never had in Canada, and we do not have now, a truly developed policy for the entire Pacific area, a policy that relates not simply to trade and commerce but to every other field of Canadian policy in relation to our Pacific neighbours. As we go beyond the direct field of trade and commerce and develop other policies that are required, such as external affairs policy, immigration policy and fisheries policy, we provide a basis upon which trade policies will be developed over a period of years. In a speech in Montreal on May 21 of this year Dr. Arthur J. R. Smith, director of the Economic Council of Canada, said:

> Traditionally, Canadian interest in international economic affairs has been concentrated on the United States. Over recent years, dynamic developments in western Europe have obviously stimulated greatly increased attention by Canadians to economic affairs across the Atlantic. But no comparable accentuation of Canadian interest has appeared in economic affairs across the Pacific—and especially in the dramatic changes which have been taking place in the Japanese economy.

I think that is a valid criticism of Canadian policy in so far as it relates to the development of our interests throughout the entire Pacific basin. While I agree it is not the direct responsibility of the Minister of Trade

and Commerce to take into account those things that come within the jurisdiction of other ministers in the government, it is his responsibility to be very much aware of all the elements of policy that will assist him in the development of policies for Canada in the trade field. I feel that the minister probably is aware of this. I hope in his discussions he has encountered the necessity for this; for this is a policy area to which we must devote far greater attention than we have in the past.

I believe there are many elements that have to be taken into account in providing a basis for the expansion of our interests in the Pacific. We have to consider trade policies with nations both bordering upon and located within Pacific regions. This includes the states of the United States on the Pacific coast, and not forgetting for one moment the state of Alaska. We must consider the relationship of Canadian foreign policy to those policies already established by Canada's commonwealth partners in the Pacific and the United States; foreign aid programs now in effect, with special emphasis on expansion of aid programs to commonwealth nations in the Pacific, including southeast Asia and the Indian subcontinent; north Pacific fisheries policy; the development of the interchange of peoples through educational aid programs and, as has just been emphasized, tourist travel; accelerated development of west coast harbour facilities, including northern and island ports; improved highway communication between the west coast and north central B.C. and the northern resource areas of the prairie provinces and the Peace river region of B.C. and Alberta; the exploration of either the feasibility or desirability of seeking a corridor through the Alaska Panhandle with free port facilities on the coast to tap the potential resources of northwestern British Columbia and the Yukon.

It is quite obvious that the suggestions I have made do not fall within the ministerial responsibility of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but they do fall within an area in which he is interested. The things I have suggested which should form the elements of policy in the Pacific will have a very definite effect on the expansion of trade in the whole of the Pacific region. I could come back to the question of communications. It will not be possible for the government of Canada to undertake the most advantageous trading arrangements in the Pacific if it is not possible for the newly developing resource areas in British Columbia, the Yukon and the northern sections of the prairies to get their products rapidly and economically to coastal ports. It will be of no advantage to develop an expanded means of communication—and particularly I am thinking in terms of highway communications to the coast—if the coastal facilities are not adequate to handle the products, particularly the newly developed, highly specialized products that are coming out of our western industries.

These things are essential, and we have to consider them in the development of a trade policy. We have to take into account all these related policies which are part and parcel of our over-all objective, the development of the Canadian economy. I hope when he speaks the minister will indicate whether he is prepared to work together with the other members of the cabinet and with the governments of the provinces of western Canada, including British Columbia, to see what leadership all levels of government can give in the development of an integrated Pacific policy.

It is said that something like two thirds of the world's people live in the Pacific region or adjacent to it. We recognize that the economies of many of the nations in that area are underdeveloped. They are not yet at that point where they can trade with us on an equal basis. We have, however, sound reasons to consider the greater role that Canada may play in helping to improve the economic conditions of those nations, so that in due course we may be able to trade with them on a more equal basis and find markets for Canadian products which do not now exist, or in which we are finding competition from other resource developing nations difficult, or in which tariff policies perhaps are a hindrance.

In any event, when two thirds of the world's people are located in an area to which we have ready access through our Pacific coast, it is about time that Canada really devoted all its resources of knowledge and interest to the development of a policy that will give us a far greater share of the economic activity, political activity, trade activity, immigration and social interchange of people in the entire area. It is absolutely essential that we stop turning our attention completely either to the south or to the Atlantic, and consider that there may be a potential we have tended to overlook in an area that is just as much a part of the Canadian area of interest as any other part of the world.

We must recognize that in tapping trade markets in South America we can reach a

very substantial part of those markets through the Pacific ports. We tend to think of the Pacific ports as shipping wheat to China, as shipping coal and the products of the petroleum chemical industry to Japan, and we forget that those ports provide us with entry not only to the western U.S. markets but also to a very extensive part of the potential South American markets as well. Therefore, by every criteria we can find reason to expand our interest and develop our policy as it applies in the Pacific.

In Dr. Smith's speech, to which I referred earlier, he outlines on the final page what he considers to be the Japanese approach to their economic development in the present world of trade and commerce, of rapidly changing economies and technology. The points he outlines as being the objectives of the Japanese government are, I think, important in the creation of Canadian policy. These are some of the things he suggests the Japanese have done, and which I think we should examine with great care and perhaps adopt ourselves:

—a broad capacity among decision makers in both the public and the private sectors of the economy to think in terms of longer range economic probabilities and potentials, and not merely in terms of short term opportunities and problems;
—a broad consensus as to what these potentials are, and what are the chief obstacles to their achievement;
—a broad understanding of the processes of economic growth, underpinned by objective and high quality economic analysis;
—a broad acceptance of the uncertainties and strains of rapid adjustments to change which are an invariable feature of swift economic growth; and
—a broad willingness to support government policies designed to promote economic growth.

If this has been the basis of Japanese policies; if this is what the Japanese people accept, both in public and private life; if this is what they believe they can and must accept to achieve their objectives, then we should be examining these policies as a basis for developing our own policy, because Japan has expanded at the most rapid rate of any nation in economic and industrial growth during the post-war period.

In that context we can think of the development of the Japanese merchant fleet and its shipbuilding industry. These are spectacular things of which those of us who live in the Pacific region are very much aware. We see their ships in our ports. We see the volume of commodities they are carrying to ports all over the world. We know what their strength is as a customer for our products. In B.C., Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba we know the importance of their purchases from us, and we are well aware that Japan is buying some $200 million more a year from Canada than Canada is purchasing from it.

This is one nation in the Pacific upon which we have become very dependent in our trading relations, but there are other nations in the Pacific which, over the period of the next decade, will be developing and, if not as rapidly, will be improving their economies so as to enable them to trade on fairly equal terms with us. There will be a tremendous opportunity in those nations for our industries in western Canada, and I assume also for all industry throughout Canada which has developed skills and specialities to the point where it is able to meet the demands of export markets wherever they exist.

Therefore I think we must come back to a very careful analysis of all the elements of government policy in the Pacific if the minister is to achieve the maximum potential of trade policies in that region. I would think that the news which the newspapers have carried during the past few days would be of interest to him, in the sense that he himself should make it of interest to his colleagues the Minister of Public Works and the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It is the news that the great glacier in Tarr inlet in the Alaska Panhandle has receded at such a rate that it may be the inlet now extends ice free into B.C. and provides us with a corridor to the sea that would give us the shortest communication with the Pacific from the southern Yukon and northern B.C. resource region.

There would, of course, be problems in acquiring port facilities, perhaps even free port facilities in the United States if the recession of ice has not been such as to permit the creation of a port entirely on Canadian soil. This inlet could provide us with a further outlet on the Pacific, and it would tap a region that has had great difficulty in getting its products into world markets because of the problem of having to ship them through U.S. ports, of paying U.S. stevedoring wages, and encountering the difficulty of shipping them to outlets on the Pacific. If we can get the products of that region direct to the ocean, which provides the shortest route of sea communication, rather than having to transport them over railway lines to the more southern ports, then we can reduce the cost of getting raw material and manufactured products into world markets.

A few weeks ago I asked the Minister of Public Works whether any step was being taken to reconvene the conference that was

once held on national highway policy. I was surprised and disappointed when the minister indicated that there was no intention of reconvening the conference nor of proceeding with the national highway policy. It should be of tremendous interest to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the question of national highway policy be considered in the context of getting Canadian products to the coastal ports, particularly in this instance to the Pacific coast ports, so as to move them into the markets that are and will be available for Canadian industry.

National highway policy is an integral part of trade policy. It is the part which will assist us to move our products at competitive costs and get them into world markets at more competitive prices than we can at present. This is a question of particular importance to the Pacific coast, where the construction of highways and the integration of a highway system are complicated by extremely rugged terrain, where the combined resources of the best government planning are essential if the network is to achieve its objective.

We on the Pacific coast know that the government of B.C. has gone into the shipping business in a big way through the construction of ferries. It is now moving from the north coast of Vancouver island into Alaska by providing car ferries, thus improving communications between Alaska and the west coast of B.C. But this will not solve the whole problem, and a proper land link between Vancouver island and the mainland appears more necessary as time goes on and pressure of traffic increases.

In the balance of time that may be available to me later in this debate I shall relate this matter to the policies of trade and commerce but now, Mr. Chairman, I note it is one o'clock.

The Chairman: Order. It is my understanding that this item will stand, and that the committee will go on to other estimates at 2.30.

Item stands.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 2.30 p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation—

L20. Advances to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the purposes of subsection (1) of section 37 of the National Housing Act, 1954, in respect of the acquisition, development, construction and improvement of land and buildings, $216,000.

The Chairman: This item will be found on page 517 of the blue book.

Mr. Nielsen: Before the committee passes this item I think we might draw to the attention of the minister a few of the inadequacies in national housing, and point out also one or two contrasts between what used to be the program of the national Liberal party as promised during two election campaigns and what has actually happened over the last two years.

Of interest to the committee I am sure is a recent report by the Ontario association of housing authorities which showed that hundreds of thousands of Canadians live in inadequate and substandard housing. An article published in the Montreal *Gazette* on August 28, 1964 under the heading "Public Housing Policy in Canada Criticized" may be of some assistance since it contains a condensation of the criticisms embodied in the Murray report. I quote from the *Gazette* of that date:

> A report sharply critical of Canada's attitude towards subsidized public housing was presented to the federal government Thursday.
>
> Based on a two year study by the Ontario association of housing authorities—

The length of time taken would certainly indicate that a good deal of care and consideration went into this assessment of national housing ills.

> —the hundred thousand word report describes the public housing program as inadequate and late, "bearing absolutely no relationship to any realistic appraisal of the need in Canada."
>
> It blames government inaction and public apathy for the fact that 750,000 families are forced either to live in dilapidated and overcrowded houses or pay an excessive portion of their income to escape bad housing.

It would be interesting to hear the minister's views on this particular criticism contained in the Murray report:

> In order to achieve good housing for all Canadians by a 1980 target, 4,000,000 new or rehabilitated dwellings were needed including about 1,000,000 subsidized for low income and ill housed families.

The report tells us:

> The study team, headed by Prof. James A. Murray of the University of Toronto, included amongst its recommendations the appointment of a federal minister of urban affairs and housing, a similar minister at the provincial level, and a national housing and urban advisory committee.

I believe the committee would also be interested to hear the minister's views on behalf of the government with regard to this particular recommendation. Perhaps the minister

would also inform the committee whether the subject of national public housing was among those matters which were considered at any of the recent federal-provincial conferences and, if not, whether this very pressing matter is to be referred to any such conference which may be held in the future. To continue this article in the *Gazette*:

> The report found that about 87 per cent of Canadian dwellings are of reasonable quality.
>
> But it also estimated that "about 570,000 younger families and 180,000 elderly families in the low income group were living in substandard conditions of dilapidation, doubling-up, overcrowding, or were paying excessive portions of their income to escape bad housing."
>
> Another 170,000 elderly households and individuals were similarly troubled.

The report goes on to say:

> "By 1964 Canada, which was the last nation in the western world to embark on assisted housing for low income families or elderly persons, had over a 15 year period laboriously achieved the unimpressive total of some 11,000 units of family-type public housing, 24,000 units of moderate-income housing, 1,000 units of low income co-operative housing and some 6,000 units of elderly persons housing.
>
> Two fifths of 1 per cent of all housing units assembled in the post-war period were public housing units, with rentals subsidized to adjust shelter cost to family income."

I quote further from this article in the *Gazette* which, in turn, quotes from the report.

> The study recommends that Canada should embark on a program which will aim at introducing low income families and elderly persons into the mainstream of community living.

These are matters which have been discussed with the minister and they are matters upon which I, and I am sure all members of the committee, would be interested to hear the minister's views. As far as I am aware, apart from one or two relatively minor alterations in our approach to housing over the last couple of years no policy has been produced to meet the valid criticisms which are contained in the Murray report.

It seems to me to be quite evident that public housing in this country suffers from fragmentation of authority, inability to make decisions and an overlapping and general confusion. We want to know from the minister what the government intends to do in order to clean up the national housing mess. I believe it can properly be called a national housing mess, particularly in the light of the Murray report. One of the more aggravating factors that gives rise to almost insuperable problems as far as the government's inability to cope with this national housing mess is concerned—

Mr. Hahn: What did you do with it?

[Mr. Nielsen.]

Mr. Nielsen: My hon. friend from Toronto asks, what did we do with it. There were more housing starts in the few years the Progressive Conservative party held office than at any time in Canada's history. If the hon. member will check the d.b.s. statistics, he will find that this statement is quite accurate. The reason for that is quite evident, too, in the policies that were implemented during the years 1957 to 1963, policies which injected $750 million, for instance—I believe that is an accurate figure; it is that, or more —into the national housing field, policies which allowed residential construction in the north, where hitherto—that is, prior to 1957 —in my own riding, for example, only two N.H.A. homes had been built. Well over 100 were built immediately after 1958.

Mr. More: Any more interjections?

Mr. Nielsen: I say, Mr. Chairman, that we are faced with a national housing mess. The Murray report indicates this quite clearly. At the same time housing prices are pushed irresistibly upward. One of the factors which is causing this upward rise is the action of this government in imposing an 11 per cent sales tax on building materials. This has produced some disastrous results, which is now quite evident from d.b.s. figures that have been published. This situation cries out for rectification. I quote from the Tuesday, September 29, 1964, d.b.s. *Daily Bulletin* at page 2, where it is set forth that new residential construction in Canada had decreased by 25.1 per cent. The reasons attributed to that decrease are set forth at the bottom of page 2 of that *Daily Bulletin* as follows:

> The upward drift of prices was reinforced in the second quarter. Most of the increase of about 1 per cent in over-all prices took place in expenditure on gross fixed capital formation (up about 1.5 per cent), largely due to the implementation of the second stage of the sales tax on building materials and production machinery. New residential construction prices rose by almost 2 per cent. An increase of a little more than 2 per cent was recorded for the price of machinery and equipment.

That is the conclusion of d.b.s. In our view every effort should be made to reduce, and not to raise the price of housing; for if the price of housing goes up, it is elementary to conclude that fewer starts are going to be made on residential units and that the national public housing problem is going to be irritated and aggravated further. One of the matters this government has crowed about as being so effectual in order to meet the national public housing difficulty is the im-

plementation of the winter built home program, whereby a bonus of $500 is given to individuals if they commence construction at a time which, incidentally, simply is not practical in the northern half of the country. I am speaking of the northern portions of the provinces as well as the areas above the 60th parallel. I believe the subfloor stage must be reached by December 15. At that date, in most northerly areas of Canada, it is simply impossible to proceed any further than the subfloor stage because it is too cold. Housing must be completed by, I believe, March. Therefore you have a bracket of December 15 and the first three months in the new year when you cannot work in northerly climes unless the building is closed in; and yet you do not become eligible for the $500 bonus if your building is closed in before December 15. As a result you find very few individuals living in northern Canada being able to take advantage of this program.

This program does nothing at all to solve the native housing mess, which is a national disgrace and about which I will have a few words to say in a moment. I am not speaking now of the housing situation as represented by the igloos of the Eskimo people; I am speaking of housing with regard to the native Indian peoples throughout Canada, who live in the southerly areas as well as the more northerly areas of this country.

What did the minister and the Liberal party of Canada say they would do with regard to the housing problem in this country? I am going to quote from a pamphlet entitled, on its red front page, "Better places to live and work. The answer", published by the National Liberal Federation of Canada, 251 Cooper street in Ottawa. The Liberal party had all the answers when these circulars and pamphlets were distributed throughout the country, and yet they do not seem to have the courage of the conviction which is disclosed by the propaganda contained in them. The one from which I read says in part:

> A new Liberal government will have a national plan to help municipal development. This plan will promote sound development projects in the places where Canadians live, where they need jobs.

It goes on, under the heading of "Clearing slums":

> Our big cities need special development measures. They have slum areas where overcrowding and poor housing breed ill health, family tension, crime and juvenile delinquency; where adults cannot live well and children cannot get a proper start on the road to good citizenship. No Canadian family should have to live in these conditions.

What does the Murray report say about the hundreds of thousands of families which are living in precisely those conditions; conditions which this government has allowed to exist and worsen for two years, and conditions for which the government is concerned for its inaction by the Murray report.

Mr. Macaluso: That is not accurate.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend suggests this is not accurate. He was not here when I was reading excerpts from the Murray report.

Mr. Macaluso: I have read it.

Mr. Nielsen: If he did not hear it the first time, it will take a moment to put my finger on it again. The Murray report blames government inaction, and the report gives the number of families in distress as 750,000. This is the Liberal pamphlet "The Answer" which I am sure my hon. friends opposite will recognize as being an official publication with which they were provided during the last two campaigns:

> We have to attack these evils. A new Liberal government will provide vigorous leadership, working with provinces and municipalities in a co-operative plan of attack.

We want to know what this plan of attack is.

Mr. More: All in 60 days.

Mr. Nielsen: My hon. friend refers to the 60 days of blazing action, a phrase which I am sure the author is sorry ever to have uttered. We want to know what are these dynamic plans which are going to meet the criticisms of Professor Murray and his colleagues in the compilation of a report which took two years to prepare. I am sure that these studies which went into this report over the course of two years cannot be lightly brushed off by the government.

> For this purpose—

The propaganda pamphlet goes on—

> —the present federal contributions to urban renewal schemes are inadequate. A new Liberal government will increase federal aid to slum clearance schemes.

This has been done in the amendments to the act which went through this house a few months ago, but obviously it is not enough and it is too late. I recall sitting on that side and meeting this criticism of almost every piece of legislation put through during the six years the Progressive Conservatives formed the government. I remember the "four horsemen" over here saying that it

was too little and too late. This is not a political charge; this is a charge made by an economics professor who knows his onions and hails from the University of Toronto. It is a charge which is the product of two years of study to make a realistic appraisal of the housing requirements of this country.

Then the pamphlet goes on to refer to a thorough program and says:

Liberal policies for municipal development will operate as a part of a thorough national development program.

Farming communities often face particularly burdensome costs for municipal services.

And further on it says:

In all areas, a new Liberal government will work with the provinces and municipalities in a major campaign to provide more low rental homes.

I should like the minister to explain to the committee, in view of the major campaign to provide more low rental homes which is referred to in the pamphlet, how many more low rental homes have been provided in the two years the government has been in office. I dare say the number the minister is able to quote will fall short of the assessment made by the Murray report.

Then this statement appears on every one of the pamphlets and nothing could be more fantastic:

The Liberal party has, for today's problems, the answers which are progressive, realistic and responsible.

We want some progressive, realistic and responsible answers from the government regarding such criticisms as those levelled by this impartial and hard hitting report, a report which exposes inaction, lack of planning and lack of responsible programs to clear up our national housing mess.

The argument of the Minister of Finance that employing men in March, April and May under the municipal winter works incentive program, and so on, and then laying them off in June, July and August represents some kind of solution to unemployment is, I think, one of the prime reasons perhaps which prompted the government to pass what I refer to as gimmick legislation, legislation such as the $500 winter built home bonus. This is what has prompted gimmick legislation rather than a realistic appraisal of what are the needs of national housing and the passing of legislation designed to meet those needs, and specifically those needs. If legislation is designed to meet housing needs and criticism such as that I have cited from the Murray report, then the resultant benefits to employment will occur as a matter of course.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

This point was made in an article which appeared in the Vancouver *Province*, a newspaper which circulates in the minister's own home riding, on August 31, 1964 under the heading: "A better place to spend defence dollars". It says:

A two year study by the Ontario association of housing authorities of Canada's attitude toward subsidized public housing declares this country's housing program is inadequate and late and that it bears "absolutely no relationship to any realistic appraisal of the need".

Then toward the end of the article the following appears:

A national housing program on this scale—

That is, the scale proposed by the report from which I have cited.

—might be the answer to those who question Canada's $1.6 billion annual outlay on a largely obsolete defence establishment but argue that if this country did not spend so much on defence it would invite unemployment and dislocate business and industry.

A billion dollars a year on new houses would go a long way to reduce the shortage of adequate housing and few can argue that it would not be a good substitute in every way for a corresponding cut-back in defence spending.

Home construction gives work to carpenters, plumbers, electricians, bricklayers, architects, earthmovers, cement men and moneylenders. Home-building dollars percolate through every level of the economy.

That is what one of the prominent newspapers in the minister's own home province feels about the situation.

I should like to refer to another article, this time appearing in the Charlottetown *Guardian* on September 1, 1964. This article also writes up the Murray report and says, in part:

Present legislation, the study finds, offers little hope of meeting the "distressing housing circumstances of thousands of Canadian families". In order to achieve good housing for all Canadians by a 1980 target, 4 million new or rehabilitated dwellings will be needed—

And then it goes on to quote the remainder of certain portions of the report.

I feel that the arguments which I have heard advanced by the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Finance in tying in this housing legislation—this what I call gimmick legislation—to meet the unemployment situation, is not a proper approach. The proper approach is to design legislation to provide adequate housing to meet the needs of Canada. To adopt the arguments of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Labour is rather an infantile approach, I believe, to economics. Certainly I am not an expert economist but I am sure that even my hon. friends opposite agree with me that the

only way to meet housing requirements in this country is to design legislation which is intended to meet those requirements, not to design gimmick legislation merely as a sop to unemployment. This is an area in which I believe the government should be moving and planning, rather than indulging in meaningless gimmicks which do not provide the addition of one single house or provide any additional jobs on a year-round basis.

I hold in my hand a bulletin issued by an association with which I am sure the minister is familiar, the Vancouver housing association. They too make some fairly pointed criticisms. The bulletin is dated March 1, 1964 and one of their submissions is the following:

> The Vancouver housing authority has applications on file from some 450 families, including many broken families, and 600 elderly persons. Many of these people are very poorly housed.

Under the heading "Too Many Cooks" the bulletin has this to say:

> In an address given in January before the social planning council of metropolitan Toronto, Mr. Harold Clark, a member of the metropolitan Toronto housing authority, made a strong plea for simplifying the administration of public housing. After stating bluntly that, "today there is general frustration over the ineptness of government in the field of public housing, and there is also confusion", Mr. Clark went on to point out that there are no fewer than five separate local agencies and four levels of government responsible for the building or management of public housing in the Toronto area and that 56 separate steps, involving numerous agencies, have to be taken before a housing project can get under way. The net outcome has been that "C.M.H.C. and the provincial government working as a team, and pooling their vast resources of manpower and money power, have since 1958 constructed and turned over to the housing authority 352 units of family housing, or 7 per cent of the 1958 metropolitan Toronto target" of 5,000 units.

Perhaps the minister can bring us up to date on what progress has been made in the field of public housing so that we can compare the situation in 1960, the time the report covers, with that in 1963.

Before I sit down I want to say a word about native housing. As I have noted, new residential construction is down by 25.1 per cent and housing starts are down by 26 per cent. I have called native housing in Canada a national disgrace. I see the minister shaking his head. I am quoting d.b.s. figures taken from page 2 of the d.b.s. *Daily Bulletin* for September 29, 1964.

The Chairman: Order. Perhaps I should interrupt the hon. member at this strategic moment to bring to his attention that his time has expired unless he has the consent of the committee to continue. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nielsen: I will just take two minutes to make my point to the minister with regard to native housing. I have called it a national disgrace and it is time that the government attacked this problem by taking off their kid gloves. They should embark immediately on a massive program of housing for native Indian populations on reserves. Present conditions on these reserves, and I am sure the minister is aware of them, are scandalous and carry with them the seeds of permanent social disaster. The minister is probably keenly aware of the disgraceful conditions in which most of our native populations in southern Canada live but if they are disgraceful in southern Canada they are absolutely appalling in northern Canada. In the Yukon, in the Northwest Territories and in the northern portion of the provinces living conditions are absolutely appalling. Some of the people live in tents all year round and others live in sod hut hovels.

I believe these conditions are an affront to the conscience of every Canadian. The government plays and plays with schemes to unload its responsibilities upon, in most cases, unwilling provincial authorities. I ask the minister this question. Why does the government not take a positive stand and come to grips with the very serious problems involving native housing conditions in this country rather than attempting to slough them off on the provinces? The minister will realize that I have reference to the plan for disposing of the Ungava Eskimos and a few other plans with respect to the native peoples of this country with which the government is playing around.

The conditions are a disgrace. As I have said, they are an affront to the conscience of every Canadian. There is no reason in the world why the minister, who reports to parliament as the minister responsible for C.M.H.C., cannot co-ordinate a scheme with the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and his other cabinet colleagues to embark on a positive program to eliminate for all time the disgraceful and appalling housing conditions which, as I have said, are inviting permanent social disaster so far as the native populations of Canada are concerned.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Chairman, with all the unofficial notice the minister has had over many weeks, if not months, through the medium of questions on orders of the day, I certainly hope that the minister and the officials of Central Mortgage and Housing

Corporation have come prepared this afternoon to give a most detailed explanation of and exhaustive reports on all operations concerning the Fraserview veterans rental and purchase scheme in the city of Vancouver. Since 1962 clear evidence has been presented in the house indicating the interest of veterans in Vancouver particularly and in general throughout Canada, as well as that of members from British Columbia in what has taken place at Fraserview in the city of Vancouver under the housing policy of the government or Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

The need for an exhaustive investigation in committee this afternoon would not have arisen had there been a commonsense and, realistic approach by either or both the government and C.M.H.C. in holding a public hearing in the city of Vancouver as promised, where the entire issue could have been placed on the table and decisions reached. In the alternative the whole question could have been referred to the veterans affairs committee of the House of Commons for the purpose of investigation and examination and making a report to the house. However, in view of the decision by the government or C.M.H.C. or both not to hold a public hearing in Vancouver as requested and promised, and not to refer the matter to the veterans affairs committee, members of the house have no other recourse than to insist, in fact demand that before this item passes we shall have the fullest information and the most complete explanation of policy. When I say the fullest information I do not mean only for the last two years. I hope the minister or the officials have information with them for everything on the balance sheet from the start of construction in 1949 up until the present time.

I ask for a balance sheet showing both sides, revenues and expenditures. I ask that the expenditure item disclose the cost of the land, the cost of servicing construction, the cost of construction, the maintenance cost, the insurance cost, the taxes and what has been written off by the central mortgage and housing as depreciation since 1949. Then the revenue item should disclose the rents and the sales. Then, Mr. Chairman, let us get the relationship between the rentals that are now being asked and the selling price which is being asked.

When I asked the minister a question a couple of days ago, and another member asked one I believe last week, we were told that everyone has signed a rental or sales agreement except 50. I believe that was the figure. I am not in any position to challenge the figure of 50 and say it is right or wrong. I will accept the minister's statement. However, let me make this clear, or as clear as I possibly can: Even if there are only 50 who have not yet agreed to the sale price or signed a rental agreement, they are backed by the hundreds who have signed in so far as the principle those 50 are espousing is concerned. I will say, without fear of honest contradiction, that the majority of those who have signed within the last two years, signed because of intimidation and fear as a result of the letters they received to the effect that if they did not agree to the rental or the sale price, then they would get their eviction notice.

There are many who will bow to that sort of thing because they feel, what else can they do? I also used the word "fear". There may be a better word that escapes me at the moment. What are they up against right now? First, you have to find new accommodation in Vancouver or the lower mainland; there are the costs of moving, the disturbance to the home and children being torn from the only local friends they have; taken away from school and put in a new one. If you add all these things together, you will find the reason many people signed under protest, as a result of intimidation and fear. I am not speaking out of hearsay, sir. I have talked to a great many of these people as recently as one week ago in Fraserview itself.

Now, sir, we are asking for a balance sheet from 1949 until now. We are asking that the minister give us, from the record, the policy basis for the construction of these homes. What were the commitments, definite or implied at the time the veterans went into these homes? What was the position of the Liberal party up until last year with regard to the Fraserview situation, on the basis of which some 1,200 veterans in the city of Vancouver, in Fraserview, are being asked by the government and C.M.H.C. to make up the losses that have been incurred in the rest of Canada? We would like to know in detail why the government, whose heart bleeds for the veteran during election campaigns, now want to make a profit out of the veteran? To the best of my knowledge, they do not even intend to take into consideration in the selling price the depreciation which has been wiped off every year since construction. Of course, when I say "every year", I may be a little bit out. If my memory serves me correctly, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation said that the records of the first

few years had somehow been destroyed. I hope that since that answer was given in the house a couple of years ago, perhaps those records have been found and we can now have the complete story.

May I ask the minister, as he gives some thought to his answer, that he bring back into his memory *Hansard* page 754, October 22, 1962, which records the parliamentary return we received. This parliamentary return indicated that the total cost of 1,137 houses built in Fraserview, including land and servicing of the buildings, amounted to $11,340,452, which works out at an average of $9,972 per house. This was the average cost to the government in 1949. A profit has been made on the rentals and on the sales, and now you want to sell the houses to the veterans at more than they cost in 1949. On what basis of decency, sir, could there be any explanation? We will be interested in hearing it.

This is not just my own view. I know it is the view of the minister that what a Liberal candidate says when he is running for election must not be held against him if he is successful and becomes a member of the government. Here we have the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, who is the member for Vancouver South, in which Fraserview is located, making the following statement. I want to read this to substantiate our request for decent treatment for the Fraserview veterans. This appeared in the 1963 election campaign, and I want to read every word on this page because this was directed to every veteran in Fraserview. I quote:

Arthur Laing
5957 West Boulevard, Vancouver 13, B.C.

An hon. Member: Speak louder.

Mr. Winch: Believe it or not, boys, I could.

Dear Constituent:

To the residents of Fraserview:

In the general election of 1962 I made an issue of the method by which C.M.H.C. was seeking to sell the houses in the Fraserview area.

It was obvious that the basic philosophy which prompted the development in 1949 had been abandoned—

This, of course, was by the Conservatives.

—and that the low rent concept no longer had an appeal to the government at least on this project. It appeared that memory was short, that this was a project for returning veterans who had lost a few years of normal incomes not denied to those who were not overseas.

It appeared to me that a 25 year mortgage carrying interest as high as 6½ per cent on these houses not only failed to recognize the residuary principle of assisted housing but would be hard to defend in a private market. As view lot property and from the angle of the services installed the area is superb. But upon discharge of the mortgage offered the houses would be almost 40 years old. Their construction is not such as to give validity to such an undertaking.

To obtain information I asked two very detailed questions... I ask that the answers be studied carefully.

Please note from the answers the following facts:

A. The average original cost of land, services and houses was $9,808.

B. Straight line depreciation of 2½ per cent was computed for the purpose of determining the corporation's book value of the properties.

C. The project was originally financed at a borrowing rate of 2 per cent per annum.

D. No instructions were ever issued that the sale price was to be based on the actual cost rather than current market value.

E. The sales prices are established on a basis to recover nationally the government's outlay in a program involving 12,000 houses throughout Canada.

F. There is an admission that identical houses are being sold in Vernon for $2,500 less. The defence is that in addition to the original cost of construction present market value and location are considered.

The method of straight line 2½ per cent depreciation would place book value of the properties, on average, at under $7,000. Fraserview being considered a premium property, prices have been set that pick up losses incurred in other parts of the country.

I believe that an injustice is being done the residents of Fraserview in the present methods of sale. I think proof of injustice is contained in the answers of the Department of Public Works. I shall continue to seek redress of our grievances here, which, when complete must include an adjustment for the some 400 properties already sold.

Sincerely,
Arthur Laing, Liberal
candidate, Vancouver South.

This was the letter written before last year's election by the man who is now Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources and is the member of parliament for the constituents to whom he wrote this letter, a letter in which he stated that the Conservative policy was to charge Fraserview a price that would pick up losses on the other 12,000 veterans' homes built across Canada, a letter in which he admitted that taking into account the depreciation charges in the books of C.M.H.C., the value per home in 1963 was under $7,000. That was his statement before he became a cabinet minister.

He also stated that the owners of the 400 homes that had been bought prior to the 1963 election were entitled to a redress because they had been overcharged by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. In view of this entire situation, in view of the situation of the minister as a candidate just over one year ago, in view of the importance of this to the veterans, in view of the policy

under which these homes were constructed —not as a profit making enterprise by the government or Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, but to meet the need of those who offered their lives in the last world war—in view of the fact that the government did not see fit to honour this promise, and in view of the fact that this matter has not yet been referred to the veterans affairs committee, though I hope it will be, if we cannot receive the most complete and factual information on this matter this afternoon then this estimate should not pass.

The estimate should not pass unless the government is prepared to refer this matter to what I consider a most responsible body, the veterans affairs committee, representative of all parties in parliament, I believe composed almost 100 per cent of veterans who are concerned with veterans' problems and welfare under all departments of government. I suggest that this is the logical procedure, in order that we can proceed with the other business of the house. In conclusion, I hope we shall have a complete, factual, realistic, honest report on policy, expenditures and revenues on the Fraserview project from the first day of construction in 1949 to date.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Chairman, this lone item of $216,000 in the estimates for Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the fiscal year 1964-65 is a very modest one, having regard to the nature and extent of the corporation's work. I would point out that the individual items which make up this $216,000 do not come within any of the remarks made by the hon. member for Yukon and the hon. member for Vancouver South.

Mr. Winch: We did not hear anything from the hon. member for Vancouver South.

Mr. Nicholson: But I do welcome the fact that the estimates come before parliament so that these hon. members and others have an opportunity of commenting on the activities of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and on housing and allied programs of our country. I think I should add that I do not intend to make any detailed reply, except on the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation aspect of the Fraserview project. I did make a very comprehensive statement, or at least what several members, including the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam said was a very comprehensive statement on the activities of the corporation when I introduced the bill which led to the amendment of the National Housing Act.

[Mr. Winch.]

His memory must be failing him, or else he was not in the chamber on that occasion, or the hon. member for Yukon would never have made some of the statements he made here today. I have sent for a copy of the remarks I made on that occasion, and I would ask one of the pages to deliver it to the hon. member for Yukon because I think he will see that almost every point on which he spoke with the exception of better housing for Indians, was dealt with in these earlier remarks of mine.

Mr. Nielsen: I was here.

Mr. Nicholson: I should also like to refer briefly to the Murray report, and I would point out to the committee that 75 per cent of the cost of that report was paid for by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. That report was commissioned early in 1962 and it refers largely to the conditions that existed prior to 1962.

I would also point out to the hon. member for Yukon that the president of the Ontario association, Mr. Freiday, who assumed responsibility for preparation of the report, came to my office with Professor Murray. On that occasion there was also present the provincial minister of economics and development, whose government paid the other 25 per cent of the cost. We were complimented by Mr. Freiday and by Professor Murray upon having anticipated many of the points made in the report and upon having covered them in the legislation we introduced last May, supplemented by the legislation introduced in the legislature of the province of Ontario There have been several complimentary references to the government in connection with the actions taken in anticipation of the criticisms contained in the report.

Mr. Nielsen: I compliment the minister, too.

Mr. Nicholson: Thank you. There was another point which the hon. member made this afternoon and which I think calls for some comment. As I announced in this house in late September, I think, we held a conference in Halifax—it was referred to as a symposium—attended not only by several provincial ministers and some deputies but by more than 50 municipal representatives. We discussed the amendments to the act and the possibilities under the new legislation When we convened not only the Halifax conference but the subsequent conference in St. John's I was acting, upon a suggestion which was made here in the house by one of the Toronto members, I think it was the hon. member for Danforth, who in the course

of his remarks on the amendments to the National Housing Act said he had a few constructive suggestions to make and offered the hope that at a later date they would be given attention. But in the main he was most complimentary about the program envisaged by this new act. He went on to make it clear, however, that in the absence of active co-operation and enthusiastic support from provincial and municipal governments this new act, of which I think we can all be very proud, would be meaningless. And he suggested a series of these conferences. The object was to ensure that every municipality in Canada or that every province in Canada would know of the possibilities and of the facilities which are now available under the new legislation. That was the purpose of these meetings.

The Halifax meeting was attended not only by the president of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation but by all of the directors of the board with one exception. The vice president and other senior officials also were there, as were the members of parliament for that riding and some members of the legislature. Questions were answered and there was a really worth-while discussion. I think I can say the conference was a great success. Then on October 8, 9, and 10 I visited Newfoundland in company with the president, the vice president and other senior officials of C.M.H.C. There we found the premier together with several other ministers of the Newfoundland government in attendance with the deputy ministers and officials concerned. No fewer than 75 municipal representatives came to St. John's for this two-day symposium. I think it was a timely and helpful discussion. I will go further and say it was a very lively discussion—you cannot spend two days in Newfoundland without things being lively, especially when a question period is included.

We have arranged for meetings in Alberta on November 5 and 6. The meeting on November 5 will be held in Calgary and the meeting on November 6 in Lethbridge, while the federation of municipalities of the province of Alberta is holding its annual meeting. At the request of the federation we are holding the meeting at the same time. The provincial minister and I will be in attendance, along with the president of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation on that occasion. Not only will the subject of housing generally be under discussion but the possibilities of using the new act for sewerage construction projects and, more particularly the advantages of an extensive program of urban renewal, will be discussed at length during that meeting.

I welcome this opportunity to make an announcement. A few weeks ago, I stated that the two provincial ministers concerned and I had agreed on the dates for the housing conference for eastern and southern Ontario as November 23 and 24, in Toronto. I have since found we were not able to get sufficient hotel accommodation for those dates. I also found that not only the mayor of Ottawa but the mayor of London, Ontario, and the mayor of Toronto felt it would be better to wait until after the municipal elections. This morning, with the assurance of the provincial ministers that they were in agreement, we changed the dates to December 16 and 17 by which time the elections will be over and some thought will have been given to who will be the leaders of housing programs by all the mayors and the reeves. So the meetings will be held in Toronto on December 16 and 17. The federation of mayors and reeves have been advised and are in agreement with the new dates.

Now I should like to make a special reference to the Fraserview veterans' housing project which, as the hon. member for Vancouver East has said, has been the subject of many questions. A series of questions has been asked in the house relating to the increases in rents which were introduced effective October 1 of this year. This housing project comprises 1,146 houses. They are units of two, three and four bedrooms. This is one of several projects completed after world war II under the 1948 and 1949 veterans' rental housing program. Hon. members may recall the statements which were made in answer to questions raised by the hon. member for Vancouver East and other hon. members. Approximately 12,000 houses were built across Canada during the two years which followed the passing of the legislation. All of them were rented to veterans of the second world war and of the Korean war.

I should like to make it clear—and this is apparent from the discussion which took place when the original legislation was passed—that this project was not intended to provide subsidized housing for veterans. It was intended to provide badly needed houses at fair rentals for veterans of the second world war and of the Korean campaign in large parts of Canada where the need arose. In 1954 it became apparent that the demand for rental accommodation for veterans was diminishing and that in most cities it was over. In that year the government of the day

authorized the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to offer houses for sale to qualified veterans. However, before the houses could be placed on sale certain requirements had to be met. In the first place the corporation had obtained the co-operation of several cities and other municipalities in providing sites for the houses, and renegotiation with these municipalities had to take place. In addition an assurance had to be received from veterans' organizations and others that there was no longer an acute shortage in a particular city or municipality and that there would be sufficient demand from veterans to buy these houses if they were offered for sale, I might say that when they were initially offered for sale, the sale price of these houses was established on a national basis. But in setting prices for each individual project consideration was given to a series of factors, including the original cost of construction, the age and condition of the houses, their location and their fair market value at the time they were offered for sale. The government was to try, if this could be done in a reasonable way, to recover its full outlay in respect of these houses on a national basis. This policy resulted in sale prices which were somewhat higher than the actual cost in some communities where the market values were higher, and in prices which were somewhat lower in a number of communities where market values were lower. This policy enabled Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the instrument of the government concerned, to offer houses for sale in individual communities in the light of existing conditions there.

Because market values in Nova Scotia are quite different from market values in Ontario or British Columbia, you have higher prices in one place than in another. That is not surprising. But if you had sold a house in Vancouver that had gone up in value by $3,000 or $4,000, you would have upset the market conditions in that area and you would in effect have been bonusing, to the detriment of taxpayers, including other veterans, all projects in other parts of the country. It was felt they should not offer houses for sale in any city or town at prices likely to disrupt the market too radically.

There was also a serious objection to this program based on the fact that there would be serious speculation in some cities. Houses that might have cost $10,000 or $12,000 in 1949 or 1950 had in some instances appreciated in value, due to conditions in that particular city, by as much as $4,000 or $5,000.

[Mr. Nicholson.]

It was agreed that if a veteran wanted to buy a house, to prevent speculation they would add right across Canada the sum of $1,000 per house, which was to be written off if the veteran remained in the house for a five-year period. It was to be written off at so much a year for five years. This technique, I might say, was known as the rebate procedure. I am assured, not only by the officials of central mortgage and housing but by veterans and others that this procedure has worked successfully in connection with projects in many parts of Canada.

Although the agreement with the city of Vancouver covering Fraserview was successfully renegotiated in 1955 to permit the sales program, they were not able to embark on sales immediately because final construction costs for the whole project were not known at that time. The Fraserview project was therefore the last one of the 10 or 15 or more projects throughout Canada that went on the market. The cost reports were completed by the end of 1958, and in February, 1959, the representatives of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation met with more than 500 of the Fraserview tenants and presented a schedule of proposed prices, together with terms of sale, and that schedule included this $1,000 mark-up which would be rebated if the veteran held the house for a five year period.

The meeting was in February, 1959, and there was almost unanimous acceptance of this schedule. The houses were offered for sale on May 1, 1959. I might say that the records show beyond a shadow of a doubt that the fair value of the average housing unit in Fraserview was $2,000 to $4,000 per unit higher than the actual cost at that time. If they had been sold, it would have meant that every veteran in those houses, in addition to the other benefits he had received would have received a bonus of at least $1,000, because the $1,000 rebate would come into the picture if he had sold the house after a five year period.

Throughout this whole program of disposing of houses—this practice has been followed consistently in most parts of Canada—Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation have disposed of thousands of these units under this program. In Vancouver, up to the beginning of June of this year, they had disposed of over 500 houses of the 1,140 or so that comprised this project. But during the whole of this period in every city or community in Canada that had a program of this kind semi-annual reviews were carried on

to determine whether the $1,000 rebate procedure should be retained in different cities. The corporation, through its staff and advisers, were also kept aware of market conditions not only in Vancouver but in other cities. In May, 1963, to encourage the sale of the Fraserview houses to veterans, a team of corporation appraisers was appointed specially to look into the Fraserview situation. They recommended the removal of the rebate. This is not surprising, because the five year period had elapsed, even in the case of British Columbia, in the period 1954 to 1959. They also recommended a reduction of $600 in the sale price of basementless houses.

But I would point out that in the same report that was made in the late spring of 1963 it was shown that existing rents were substantially below the level of houses of that quality in that part of Vancouver. On July 25, 1963, the $1,000 rebate was removed from the sale of these houses and the prices of the basementless units were reduced by the $600 recommended by the corporation's appraisers. However, at the same time the corporation announced rent increases ranging from $3.50 to $11.50 per month to take effect on September 1, 1963. Following this representations were made on behalf of the tenants by several people, including the hon. member for Vancouver South. I believe representations were also made by the hon. member for Vancouver East, but I know they were made by the hon. member for Vancouver South. As a result of representations from several sources, the rent increases were deferred and the minister then in charge, the late Jack Garland, after consulting with the corporation and receiving their agreement in this regard, arranged for an independent appraisal to be carried out with regard to the rentals that should be charged and as to the values of these houses.

The appraisal company that was brought in was Bell-Irving Realty Limited, of Vancouver, the president of which is a distinguished veteran, Brigadier Henry P. Bell-Irving. He has a distinguished war record; he was awarded the D.S.O. and O.B.E., and fought in Italy and on the western front. The firm's appraiser, Mr. E. W. Palmer, was eminently qualified for the task he was asked to perform. He is an accredited appraiser of the appraisal institute of Canada, a senior real estate appraiser in the society of real estate appraisers, a fellow of the valuers institute of London, England, and a member of the professional division of the realtors institute of British Columbia. He is considered by all who know him to be a highly qualified specialist in this field.

The Bell-Irving appraisal confirmed the corporation's report of May, 1963, but recommended that further reductions should be made in the sale prices of two basic house types in the amounts of $300 and $500. The corporation immediately implemented the reductions recommended by this independent appraiser; they were implemented on June 1, 1964, and since that time I understand that another 50 or so houses have been sold. The effect of these adjustments was to establish selling prices that are in the order of $500 to $600 below current market values in Vancouver. I ask the hon. member for Vancouver East to keep that in mind. This shows conclusively that the prices at which veterans are now able to buy them are in the order of $500 to $600 a house lower than the current market value for that type of house. At the time these reductions were effected the corporation's board of directors reaffirmed the previously recommended rent increases that should have taken effect in September, 1963. They reaffirmed them to take effect on October 1, 1964. In June last notices to that effect were sent out to the 601 tenants. They were given until September 15 to signify whether they wanted to enter into a new lease at the increased rents. I might say that the increase in rentals is due largely if not entirely to an increase in grants in lieu of taxes being paid to the city of Vancouver. There is no profit in it for the corporation. The increases do not cover the added amount paid on the Fraserview houses to the municipality. These rent increases range from $3.50 to $11 per month.

By the deadline of September 15, 419 of the 601 tenants had accepted, 38 had purchased their houses, 12 had vacated, leaving 132 not heard from. In the two weeks which followed, that is between September 15 and October 1, 59 more tenants made their decision and as of the close of business on September 30 the corporation then had 73 tenants from whom they had not heard. The corporation then sent out notices that since the tenants had not entered into these new arrangements they would be evicted. Of course this would not mean that if they had a good case they would be evicted; a judge of the court would listen to the reasons in any case coming before him. I have stated repeatedly that since this matter had been reduced to manageable proportions I was quite prepared to have the officials of the

department consider each individual case, or if anyone wanted to take them up with me individually I would be pleased to do so.

Mr. Douglas: Could I ask the minister a question. Could he tell the committee on what basis the appraisers set these rents? Was it on the basis of actual cost or a rent which would retire the investment which Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has made, plus current expenses, or was it a rent which was based on current rents in the area?

Mr. Nicholson: The rents in all cases are lower than rents in the area for houses of similar value. The combination of circumstances to which I referred—the cost of the house, its condition and other factors—were all taken into consideration, as well as general rents in the area.

Mr. Douglas: The minister is talking about the condition of the houses and I assume is talking about the sale price; but in determining these rents was the determination based solely on an economic rental to cover the investment of C.M.H.C. or was any other factor taken into consideration?

Mr. Nicholson: The rents were just enough to carry these houses, but not to make any profit out of the transaction. They are amortized to the amount of the balance owing so as to pay current taxes and maintenance and operating expenses.

Mr. Chatterton: Could the minister tell me at what rate was the amortization?

Mr. Nicholson: The amortization was on the basis of 2½ per cent interest over a period of 50 years, credit being given for the amount which had accumulated up to that date.

Mr. Winch: Might I ask whether in this compilation the amount which had been cleared off through depreciation over the years was also taken into consideration?

Mr. Nicholson: Might I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that I be allowed to finish my statement. I have had prepared a table which will help answer these questions, and then if hon. members have any further questions I will do my best today to answer them.

As of the close of business on September 30 there were some 73 people who had not agreed to enter into new leases; two of the people who said they were going to did not in fact do so. Then in the two weeks which followed the notices of eviction which were sent out, certain other people indicated that they wanted to stay on in the houses. This reduced the total of 73 to a total of 54 by a date in early October.

Yesterday I received from 18 other people —that is in addition to the 52 plus the two —altogether 54-signed letters addressed to me which obviously had been typed by the same machine, indicating an organized drive. These letters asked for a public hearing. All but 54 of these 600 odd tenants are paying the new rents and have paid them for the month of October. So that while over 500 people out of the 601 have entered into some new leasing arrangement, another dozen or more have vacated voluntarily and I think about 40 people have bought houses, you have at the outside, taking the 52 and 18, 70 people who are still complaining. These people have had the benefit of the lower rentals for more than a year. The corporation has not collected rents so as to carry this project for over a year. The corporation's appraisers recommended that these rent increases should take effect last summer. Further delay will be unfair to the people who have bought houses, and the 500 odd people who have entered into the new leases and are paying them without complaint. I am not saying that there are not people who do not complain. Of course, no one likes to have his rent raised and any one of us would complain of that. But many veterans have stated publicly that they do not want to be subsidized in these houses and are willing to pay, which is demonstrated by the fact that over 500 of them are paying the higher rents.

To explain the current rents and also the current selling prices I have had a tabulation prepared showing the individual type of houses and listing the original selling price, that is, the price at which these houses were offered in 1959 and which was almost unanimously accepted by the tenants. On the same sheet is shown the adjusted price as a result of the corporation's appraisal in 1963 and the independent appraisal in 1964. The rent is also shown; that is, the former rent, the new rent and the estimated fair market rent for each type of house. Rather than read this, Mr. Chairman—it would be difficult to follow if I just gave the isolated figures—I should like to table a copy of this tabulation and have it made part of *Hansard*.

Mr. Nielsen: Might I suggest, Mr. Chairman, if the committee is agreeable, that the tabulation referred to by the minister be printed in *Hansard* at this stage of the minister's remarks.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Richard): Is it the wish of the committee that the minister have leave to print this tabulation in the record?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: The table above referred to is as follows:*]

Fraserview Veterans' Housing Project
Schedule of Selling Prices and Rents

Selling Prices

Type of unit	Original sale price including rebate	Adjusted sale price
Small, 4 room, non-basement bungalow	$ 9,300	$ 7,700
Large, 4 room, non-basement bungalow	9,600	8,000
5 room, non-basement bungalow	10,800	9,200
Small, 4 room, full basement bungalow	9,800	8,800
Large, 4 room, full basement bungalow	10,400	9,100
5 room, 2 level	10,500	9,500
5 room, full basement bungalow	11,600	10,100
5 room, part basement bungalow	11,700	10,700
5 room, 1½ storey, small	11,600	10,600
5 room, 1½ storey, large	11,800	10,800
6 room, 1½ storey	11,900	10,900

Rents

Type of unit	Former rent	New rent	Fair market rent
Small, 4 room, non-basement bungalow	$48.50	$52.00	$67.50
Large, 4 room, non-basement bungalow	50.00	54.00	67.50
	50.50	59.00	70.00
5 room, non-basement bungalow	57.00	67.00	77.50
Small, 4 room, full basement bungalow Large, 4 room, full basement bungalow	55.50	65.00	75.00 and 77.50
5 room, 2 level 5 room, full basement bungalow 5 room, 1½ storey, small 5 room, part basement bungalow 5 room, 1½ storey large	61.00	72.00	82.00 and 92.00
6 room, 1½ storey	64.00	75.00	93.50

Mr. Winch: May I also ask the minister if he has any tabulation of costs and revenues?

Mr. Nicholson: Not included in this form. I have it before me and if the hon. member will come into my office I will be glad to show it to him in detail.

Mr. Winch: I want to see it before the estimates pass.

Mr. Nicholson: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I have extra copies of this sheet for each of the other parties if they wish to have one. The last column is headed "fair market rent", and that is the fair market rent in the opinion of the representative of the Bell-Irving firm who made the appraisal. Hon. members will see that in each case the new rents are substantially below rental charges in the area.

That is all I wish to say on the subject of the Fraserview veterans' housing project, but I should also like to correct another impression that might have been created by an earlier statement. I am sure the committee will be interested to know that as of September 30 starts of new housing units in Canada were up in 1964 by 10.2 per cent over those reported for the same period in 1963.

Mr. Nielsen: May I ask the minister a question at this point? Is he suggesting that the d.b.s. news bulletin is inaccurate?

Mr. Nicholson: All I am suggesting is that the figures I am giving may be as of a different date and they may also represent a comparison with a different period. I am comparing the first nine months of 1964 with the corresponding nine months of 1963, and the figures show that starts actually are up by 10.2 per cent.

Mr. Nielsen: I think the figures I quoted from the bulletin were for the same period. I do not have it before me now because I gave it to *Hansard,* but my recollection is that the figure in the bulletin was as of the same date, September 29, 1964. If d.b.s. is wrong may I suggest there is an obvious lack of accurate communication between C.M.H.C. and d.b.s.

Mr. Nicholson: That may be but this is the figure and I am prepared to stand behind it. It is up 10.2 per cent for the first nine months. This means that if the winter house-building program meets with the same measure of success it did last year, and this is our expectation based on the applications for loans, housing starts in 1964 will be upward of 155,000 units, or the second highest year in Canada's history.

Mr. Nielsen: Which was the highest?

Mr. Nicholson: I think it was 1958. Prior to this year the second highest was 1963 which now takes third place. On the basis not only of my visit to Halifax and St. John's and the meetings that took place there, but also of my visit to Saskatoon where in company with the minister of the former government a federal-provincial housing project was opened and discussions were had at that time, as well as of visits that I have made to housing projects in Manitoba and Alberta and more recently to my native province of New Brunswick, I would say that a great deal of interest has been stimulated in housing and urban renewal. The scope of the projects, for instance, in the city of Hamilton, in the city of Windsor and in the city of Saint John is beyond belief. The same applies to cities in Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is in the midst of one of its busiest and, I think, most challenging years. There is a lot of educational work to be done, but I believe sincerely that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is an efficient and dedicated organization and I invite the committee's early approval of their very modest estimate.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

Mr. Chatterton: With regard to the column, "new rent", in the table the minister has given us, I think the minister said in his remarks that one of the factors considered was amortization of the outstanding capital, and the minister referred to a rate of 2½ per cent. Is that correct?

Mr. Nicholson: Two and a half per cent. It was agreed in the initial stages when these houses were being built for veterans that the investment would be recouped over a period of 50 years at the rate of 2½ per cent per year. This policy has been carried through, but when some years later a program of sale was embarked upon factors involving speculation and other things came into the picture and they were taken into consideration in determining market values in the respective areas. If I may leave rents aside for a moment, you will note that so far as the sale price is concerned in no case is the adjusted price higher than the original price. In some cases they are slightly higher than cost but they are not higher than the original price.

Mr. Chatterton: That is my next question. The adjusted sales price is less than the original—

Mr. Nicholson: No, it is not higher.

Mr. Chatterton: It is less, I say. What factors were used in making that adjustment? Was the portion of the rent allocated by C.M.H.C. to depreciation considered?

Mr. Nicholson: My information is that it was only one of the factors.

Mr. Chatterton: Would that be the major factor in considering adjustment?

Mr. Nicholson: I think the major factor was that nobody would have to pay more than the house was worth and the object was to try not to disturb either prices or rentals in the particular areas involved. It is not just a case of being fair to a limited number of veterans, for whom I am sure every government would want to do the best it could. The fact is there are other people to whom the government has to be fair, the people who are paying the taxes that make these projects possible.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, I should like to join with the hon. member for Vancouver East in protesting very strongly the treatment which has been meted out to veterans in the Fraserview housing project. I must say that my concern about this matter has not been

lessened to any degree by the outline the minister has just given to the committee. If anything it has been heightened.

The minister says that there were some 1,146 houses in this project and that they were a part of 12,000 low rental houses that were built for veterans across Canada. Then he went on to say that these were not to be subsidized houses but houses which were to pay the actual cost. But then he went on to say that when it was decided in 1954 to make them available for sale, the sale price in some communities of necessity had to be higher than cost in order not to disturb the market. I take it this means that if C.M.H.C. was going to balance out its operations over the entire 12,000 houses and if some of the houses were going to be sold for more than they cost, then in other communities they were going to be sold for less than they cost. The government which objected to subsidizing houses, was really asking the veterans to subsidize veterans' houses in some instances. Veterans in some parts of Canada were going to subsidize veterans in other parts of Canada. It seems to me the height of absurdity to object to government subsidization and yet to ask veterans to subsidize other veterans' houses in other parts of Canada.

The argument which the minister posed, that they could not disturb the market, seems to me like a typical real estate argument. These were veterans. These were men who had lost years of income. These were men who deserved special consideration from the country, and to say it was necessary to charge them more than cost merely for fear of disturbing the local real estate market seems to me the strangest argument I have ever heard advanced for charging veterans more than they should have been called upon to pay.

The minister says that by 1959 they had finally worked out what the cost of these houses would be and that for the Fraserview veterans' housing project the price set at that time was $2,000 higher than the actual cost. Of course, at that time there was to be a rebate of $1,000 but this was later cancelled and instead there is to be a reduction of $300 or $500 depending upon certain categories. If I understood the minister correctly, what he is really saying is that in order to balance out the total cost of the entire 12,000 houses the veterans in the Fraserview project who decided to buy their houses were going to be charged in 1959 $2,000 more than it actually cost to build those houses. Instead of a reduction of $2,000, there is a reduction of only $300 or $500 as the case may be. The minister is shaking his head, so I do not want to proceed on this line if I am wrong. May I ask the minister, is that not what he said? In 1959 the price which he said the veterans were prepared to accept in the schedule was $2,000 higher than the actual cost of constructing these homes? I notice the minister shaking his head, and I do not want to make a statement that is incorrect.

Mr. Nicholson: What I was saying, or at least by nodding my head was indicating, was that the statement was not in accordance with what I tried to say earlier this afternoon. The new sale program was introduced in 1954, and was introduced in Vancouver in February of 1959. The original program was to provide houses at a modest rental for veterans who urgently needed houses when they returned from the two wars. You were converting a purely rental project to one giving the veterans an opportunity to buy the houses into which they had put some of their own efforts and to which they had become attached.

At that time, in 1954 and 1955, and in the case of Vancouver in 1959, you were going to sell the houses and it was no longer a case of getting just a rental that would cover it. With housing values as they were in Vancouver—I am sure the hon. member knows they were really higher than in Halifax or some other place—the government would get out of the sale project, not just a rental project, on a nation-wide basis without making or losing any money.

I should like to read into the record, for the benefit of the hon. member and also the hon. member for Vancouver East, a letter that was sent by the Fraserview community association. It is dated February 10, 1959 and it is addressed to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, re offer of sale of Fraserview homes. I quote:

> Further to our telephone conversation with you this morning, we are pleased to report the outcome of the meeting of this association held last evening in the auditorium of Sir James Douglas school with reference to the above question.
>
> This meeting was attended by more than 500 members of the Fraserview veterans' community. Subsequent to presentation of our report of the meeting with you on February 2 together with the schedule of prices upon which sale of the Fraserview homes will be based, and a subsequent detailed question period, a show of hands indication was called on two questions.
>
> To the first, viz., approval in principle of the schedule of proposed home prices and terms, well over 90 per cent indicated affirmatively.

To the second, viz., how many had already made the decision to purchase upon receipt of the official offer, something over 50 per cent of those present so indicated.

This was borne out by the fact that they did.

In view of the size of this meeting, we feel that you will agree with us in regarding these results as quite decisive and as fully warranting your implementation of the proposed offer of sale forthwith.

We take this opportunity to express to you, Mr. Houston and to Mr. Clauson, our sincere appreciation and thanks for your sympathetic attitude and kind co-operation in this matter. It has been a pleasure thus to associate with you.

Now, you will see that the deal which came out of the two recent appraisals is better for these veterans who have remained there than had they taken advantage of this earlier offer.

Mr. Douglas: This does not alter in any way the point I was making. The Fraserview housing project was originally a rental project. In 1954 it was decided to offer these houses for sale. In 1959, the price which was set was not based on the cost to C.M.H.C. for that particular project, it was based on the cost of the entire 12,000 veterans' houses built across Canada. If I interpreted the minister's statement correctly so far as the Fraserview project was concerned, the prices at which these houses were offered in 1959 were $2,000 higher than the actual cost for that project, less the reduction which the minister is now producing of $300 or $500.

Mr. Nicholson: That is correct, with this modification, that they were also $2,000 lower than the fair market value for similar houses in that area.

Mr. Douglas: I am not interested in the market value of houses in this area. I am interested in the Canadian people making these houses available at what it cost the Canadian government to construct and operate them. The minister is now talking about some other fact. These people are now going to pay more for these houses than they cost C.M.H.C. to build and operate.

Now the minister has defined the position which was taken in 1959. I want to point out that is not the position which the Liberal party took in 1959, or which they took in the election campaigns of 1962 and 1964. My colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver East, read into the record a copy of a letter sent out by the present minister of northern affairs, the member for Vancouver South, in 1963. Here is part of a letter he sent out in 1962 on exactly the same subject. It is dated June 15, 1962, and was also sent to the veterans in the Fraserview housing project. I quote:

I think that home ownership is good and that the residents, having paid for depreciation of the houses and services in their rent for years should have the opportunity to buy their homes if they wish to, at cost, taking into account the depreciation they have already paid.

The present Conservative government says that at a price around $10,800 per home it is making the Fraserview houses available at cost. This is not the case. The actual average cost of house, land and services on C.M.H.C. books is approximately $6,600. If all houses are sold at an average of $10,800, C.M.H.C. will make a capital gain of just under $5 million.

It is imperative, of course, that C.M.H.C. return to those veterans who have already purchased their homes, the capital gain that C.M.H.C. has taken. The method of doing so will not be difficult to devise if fair principles are applied.

It is my intention to see to it that the intention expressed by C.M.H.C. to offer these properties for sale without capital gain is implemented. If this is done the houses can be made available for sale on monthly term payments approximately the same as is now being paid for rent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, surely that is quite plain. When the Liberals were in opposition, when they were seeking re-election, the member in whose constituency this project is located criticized the Conservative government because it was offering these houses for sale at a figure not approximating the cost for the particular project, but at a cost covering the entire 12,000 houses that had been built across Canada. The Liberal candidate, I assume speaking for the Liberal party, said these veterans should be entitled to buy those houses at what those particular houses cost C.M.H.C.

Mr. Nielsen: Who said that?

Mr. Douglas: The hon. member for Vancouver South, (Mr. Laing). He said that these houses stood on the books of C.M.H.C. at $6,600. He said that if they were charged $10,800, which was being suggested at that time, C.M.H.C. would be making a capital gain of just under $5 million.

I object strongly to any party taking one line when it is out of office and an entirely different line when it is in office. If the position the minister is taking now is a sound one, that the price charged for these houses should have nothing to do with the actual costs of this project but should be based on the cost of building 12,000 houses across Canada, then why did the Liberal party criticize this concept when it was introduced by the previous government, and why did the present minister of northern affairs, when he was running for office in this constituency, pledge

himself that these houses would be sold to the veterans at the actual cost, which would be about $2,000 less than they are being asked to pay; and why did he pledge that those who had already purchased their houses would get a rebate of the extra amount they had paid?

The minister wonders why there is a great deal of discontent in the Fraserview veterans' housing project. The people are discontented because they were told in 1959, and particularly in 1962 and 1963, by spokesmen for the Liberal party, that it was unfair to make them pay more than the houses cost in order simply to make up the losses which C.M.H.C. had incurred on other housing projects across Canada.

The people were told that if a Liberal government were elected the sale price of these houses would be reduced to actual costs, which would mean a reduction of about $2,000, and that those who had already purchased houses would get a rebate. On that basis surely these people had a right to expect, when a Liberal government was elected, that that promise would be kept.

I think the criticism which Liberal members expressed regarding the policy outlined in 1959 was a valid one, but I strongly object to their now coming in and defending the position that was taken in 1959, which the minister and his colleagues criticized in two general elections and promised to reverse if they were elected. So far as these people are concerned this is a complete betrayal of public trust. I presume a great majority of these people—maybe all of them for all I know—supported the minister of northern affairs, the member for Vancouver South, because they thought the statements which he made in the letter of June 15, 1962 which I have just read, and in the letter which my colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver East. put on the record, were a commitment on behalf of a responsible Liberal candidate, now a minister of the crown, and that that commitment would be kept. It has not been kept and that is why the present minister is incurring so much displeasure and so much discontent from these people.

I say to the minister that I am not at all satisfied to be handed this sheet of paper in which the minister tells us what was the original sale price offered in 1959, and what the adjusted price is after taking off the $300 or $500 as the case may be. This does not tell the committee what it cost C.M.H.C. to build these houses.

This committee has a right to a balance sheet. We have a right to know what it cost C.M.H.C. to buy this property, and to build these houses. We have a right to know how much was collected in rent, how much was written off in depreciation, what the operating costs have been and what the actual cost ought to be now if these people are going to get the houses at cost, as was promised in this letter of June 15, 1962 by the minister of northern affairs. We ought to have a balance sheet. We ought to have some facts—not figures pulled out of the air.

For the minister to get up and say he has a letter from a group of people who had a meeting, saying that a lot of people by a show of hands were prepared to accept this schedule, is completely begging the question. The point at issue is that Liberal members promised they would get these houses at cost.

The tenants are not asking to be subsidized. They are not asking the government for any money. They are not asking C.M.H.C. to give them a handout. But they are asking that the Liberal party keep its promise.

It is very apparent from the sheet of paper which the minister has given us that these people are not going to get their houses at cost, and I say to the minister that before I will be satisfied I want to see a balance sheet. I want to know the actual costs to C.M.H.C. as of this present time. I want to know the figure at which these houses are being carried on the books of C.M.H.C. I want to know what prices would have to be charged these veterans in order to relieve C.M.H.C. of any financial liability with respect to this project and this project alone, because that is what was promised.

I want to know if the minister of northern affairs was correct in his letter of June 15, 1962, when he said these houses were being carried in the books of C.M.H.C. at $6,600. If he was correct, then the figures which the minister has given to the committee of the prices which they are going to charge, running all the way from $7,700 to $10,900, are a form of robbery. This is taking more money from these people than the houses cost, and it represents a complete breach of faith with the people in that constituency who took the minister of northern affairs at his word that these houses would be sold to them at actual book value.

The minister says that the number of persons who have not signed the leases for the increased rentals totals some 52 persons. That does not surprise me, but what does surprise

me is that there are still 52 who have not signed the leases. I do not know what choice these people had but to sign these increased rentals because they have had every possible form of duress imposed on them. They have been told repeatedly that they are going to be put out. When a man and his family are faced with the prospect of being evicted, he signs a lease no matter what the increase in rent.

I would certainly like more information than we have been given this afternoon as to why these increases in rent were necessary, whether this is an actual economic rent based on costs to C.M.H.C., or whether this is once more an attempt not to disturb the market. I would like the minister to inquire of C.M.H.C. just to what extent rentals in other projects are carefully checked, and in this connection I would like to draw his attention to a project in my own constituency.

I have already written him about it and he was kind enough to send me a reply. It has to do with the Woodland Park apartments in Port Moody, B.C. Though the minister has told me it is under the name of Port Moody Garden Apartments Limited the letters have all been sent out by Midwest Property Management Limited of 12,220 125th avenue, Edmonton, Alberta. I have a copy here of a letter which has been sent to one of the tenants in the Woodland Park apartments at Port Moody—

Mr. Nicholson: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I think I told the hon. gentleman in my letter that I was convinced it must be this other organization. We know nothing of this midwest body. This is a limited dividend project. We have loaned money to them but we are not the landlords.

Mr. Douglas: I am quite aware the minister is not the landlord. However, I am pointing out that this particular landlord, as I pointed out in my letter to the minister, has posted in front of the property a sign which I myself have seen many times saying, "Government controlled rent—$76.50 for three bedrooms," and also giving the cost of the other suites. The tenants are told when they sign a lease that these are government controlled rents and that they cannot be increased without the consent of C.M.H.C. That is the question I am raising—

Mr. Nicholson: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to answer it?

Mr. Douglas: No, I should like first of all to put the problem before the minister. In this particular instance, in the middle of the year—this is a new project; people have only been in this apartment a few months—the rents were raised by $6 a month. That is $72 a year. And the reason given for increasing the rents was that taxes had gone up, and apparently C.M.H.C. which controls the rents authorized an increase. What I want the minister to tell us is the extent to which C.M.H.C. reviews these applications for increases in rents. I am sure the minister realizes the prospective tenants take seriously the fact that they see a sign in front of a housing project saying "Government Controlled Rents". They believe that having signed a lease the rent agreed on is at least good for a year, and that if there are any increases they will be justifiable. It is difficult for me to believe that in five months taxes on this project, a 100 house project, had gone up by $7,200 a year in respect of two high rise apartments. I want to know what attempt has been made to police this arrangement. There are two possibilities. Either the corporation is simply granting to these limited dividend companies the right to increase rents without a very careful examination of their financial statements, or factors other than taxes have been taken into consideration. I want to urge the minister and, through him, the corporation, to check very carefully these applications for rent increases by limited dividend companies. These companies do manage to attract tenants by virtue of the fact that they can advertise that rents are government controlled. If they are going to use this as a gimmick, then the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in turn has the responsibility to see that the rents are, in fact, controlled and that they are not raised half way through a year on the excuse that taxes have gone up in the course of the year, if they have not done so to such an extent as to make the increases justifiable. I should like to know whether in this case taxes actually went up by $7,200 in one year. I recognize that the corporation is responsible for a great many projects which are going on across Canada and that it has a great deal of work to do, but if these companies are given the right to advertise that rents are government controlled, then C.M.H.C. surely has a responsibility to the tenants to see that the rents are controlled and that any increases which are authorized are justifiable and necessary.

Mr. Stenson: I have no intention of delaying the committee for long but there are a few observations I wish to make. Earlier this year

the minister spoke of land assembly projects which come under the control of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. I asked the minister several questions at that time and I do not feel I received satisfactory answers to them.

The first question I had in mind is this: Why should land assemblies be set up in direct competition with private developers who are obliged to pay taxes on the property while holding it? I refer to the agreement which was signed with the city of Peterborough. It provides that no municipal tax rate or charge of any nature whatsoever shall be levied by the city while the lots are owned by or on behalf of the corporation. In 1952 the city turned over to the corporation 660 acres of land to develop. Since that day the city has received no tax revenue whatsoever from this property, so in effect the city has been asked to make a direct subsidy. No private developer has ever had such a concession made to him. I consider that the city of Peterborough has lost thousands of dollars in tax revenue over the past 12 years. This arrangement was set up in 1952 but there was no development in the area until 1957. If the present government intends to carry on with land assembly projects it should be asked to share in the cost of trunk services such as sewers, water mains and storm drains and also to bear some of the cost of providing main streets and thoroughfares. It should also be asked to pay its fair share of municipal taxes. All private developers in cities today are required to do this.

Another point I should like to bring out is this: If a city does not wish to carry on a scheme of this type and the property involved has not been developed after 10 or 15 years, the land should revert to the municipality and any moneys owing to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation should be paid by the municipality. Why should the corporation be allowed to put its property on the market to the highest bidder and keep the money for the government of Canada, when the corporation has made no investment in it and taken no risk? The only party which has been stuck for an investment is the city itself.

I feel that the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation should be careful where they set up land assembly projects. I do not feel they should come into an area, as they did in Peterborough, and sell the municipality a project which is not likely to be completed for 10, 15 or 20 years. This is exactly what was done in my constituency. I feel the project was too big for the area. It is well planned and it is a subdivision of which any city could be proud. On the other hand it has cost the city many thousands of dollars and I do not think it has cost this government or the provincial government anything. Right now the Peterborough land assembly is short of building lots and the corporation points the finger at the city, blaming the city for not keeping lots available. I know that if the city had received more financial assistance from the corporation it would have been in a better position to keep the lots coming forward.

I should like to ask the minister whether he does not feel projects of this type should share in the cost of the municipal services I mentioned earlier and also whether he does not agree that a municipality wishing to withdraw from such a project should be able to do so without the balance of the property reverting to the corporation, which would then make a substantial gain. I should also like to ask the minister whether he does not believe that land assemblies should be kept for public housing and for the construction of houses for older people and for people with small pensions.

There is one other point I would like to raise before resuming my seat. I think this matter was mentioned by the hon. member for Yukon, but I wish to raise it specifically. It refers to Indians. I believe they should have money available from Central Mortgage and Housing to build on the reserves. I would refer to a young constituent of mine, 25 years old, who came to the city of Peterborough, educated himself and now has a job in the city. He is married and wants to build a house for himself on the Indian reserve, under the provisions of the National Housing Act, and commute to Peterborough. He made application under N.H.A. to build a home on the property owned by him on the reserve, but was refused. I would like to ask the minister if there is not some legislation which would permit those living on Indian reserves to obtain such a loan. This is one way in which we could improve living conditions on reserves. I think the minister and his department should consider these suggestions and look into the possibility of making these loans available to deserving Indians.

Mr. Prittie: Mr. Chairman, the minister has heard from the cities of Vancouver and Port Moody and now he will hear from Richmond. I do not wish to lay any charges against Central Mortgage and Housing or

Consolidated Building Corporation, which is involved with the construction of the Richmond Gardens project; but I just wish to relate to the minister some of the complaints I have received and pose some questions to him.

This has to do with the Richmond Gardens housing project in Richmond, B.C., which was built by Consolidated Building Corporation of Toronto. I think the concept is a very good one. They took a large tract of unoccupied land, laid out a fairly good subdivision pattern and built houses which from the exterior are very attractive. They completed the services. I believe the municipality was very well satisfied. However, there have been a considerable number of complaints about the quality of the workmanship and the finish of the houses generally. I wish to bring to the attention of the minister some of these complaints.

I am going to quote from a letter from one of my constituents to the manager of Central Mortgage and Housing of Vancouver. This letter is dated August 22, 1964. I shall not use the person's name, but the corporation of course has some of this correspondence on their file. This letter illustrates the type of complaint I have heard on a number of occasions concerning this particular project which was built under N.H.A. The person protesting had not been making his payments, and the letter concerned that point. Then it says:

> I know my agreement with you. I know that it will take 25 years to pay this house. Can you guarantee that it will stand those 25 years?
>
> When I made my agreement with you, I trusted that C.M.H.C. would make five careful inspections of this house, and especially because it is built by government loan.
>
> Am I forced to buy a house where the foundation is completely fractured in three places; where framing is showing the poorest workmanship ever done; where the outside siding is filled with nail holes; insufficient or no overlap, broken and used asbestos shingles, as well as being wavy; where brick facing is loose with cracked base due to building mistakes; where the ceiling is wavy; where the basement floor is cracked all over, etc.
>
> If your "inspectors" passed all these facts, I have not only been misled by C.B.C., but also have a wrong conception of C.M.H.C.
>
> I am sure that this house does not meet N.H.A. minimum standards. It is wasting government money.

This complaint has been looked into by the corporation. There has been correspondence between this person and myself and the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, and between the minister and the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. The house was to have been completed in December. This person moved in in February and as late as September, last month, the corporation was still sending inspectors back to check on the workmanship and to see whether certain repairs had been carried out. This is a particular case, but others have come to my attention.

I said that I am not making charges, because I have not had an opportunity to personally inspect a number of these houses built under N.H.A. However, I did have an opportunity during one of my trips home recently to look at the type of row houses which have been built by the same company, but not with N.H.A. money; this was done with private mortgage money. The workmanship which I was shown at these places was very, very poor; the steps were of a very narrow type and the risers were of varying height. There was very poor workmanship on the woodwork generally, on the mouldings, and so on. There was some evidence that this corporation is perhaps not employing competent workmen who can do the work on time and do it well.

This may raise some doubt about the quality of inspections. I do not want to condemn C.M.H.C. inspectors out of hand, but I would ask these questions. Have they the time to do a proper job of inspection? Have they enough inspectors in the lower mainland area, in the Vancouver area, to do the work? If they have not enough inspectors to carry out the type of inspection that should be carried out, what is the reason for this? Are they not offering sufficient salary to get sufficient qualified building inspectors? If they have sufficient inspectors, why should these complaints be coming in? I should also like to ask the corporation, through the minister, to give us some idea of how many complaints they have received about this particular project. Have they investigated all these complaints? Have they found out whether or not they were ill founded? It seems to me that if members have received a great many complaints, surely the corporation has also, and I should like to know what type of investigation has been carried out.

With regard to the particular case I mentioned a few minutes ago, apparently the complaints were valid, because the inspectors made several return trips and the work was still not done satisfactorily. I would also raise this question and ask the minister to answer it. If a building company has developed a record of this type, and apparently because of the type of workmen they are hiring there are too many complaints from prospective or actual buyers. does this make any difference

to the corporation's dealings with the building company in the future? In other words, if there are too many complaints does that company continue to be an approved builder eligible to receive N.H.A. loans?

This is a very serious matter for the people in these houses. They are paying a considerable amount of money for them and will have to pay this money for many years to come. They are concerned that they receive value for their money. I know there have been some complaints that this particular project is not meeting N.H.A. minimum standards. The general type of housing construction in the area is of a higher standard than is the case with this project, which is simply meeting the minimum N.H.A. standards as to the spacing of the framing, 2 by 4's, joists, etc. I am very concerned about the complaints regarding the quality of the workmanship. The corporation has sent people back time and again to try and repair some of this poor workmanship. I simply conclude, Mr. Chairman, by asking whether C.M.H.C. has sufficient inspectors in the lower mainland area to carry out the kind of inspection that should be carried out. If they have not, why do they not have sufficient inspectors who are qualified to do this work? Also, has the corporation received a considerable number of complaints from this particular project, Richmond Gardens, and has it been found that these complaints were well founded?

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here patiently and I want to make a few remarks on this item. First of all I should like to say how much I appreciate the courtesy of the senior officials of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the keen attention they have paid to any complaints that have been directed to them by people in my constituency. I appreciate that very much because there are a few unusual and particular problems which have arisen during the last year. I was very glad they acted promptly in getting the facts and dealing with the situation, meeting the local representatives of the council in one case and certain other individuals on another occasion. I also recognize the good work which has been done by local officials. Sometimes one is misinformed and I have had a few letters criticizing local officials for delay in making arrangements for certain payments to be made in regard to the winter works program, I think the $500 for winter built houses. That was not the fault of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation but was occasioned, shall I say, by some delay in another department in making a payment.

I want to take this opportunity again to stress the need for continued and careful consideration of the needs of the residents in the smaller communities. I think there has been an improvement in this respect in recent years, but I do urge continued consideration of the particular problems which arise in smaller communities.

Second I want to urge once more—I am sure the minister supports me in this—that everything be done to utilize local materials. We have all these synthetic materials and newer types of materials these days, but there is no more interesting house today, both in its exterior and its interior, than one built from forest products. There is a great opportunity for even further research in this respect.

I would also say that I was very pleased that the local officials during the last year or so have met with responsible organizations in various communities to explain the operation of the act, the regulations, and so on. I urge a continuation of that policy because it removes a lot of misunderstanding. If you can get the co-operation of responsible groups such as chambers of commerce, labour organizations and farmers' organizations in the administration of the act, and in dealing with any problems which arise locally, I think matters generally are settled to the satisfaction of all concerned. The greater co-operation that exists in the administration of any department, the more democratic is the system.

I want to bring to the attention of the minister a problem which has interested me for some years and which has also particularly interested the Royal Canadian Legion and other veterans' organizations in the country. I am referring to the problem of satisfactory housing for aging veterans who are capable of looking after themselves. I have discussed this question pretty thoroughly with a good number of veterans and with representatives from local organizations, and I have become well informed on the matter as a result of attendances at conventions of veterans' organizations, zone council meetings of the Royal Canadian Legion in my own constituency, attendance at branch meetings of the Legion and attendance at meetings of other organizations which are interested in this particular problem. I met some of the committee members of the Royal Canadian Legion on housing and discussed it with them,

and I found that this problem was not just related to Kootenay West but was of concern across Canada.

I want to make a special appeal, Mr. Chairman, for some further consideration of the needs of these veterans for assistance under the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation Act, and in this regard to quote briefly from the report of the committee on aging veterans and housing of the Royal Canadian Legion. Their report deals with the needs of aging veterans for housing, and this is an extract from the report which was submitted to the nineteenth dominion convention at Halifax:

> Provided that an aging veteran is physically and mentally capable of looking after himself, either alone or with help, and provided he has sufficient funds to live on and is adequately housed, he will be happier and it will, in every way, be better for him to remain an ordinary citizen enjoying his own comparative independence in his own community.

I heartily agree with that paragraph in the report because that has been my experience. I know a number of veterans in my own constituency who are desirous of living in satisfactory houses, not palatial quarters by any means, in the community. They have spent the greater part of their lives in these communities and wish to live among people they know, and this is the reason for this particular representation this afternoon. The report goes on:

> It was further noted that while valuable help and co-operation was available from several of our provincial governments, there was little or no help received from our federal government, outside of the fact that a loan for building purposes could be secured from C.M.H.C. It was also the opinion of our committee that the sponsoring body had to pay far too high a rate of interest on the mortgage money (presently 5¼ per cent, while the interest rate under V.L.A. is only 3½ per cent). The situation was further aggravated by the government's action last year imposing an accelerated sales tax on building materials which by next year will amount to 11 per cent. A request that Legion-sponsored housing for aging citizens be exempt from this tax was contained in the brief presented to the cabinet last November. To date we have received no relief on this. Construction of homes such as these is a non-profit venture and we feel that this tax is unjust. We do pay provincial taxes which we cannot object to, as we receive other considerations, but from the federal government, no assistance is provided other than a loan. We feel this should be of vital concern to the department of health and welfare.

I draw that to the particular attention of the minister who I see is listening most carefully to my remarks on this occasion. The report continues:

> Your committee recommends that C.M.H.C. be requested to develop plans for smaller projects of 10 to 15 units, in the same way as plans are provided for veterans wishing to construct their own homes. This information would be of considerable help to our sponsoring groups who wish to do something for our senior people in the smaller towns and cities. It is further recommended that more detailed written instructions be made available outlining the requirements that have to be met by sponsoring groups to qualify for loans so sponsors of projects will become better acquainted with the requirements for same.

I heartily support that recommendation and urge that it be given favourable consideration.

I should like to quote another paragraph from this interesting report which I promised certain persons to bring to the attention of the minister:

> At present, C.M.H.C. has a regulation that low-rental homes may only be used by people who are 60 years of age and over. It is recommended that this regulation be amended to permit disabled persons of any age to take advantage of this assistance.

I think that is a very good point indeed.

> It was also suggested that further study should be given to the advisability of restricting admittance of those who, other than disabled persons, are over 65 years of age.
>
> Another regulation which adds considerably to the cost of construction is with respect to the size of both suites and storage space. Persons with sufficient income, living in commercial, profit making buildings, are paying much higher rates for considerably smaller accommodation than that required by C.M.H.C. in our housing projects. The greater percentage of our units are far more elaborate than the requirements demand.

I do think that consideration should be given to evolving a design which meets the needs of those persons who wish to take advantage of the act to live under very modest circumstances.

> If C.M.H.C. would reduce its requirements for space, this would result in greatly reduced construction costs.

I have mentioned these sections of this report because I think they are based on a very sound study of the situation by some very capable men who undertook to become members of this housing committee of the Royal Canadian Legion. As the result of the collection of information from various branches across Canada it represents the opinion of those persons who are interested and represents, shall I say, the need for consideration of changes in the regulations and administration to meet the circumstances.

I see I have been allowed to go three or four minutes overtime and I thank hon. members for their courtesy in this respect. I do urge the minister and his officials to give some consideration to the particular needs of

aging veterans who are quite capable of taking care of themselves and who want to continue to reside in the communities in which they have lived for many years.

The Chairman: Shall the vote carry?

Mr. Winch: I should like to ask one very brief question. Is it possible for the minister to give a short progress report on the meetings which I understand have been commenced between representatives of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the Department of National Defence and the city of Halifax and surrounding communities for the purpose of resolving the big problem there in respect of accommodation for navy personnel?

Mr. Nicholson: I am glad to inform the hon. member that we had a good meeting in Halifax. It was held in Admiralty house. Admiral Brock and several of his officials were present. In fact, I understand that the officials who presented the case for the service personnel when the defence committee was in Halifax were represented at this gathering. It was agreed that a committee should be set up immediately upon which the service personnel would be represented and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. I believe that Mr. Houston, who used to be in Vancouver and is now head of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in the Atlantic provinces, is chairman of the committee. They are at work now trying to find a solution for this serious problem.

The Chairman: Shall the vote carry?

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated earlier that he had the balance sheet on the costs of the Fraserview houses and I wonder whether we could get that now or when the committee meets again.

Mr. Nicholson: I have it here. I would be glad to have it also printed in *Hansard*. It is a full page and it shows not only the costs but a breakdown of maintenance and operating expenses, payments in lieu of taxes and so on year by year up to 1962. It also shows the credits. It shows that the average operating loss per unit, charging for money at 2½ per cent over the 50 year period, at the rental level that prevailed prior to October 1 of this year was $10.38 per unit.

Mr. Douglas: The minister misunderstood me. I was talking about the sale price. Could the minister give us the balance sheet which would show us the essential thing we want to know, namely the figure on C.M.H.C.'s books at which these houses stand?

Mr. Nicholson: I would be glad to. I have that here and I could put that in also as part of the record today provided I have the consent of the committee.

The Chairman: Is it agreed that these tables will be incorporated in the minister's remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: The tables above referred to are as follows:*]

Vancouver 6—Fraserview

Capital cost and financing statement as at December 31, 1963

Capital cost to Dec. 31/53 (The last unit was completed and turned over Nov/53)		$10,972,275	
Additional capital cost 1954 to 1958		368,177	
Final capital cost		$11,340,452	$11,340,452
Cost breakdown as follows:			
Land	$ 1,202,390		
Services	2,241,751		
Houses	7,896,311		
	$11,340,452		
Less capital value of 512 houses sold to December 31, 1963			4,878,183
Capital cost of 634(*) unsold houses as at December 31, 1963			6,462,269
Principal repayment of capital borrowings under section 34, NHA (1944) based on 2½% per annum, to Dec. 31/63			2,081,264
Outstanding borrowings as at December 31, 1963			$ 4,381,005

(*) Includes 630 houses built
4 existing houses acquired when land assembled
634

[The Chairman.]

Vancouver 6—Fraserview

Comparative operating statement (Estimated)[1]

	5 yrs 1954 - 1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		Current stabilized operating statement	
	Total	Average per unit per month	Total	Average per unit per month	Total	Average per unit per month	Total	Average per unit per month	Total	Average per unit per month	Total	Average per unit per month
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
Property maintenance expense and operating costs	244,009	3.55	50,196	3.92	90,336	8.00	105,500	10.42	82,940	9.12	82,909[2]	9.62
Municipal payment in lieu of taxes	546,260	[3]7.95	225,434	[4]17.59	213,656	18.92	193,149	19.07	186,008	20.45	186,680	21.67
Principal repayment of capital borrowings under section 34, NHA (1944) (2½% of cost of project)	1,530,091	22.25	273,233	21.32	242,629	21.49	221,005	21.82	199,317	21.91	189,000	21.93
Interest paid on borrowings (2% of outstanding balance)	1,003,765	14.60	184,525	14.40	158,461	14.03	135,872	13.42	119,341	13.12	110,000	12.76
Administrative overhead	159,102	2.31	35,677	2.78	32,182	2.85	29,962	2.95	25,810	2.84	24,928	2.89
Total expense	3,483,227	50.66	769,065	60.01	737,264	65.29	685,488	67.68	613,416	67.44	593,517	68.87
Rental revenue	3,182,040	46.28	713,544	55.68	643,644	57.00	599,240	59.17	533,894	58.69	503,960	58.49
Loss	301,187	4.38	55,521	4.33	93,620	8.29	87,248	8.51	79,522	8.75	89,557	10.38
Average number of units	1,146		1,068		941		844		758		718	

(1) The Corporation's accounting records do not reflect costs by project.
(2) Based on national 1962 average of $95 per unit, plus .2% of capital cost of unsold houses.
(3) Fixed payments in lieu of municipal taxes were $55 per unit to and including May 1, 1955. On that date fixed payments increased to $110 per unit per annum.
(4) Payments in lieu of municipal taxes increased January 1, 1959 to equivalent to regular taxes.

Mr. Douglas: Could I ask the minister this question? This would give us the figure at which these houses could be sold if the only purposes was to clear off all liabilities for C.M.H.C.

Mr. Nicholson: Yes.

Mr. Douglas: Is this figure anywhere near the price at which the houses are being sold?

Mr. Nicholson: It was $4,381,005 at the time, when there were 630 houses still to be sold.

Mr. Stenson: Mr. Chairman, would the minister consider some time in the future the matter I raised regarding taxes?

Mr. Nicholson: I will undertake to meet with the hon. member and give him the information he has requested today.

Mr. Prittie: Mr. Chairman, I would be quite satisfied if the minister would take note of the questions asked and reply to me personally or by letter.

Mr. Nicholson: I have taken note of the question and I can answer one of the questions asked now. I can assure the hon. member that if an approved lender or builder does not correct his practices he is struck off the list. The builder and the lender are treated in the same way. I will give a more complete answer to the hon. member either in writing or, if he prefers, in my office.

Item agreed to.

Resolution adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

ADDRESS OF LOYALTY AND AFFECTION FOLLOWING VISIT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that a message has been received from the Senate to acquaint this house that the Senate have passed the address to Her Most Excellent Majesty the Queen, conveying to Her Majesty the expression of our deepest loyalty, affection and respect and of our heartfelt appreciation of her recent visit to Canada and have inserted in the blank space therein the words "Senate and".

I also have the honour to inform the house that a message has been received from the Senate as follows:

Resolved—That the following address be engrossed and presented to His Excellency the Governor General, namely:

To His Excellency General the Right Honourable Georges P. Vanier, Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, upon whom has been conferred the Military Cross and the Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

May it please Your Excellency:

The Senate...of Canada, in parliament assembled, have agreed to an address to Her Most Excellent Majesty the Queen, conveying to Her Majesty the expression of our deepest loyalty, affection and respect, and of our heartfelt appreciation of her recent visit to Canada, in the manner set forth in our joint address hereto attached, and respectfully request that Your Excellency will be pleased to transmit the said address to Her Majesty the Queen.

Ordered—That the Clerk do go down to the House of Commons and acquaint that house that the Senate have passed an address to His Excellency the Governor General respectfully requesting that His Excellency may be pleased to transmit our joint address to Her Most Excellent Majesty the Queen, conveying to Her Majesty the expression of our deepest loyalty, affection and respect, and of our heartfelt appreciation of her recent visit to Canada, and more particularly set forth in the said joint address, and request the House of Commons to unite with this house in the address to His Excellency the Governor General by inserting therein the words "and Commons".

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Queen's Privy Council): I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker):

That this house do concur in the address of the Senate to His Excellency the Governor General, respectfully requesting that His Excellency may be pleased to transmit the joint address to Her Most Excellent Majesty the Queen; that the words "and Commons" be inserted in the said address from the Senate; and that a message be sent to the Senate informing their honours that this house doth unite with the Senate in the said address.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B), 1964-65

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting supplementary estimates (B) for the financial year ending March 31, 1965, was presented by Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Queen's Privy Council), read by Mr. Speaker to the house, and referred to the committee of supply.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McIlraith: If it is agreeable to the house, Mr. Speaker, I should like to indicate the business for Monday now, rather than at six o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McIlraith: On Monday the government proposes to submit for consideration of the house item No. 77 on today's order paper,

the house in committee of the whole on Bill No. C-126, an act respecting hours of work, minimum wages, annual vacations and holidays with pay in federal works, undertakings and businesses. In the happy event of that being disposed of before the end of the day, we propose to submit for consideration several smaller bills and perhaps I should indicate them by the numbers of the items on today's order paper: item No. 51 on today's order paper; item No. 68 on today's order paper; item No. 32 on today's order paper and item No. 69 on today's order paper. Then, on Tuesday, regardless of the progress made on Monday, we should like to call for consideration of the house item No. 6 on today's order paper, that is the house in committee of the whole on Bill No. C-72, to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock, the house will now proceed to a consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely public bills and private bills.

POST OFFICE ACT

USE OF MAILS FOR DISSEMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION LITERATURE

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North) moved second reading of Bill No. C-43, to amend the Post Office Act (hate literature).

He said: Mr. Speaker, Canadian cities from Montreal to Vancouver in recent months have been inundated by hundreds of thousands of pamphlets, some of them by mail and some by door to door distribution. The material in these pamphlets has been of the kind that most of us thought would have disappeared with the defeat of Hitler's armies in Germany. Much of the material has been actual reprints from material which was published by the nazis in Germany. I am sure hon. members have seen copies of the infamous paper put out by the nazis called Der Stürmer which went to many homes across Canada. I have with me, as I am sure other hon. members have, some samples of the literature which has been distributed. One distributed in Toronto some months ago, which has been referred to in this house on a number of occasions, mailed from Scarborough and printed originally in Atlanta, Georgia, comes from the National White Americans Party. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read just a couple of lines from this pamphlet to indicate the kind of filth which is going into Canadian homes:

[Mr. McIlraith.]

> We believe in sending all negroes back to Africa whence they came. The negro races have never developed a civilization, discovered any new invention, written a great symphony, or even originated an alphabet. They are on a much lower level to the whites.

Coming a couple of days after Martin Luther King received the Nobel prize for work for peace, I think this indicates the level to which such material descends. Later on, the same pamphlet says:

> On the Jewish question our policy is much stricter. We demand the arrest of all Jews involved in communist or Zionist plots, public trials and executions. All other Jews would be immediately sterilized so that they could not breed more Jews. This is vital because the Jews are criminals as a race, who have been active in anti-Christian plots throughout their entire history.

Last week in the city of Ottawa I received a pamphlet, apparently printed in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, but mailed in Toronto, headed "Anti-Semitism, a Phony Bogey." Some weeks ago an Ottawa resident sent me a copy of a paper, put out in Ottawa, called *The South End News,* which is mailed through the facilities of the post office. Its issue of August 6, 1964 devoted a full page to the reprint from the Protocols of Zion, incidentally quoting Henry Ford as to the veracity of it, even though it is well known Mr. Ford made a public statement many years ago saying he realized this was a complete forgery.

This is the kind of material being distributed in Montreal and Toronto. I have also with me a statement issued by the secretary of the B.C. federation of labour, Mr. O'Neal, referring to the kind of material which is being distributed in Vancouver. In my own city of Winnipeg the Winnipeg junior chamber of commerce, in the summer issue of its magazine called *Actimist,* printed a whole page with a montage of the kind of pamphlets being distributed in Winnipeg.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that in proposing any kind of legislation which would restrict the rights of people in Canada to use the mails, I can be accused of infringing on the democratic rights of people, and that I can be accused of supporting censorship. However, since coming to this house I have consistently defended the rights of any and all groups, no matter what their opinions, no matter how small a minority, to have the widest democratic rights, above all the right to express their opinions. But it seems to me we must distinguish between democratic rights and licence, licence to incite to vio-

lence, licence to incite to kill, licence to attack people on the basis of race, creed, colour or religion.

For those of us who were born in Canada and who have lived under a democratic system of society, most of us looking at this kind of material would think it was ridiculous that it could not have any effect and that we ought to ignore it. But that was precisely the attitude taken by so many people in Germany, until it was too late.

A large number of organizations have called on the government to take action in respect to this matter. I am sure the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) know better than I do the organizations which have written them and which have passed resolutions urging action on this matter. I have seen some of the material. I have seen editorials, written in newspapers published in almost every city of Canada, calling on the government to take action.

I know that the Canadian Legion passed resolutions at its national convention. I know that the Canadian Labour Congress submitted a brief to the Minister of Justice calling for action. I know that the Canadian Jewish Congress has called for amendments to the Criminal Code. Just briefly I wish to refer to two of these submissions made to the government, in order to indicate the kind of proposals which the government has been asked to consider.

The Canadian Labour Congress, in a brief presented to the Minister of Justice on April 7, 1964, by the president of the congress, Mr. Claude Jodoin, made two specific recommendations, and I quote:

> We call upon the government to enact legislation which would require the authors, publishers, distributors and printers of any printed matter being sent through the mails to identify themselves clearly on the face of the material which they disseminate. This legislation should be drafted in such a way as to require the identification of at least one responsible officer as well as that of the organization itself. It should also identify the Canadian accomplices in the distribution of materials printed outside of Canada.

If such a proposal had been adopted by the government it would in fact only be applying to this kind of material the same kind of provisions which we have in our legislation with respect to elections, which require that all election material have the person responsible for its printing identified on it. In fact it is similar to the kind of provisions which are in the labour relations act, which require a union, during an organizing campaign, to identify itself on any printed material it distributes.

The Canadian Labour Congress in its brief also said:

> We call upon the government to enact legislation making it illegal to publish statements which are designed to incite violence or disorder against groups because of the group's race, creed, colour, place of birth, national or ethnic origin.

On March 12, 1964 the Canadian Jewish Congress submitted a brief to the Minister of Justice and the Postmaster General, in which they made several specific proposals, one being that section 166(2) of the Criminal Code include the following:

> Injury or mischief to a public interest shall include the promotion of hatred, contempt or hostility against a group of persons by reason of their particular race, national or ethnic origin, colour or religion.

And that a new section 62A should read:

> Every person who publishes or circulates or causes to be published or circulated, orally or in writing, any matter or statement which is intended or calculated to incite violence or disorder against a group of persons of a particular race, national or ethnic origin, colour or religion, or against the members thereof, shall be guilty of an indictable offence and liable for imprisonment for two years.

I know that both these briefs received very sympathetic consideration from the Minister of Justice. I know he is concerned, and rightly so, about the kind of hate literature which is being distributed. Nevertheless he and his officials have not been able to draft legislation which, though not accepting the specific proposals I have quoted, would at least begin to meet some of the problems which have arisen. It is for that reason I hope the house will give serious consideration to my bill today.

I recognize there may be difficulties. I recognize that once you begin to put any kind of prohibition on the freest dissemination of printed material you may run into difficulty. But, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that until the government brings in alternative legislation, which the Minister of Justice on a number of occasions has indicated the government is considering, the house should give sympathetic and favourable consideration to my proposal.

My proposal is a very simple one. It is merely an addition to section 7 of the Post Office Act, which would spell out the rights of the Postmaster General to restrict the mailing rights of people who are using the mails to distribute hate literature.

On Wednesday of this week, as reported at page 9041 of *Hansard*, the minister was

asked a question by the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Walker), with respect to actions which he had taken in several cases. The minister made an excellent statement to the effect that he had already taken action against several people who had been found responsible for the dissemination of hate literature. I think the actions of the minister were very proper and very correct. I am concerned, however, that should he take similar action in the future his orders might be challenged, not simply before a board of review, which I understand is an internal organization, but on the basis that the hon. gentleman does not have the power under the Post Office Act as it now stands to issue orders of the kind he has already made.

The gist of my bill is simply to spell out the legislation so that there may be no question that the minister has the right to take action to remove mailing privileges from people who disseminate literature of this kind. As I said earlier, those of us who were born in Canada and who have lived here all our lives may not regard this as a very important matter. We may not feel that many people will be misled by this kind of filth which has been widely disseminated. However, to the people who have come from Europe, more than a million of them, from countries where literature of this kind was extensively used to divide people, this is a matter which is serious, which really is urgent, and in respect of which the government should take action and take action now.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Let me say at the outset of my remarks that nobody in this chamber is more disgusted or more shocked than I am at the distribution of the vicious material of the kind referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow).

To me it makes no difference whether this vile material is distributed through the mail or by any other means; it is offensive and objectionable and every reasonable effort must be made to stop it. Nobody is more anxious than I, or the government, to put an end to this filthy business and to protect the innocent persons in Canada who have suffered from such conduct.

As I have stated more than once in this house, my department is working closely with the Department of Justice in an effort not only to find some effective legislation to deal with this situation, but to find an effective means of applying existing laws to cut off what I think has properly been referred to as traffic in hate. We are trying to find a means of amending the law in a way which will accomplish the purpose the hon. member had in mind when he introduced this bill.

I will admit frankly, however, that in searching for a solution to this problem we are on the horns of a dilemma. If, on the other hand, we do not take effective action against these nefarious traffickers in hate literature, this traffic is likely to continue. On the other hand, and this is what distresses me—and I know it distresses others with whom I have discussed it—if we do take strict measures to shut off the use of the mails to those who deal in hate literature we shall almost certainly prejudice the rights and freedom of the majority of Canadians and others who use our mails for decent and legitimate purposes.

Perhaps we should look back on history. It will be recalled that the privacy of the royal mails has always by law and practice been sacrosanct, at any rate in this country. In times of peace post office officials have never had the right to act as censors, to open deliverable letters and, more important, to decide what is objectionable or unacceptable correspondence. I believe that we in this house must make very sure that any action we may take to suppress the transmission of hate literature is not likely to result in a situation where government officials, with no trained jurists to guide them—and certainly the officials of my department are not trained jurists—would be called upon to exercise censorship of the mails and to impose their ideas of morality upon the public at large. I believe that legislation which would permit such a situation would be striking a blow at the very roots of our freedom of speech and expression. If today we decide it is illegal to express an opinion about a religious sect or group, then tomorrow why should we not make it illegal to attack a political party or to question the authority of the government? If there is one thing I have learned in the few months I have been Postmaster General, it is that the post office is really a service organization; it is in the business of carrying the mails expeditiously. It is not our responsibility or our business to decide what opinions are legal or illegal. Surely that is a matter for the courts. And when the courts have made the decisions as to what is right or wrong and what should or should not be distributed, then I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, the post office will exert every reasonable effort to carry that decision into effect when it has to do with the use of Her Majesty's mails.

I am well aware that certain sections of the Post Office Act and of the Criminal Code give the Postmaster General the authority to prohibit the use of the mails for illegal purposes and, as has just been mentioned by the hon. member for Winnpeg North, I have had occasion to exercise my powers under that statute more than once during the last few months. Twice I have issued orders, once in July and again in late September, under section 7 of the act under which I have been given the right, if I feel that a section of the Criminal Code is being broken, to prohibit the use of the mail for the distribution of indecent or scurrilous literature. I had no doubt about reaching the conclusion that the material in question was scurrilous and I had no hesitation in imposing these orders, the first of which now stands as a final order.

Obviously, however, an attempt has been made to get around my first order because directly it was put into effect another organization, with a name similar to the one I had prohibited, came into being. That is what happens in these cases. The organizations affected go under cover, adopt a new name and start out afresh. However, I have not hesitated to use my authority where I can in an effort to suppress the distribution of scurrilous literature whether by organizations or by individuals. We will block it in Canada, and we will block it coming into Canada if we have to.

In the last case—and the literature to which the hon. member has just referred is this type of literature—the literature was so vicious, so outrageous, so scurrilous that I felt I had very firm grounds for taking the action that I did. But I should point out and reiterate what I said a moment ago, that what has happened in this particular case illustrates the thing about which I am most concerned, namely that it drives these people underground and they seek the protection and privacy of the first class mail, which we cannot open. We cannot under such circumstances even perform the service we are performing now, if they resort to that practice. When this happens we have a very limited course of action open to us.

My department and the Department of Justice have this difficult problem under active and intensive study. We have not as yet, unfortunately, come up with what we consider to be an effective solution—that is to say, a solution that would stop the flow of hate literature but at the same time would not interfere with the right of free expression or the privacy—and this is what concerns us —of the mails. If we had to open all letters in trying to find out whether or not hate literature or even vicious material was being distributed, we would come across all kinds of secrets and we would find ourselves acting as censors in many fields which are of no concern to the department.

It is my opinion that if a solution—and we must strive to find a solution—is to be found, it will lie in an amendment to the Criminal Code or some similar statute, rather than in changes in the Post Office Act. I say this because, as I intimated earlier, in my opinion—and I practised law for nearly 20 years before I went into business, and had some experience in the criminal courts as well as with constitutional law—the courts, which interpret the Criminal Code and our other statutes, are the logical persons, are the proper judges, of what literature is decent, what literature is vicious, what literature is legal and what literature is illegal. In my humble opinion it is not for post office officials to make such decisions, as I am sure most members of this house will agree.

Mr. Speaker, from the time the first newspaper was printed and the first broadside distributed, those whose views were offended have cried out for control, for censorship. It is easy to say, "This material is vicious," or "scurrilous," or "poisonous. Ban it from the mails". But I again say, who is to judge what is vicious, what is scurrilous and what is poisonous, unless it can be brought to the attention of some person charged with the specific responsibility, and brought before that person in a proper way? Especially, who is to make the decision as to just what sealed letters officials of the post office can open? If they do, what do you do with mail that comes in a plain envelope, first class mail? It will be said that some of the cases that have been discussed in the house, including some of those mentioned by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), this afternoon are very obviously scurrilous. I most certainly agree. But if we start, where do we stop? Do we prohibit the use of the mails to a newspaper because it attacks a political organization? Do we ban the use of mails to those religious publications that violently and intolerantly oppose other denominations?

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I loathe and detest the foul propaganda that has been circulated throughout this country by people with warped and twisted minds. I believe that every possible action should be taken against them under the law. But in saying that, Mr.

Speaker, let us make sure that we do not set up a machine that is perhaps potentially more dangerous than the evil we are fighting. Let us make sure that the medicine is not worse than the disease. Let us make sure that our decisions as to what is right and what is wrong are made by the established process of law, by the courts, and not by officials of the post office or any other department. They certainly should not be made by persons whose prime job is to distribute the mail as quickly and as expeditiously as possible. They are not there to act as censors; they are there to do the job in the quickest and most expeditious way.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I, too, have received some of the literature that the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) has described. I think all members of this house join in agreeing that it is offensive, that it is deplorable that persons should take it upon themselves, first of all to write and then to distribute this kind of despicable material. I think too that when we understand that there is an opportunity, through paying a certain amount of postage, to deliver these things through the mail to a great many people who have not subscribed to them, they do take offence and resent the fact that this kind of material is being sent into their homes.

I have to agree, however, with the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) that there are some very serious problems involved in administering the provisions contained in Bill No. C-43. The minister mentioned—and I was pleased that he did mention these things—that a post office department is not and should not be a censorship bureau or organization; they are primarily, and perhaps even solely, concerned with being a service organization to deliver the mail. Therefore we run into the problem, because I do not see it provided for in the amendments to the act that are proposed to us, of who is going to decide what is in fact calculated to bring into hatred, ridicule or contempt any person or group of persons by reason of race, national origin, colour or religion. It is, as has been quite properly stated, a matter for the courts to decide as to what should be calculated to bring into hatred or ridicule any of these things.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this is not an easy matter. I think it is well that we have this bill before us so we may discuss this problem, cast some light on it and then give consideration to what can be done about it.

As has been said by both hon. members who have spoken, it is an offensive thing to receive some of these pieces of literature, but at the same time to amend the Post Office Act in such a way that you can prevent this literature being carried is perhaps not the way to deal with it. I think, too, that the Criminal Code should be amended so it could be made substantially more clear with regard to what would be an offence, to be decided by the courts, with regard to printing this kind of literature. But I do not think members of the house would be satisfied to set up any quasi judicial committee or board to really decide whether an offence had been committed, because the two or three pieces of literature from which the hon. member for Winnipeg North quoted are certainly extreme cases and there would be no problem in deciding that this was scurrilous, offensive, and so on. If we were to write into the statutes the provision that this be decided by the Post Office Department, they are certainly going to be presented with other pieces of literature not so extreme. Then it will be a problem of making a decision whether or not they are an offence under the act.

I want to join with the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) and the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) in expressing our distaste at the fact that it is possible for this sort of thing to be distributed; but at the same time I believe we must be pretty careful about charging the Post Office Department with a responsibility with which they are not equipped to deal, and further must be reasonably careful not to set up restrictions in the use of mail which really may not serve the purpose for which they are designed.

Mr. M. L. Klein (Cartier): Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) for the action he took in July and September of this year in passing judgment on this scurrilous literature and I believe he has earned the approval of every right thinking man, certainly in this house and in the Dominion of Canada.

It is not my purpose to deal with this matter at length but I should like to bring to the attention of the house a statement made by President Johnson after the assassination of President Kennedy. It is printed by the Institute of Human Relations of the United States and the quotation is as follows:

The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and to respect one another. So, let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and

violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics, from the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our nation's bloodstream.

Appearing in the Montreal *Star* of this week is an article dealing with the appearance of President Johnson in Corpus Christi, Texas, this Sunday. A raid had been made by the police and an ex-plumber was questioned, at whose home the police seized guns and nazi flags in connection with a reported plot to kill President Johnson this Sunday. The police chief and 25 deputies gathered up machine guns, automatic pistols, high-powered rifles, a mortar, a rocket launcher, live hand grenades and about 20,000 rounds of commercial and homemade ammunition, swords, several nazi flags, world war I and II German helmets, and so on. I bring this to the attention of the house in order to indicate that hate literature brings the kind of violence it breeds, especially in the state of Texas. Because where hate literature flourishes it creates an atmosphere which gives the assassin the courage which he would not have in a healthy and sane community.

I should like to bring to the attention of the house the fact that in discussing another bill dealing with group defamation there was a motion to send it to the external affairs committee as set out in the motion at page 5984 of *Hansard*. I would be happy to have this bill referred to that committee, since the motion stood in the name of the government, and particularly since the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), at page 7823 of *Hansard*, is reported as saying:

> Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this question of hate literature and the action to be taken under the Criminal Code has been under consideration by the government for months, would the minister consider setting up a special committee of the house to look into the whole problem, to hear the law officers of the crown, and to ascertain whether action has been taken in other parts of the world without interference with freedom, to the end that the house might favour the recommendation of amendments to the Criminal Code—

And so on. In view of the fact that the government seems to favour a committee for this type of subject matter, whether the external affairs committee or some other committee, and in view of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition, and I believe the leaders of other parties also favour committee consideration, I hope that a clinical study can be made of this bill by referring it and all other bills of this nature to that committee.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Albert Béchard (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) for the worth-while initiative he took in introducing Bill No. C-43 to amend section 7 of the Post Office Act.

Before proceeding with my remarks on this bill, I feel it would be proper to read section 7 of the Post Office Act:

> (1) Whenever the Postmaster General believes on reasonable grounds that any person
>
> (a) is, by means of the mails,
>
> (i) committing or attempting to commit an offence, or
>
> (ii) aiding, counselling or procuring any person to commit an offence, or
>
> (b) with intent to commit an offence, is using the mails for the purpose of accomplishing his object, the Postmaster General may make an interim order (in this section called an "interim prohibitory order") prohibiting the delivery of all mail directed to that person (in this section called the "person affected") or deposited by that person in a post office.

The amendment provided for in Bill No. C-43 apparently would deny in effect the use of Her Majesty's mail to persons who address or disseminate hate literature calculated to foster hatred, cast contempt or ridicule on any person or group of persons for reasons of race, national origin, colour, religion, etc.

This matter, Mr. Speaker, has been brought up in this house many times before, and I entirely agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg North who, with all his deep and sincere feelings, respects the rights and freedoms of every citizen of this country, whatever his tongue, religion, nationality or colour.

I am one of those who in this house have vehemently protested against the almost systematic poisoning of our youth and our whole population, as practised by certain publicity media in this country. The mails, Mr. Speaker, are not the only means used for discriminatory purposes. One only has to read certain newspapers and publications and look at certain television programs to realize the immense harm and sometimes irretrievable injury which some of those writings, programs or broadcasts can inflict upon the individual, the family and the Canadian population in general.

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, in view of the fact that we did not get started on this bill until 20 minutes

after five o'clock, and also in view of the general interest in this matter and the very constructive suggestion made by the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Klein), I wonder whether hon. members would agree that this bill should retain its position on the order paper?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Does the house agree that this bill will retain its position on the order paper?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

[The following item was passed in committee of supply this day:]

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE

Loans, investments and advances—
Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation—

L20. Advances to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the purposes of subsection (1) of section 37 of the National Housing Act, 1954, in respect of the acquisition, development, construction and improvement of land and buildings, $216,000.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, October 19, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. COATES—FAILURE OF MEMBER TO RISE FOR SINGING OF GOD SAVE THE QUEEN

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): I rise on a question of privilege affecting all members of this house. When a member takes a seat in this chamber at the beginning of a new parliament he must first swear an oath of allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen. The oath in question is to be found on page 406 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms and reads as follows:

I do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

The words in the oath which I think are most significant are the words "faithful" and "allegiance". The most obvious definition of "faithful" is "loyal" and of "allegiance" either "loyalty" or "devotion". On Friday every member present in this house, with the exception of the member for Quebec West, stood and sang the prayer and anthem "God Save the Queen". We were displaying by our action our continued adherence to the oath we took on assuming our seats in this house; we were indicating our faithfulness and our true allegiance as members of parliament.

The member for Quebec West by his action indicated his unwillingness to stand by the oath to which he swore when he took his seat in this house and it is my belief that you, Mr. Speaker, or the committee on privileges and elections should determine whether he has any right to continue sitting in this chamber. This is not the first example of words or actions incompatible with the oath of allegiance, but it is certainly the most glaring and repulsive example to date in this twenty sixth parliament—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Coates: —and other members are entitled to know the true significance of the oath of allegiance and the action which will be forthcoming when it is broken.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that the hon. member for Quebec West, (Mr. Plourde) is absent, I wish to point out that the stand taken by our party in this matter was formulated by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) the other day, and all parties in the Commons agreed that it was reasonable.

The members spontaneously decided to sing "God Save the Queen". The hon. member for Quebec West stated that he did not know this English hymn and that he could not sing it. Therefore, he remained seated. That was not an official act from a member of the government, and in no means does it violate the oath he took upon entering this house.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that there is no motion before the house, I propose to proceed.

PROCEDURE

CONCURRENCE IN ELEVENTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat) moved:

That the eleventh report of the special committee on procedure and organization, presented to the house on October 7, 1964, be now concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving concurrence in the eleventh report on behalf of the committee on procedure and organization, I would like to make a few brief remarks respecting the four recommendations that are contained in it. If hon. members will refer to *Votes and Proceedings* of Wednesday, October 7, they will find the complete report. I might say that in that complete report there is a summary of some of the work that has been done by the committee in attempting to examine and make recommendations respecting the whole committee structure of the House of Commons. The committee on procedure and organization in fact appointed a subcommittee to address itself specifically to this problem, and to study and make recommendations respecting the committee structure of this house. I have before me several copies

of the summary that was prepared and the recommendations that are in the report. For the interest of the various parties perhaps they would like to have copies of this summary.

Generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee held a number of meetings to try to find ways and means of strengthening the committee structure of the House of Commons. One of the most important matters considered—and it is the main substance of this eleventh report—was that of giving committees the power to perhaps sit beyond prorogation, or at least to sit during an adjournment of the house. We looked into this matter in some detail with regard to the propriety of standing and special committees sitting after prorogation, and your subcommittee came to the conclusion that it was not competent to make recommendations with regard to sessions of standing or special committees after prorogation. If hon. members would refer to paragraph 14 of this report they will note that it says:

> Your committee is of the opinion that the house should not empower a committee to sit beyond the prorogation of a session by simple resolution, or even by means of an amendment to standing order 65, since either course would infringe the royal prerogative. It appears to your committee that this reform could properly be implemented only by means of legislation. Ample precedent exists whereby the royal prerogative has been limited by means of an act of parliament, such legislation requiring the signification of the Queen's consent (not to be confused with the royal assent) prior to its final passage by the house. Since the practical exercise of the royal prerogative is today vested in Her Majesty's ministers, with whom the reality of power resides, your committee therefore recommends that the government give serious consideration to the introduction of such legislation at an early date.

The recommendation, therefore, is that the government should give consideration to this matter and introduce such legislation if they see fit. We believe it would be well for the government to consider this kind of action.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we draw to the attention of the government and the house that there are two ways of dealing with this matter in the interim. One is that prorogation of a session could be delayed as long as possible to enable committees to meet while the house stood adjourned; and (b), where necessary a committee of the house could be constituted as a commission under the terms of the Inquiries Act, chapter 154 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, to enable it to continue its work beyond the prorogation of a session. Of these two alternatives your committee feels that the first suggestion—that is, to delay prorogation—would be the most desirable.

I think it would be well for hon. members to consider the problems this house encountered last year when a number of committees were sitting and we were working toward a prorogation date of, I think it was, December 21. Many of those committees had insufficient time to complete their work, to report to the house and to move concurrence therein before prorogation. It is well known to all hon. members that all the work of a committee dies on prorogation unless a report is made to the house which is considered, adopted or concurred in by the house.

This session we see the possibility of two of our standing committees of this house requiring time beyond what may be considered an appropriate date for prorogation. One of those committees is the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines which is considering Bill No. C-120; the other is the standing committee on agriculture and colonization which is considering the matter of feed grains for eastern Canada. Perhaps both these committees would need to sit beyond the date when most of the other business of the house has been completed.

We do not believe it ought to be automatic that these standing or special committees sit when the house is not in session, but we do think that by adjourning rather than proroguing and passing a simple resolution or motion in the house, certain of these committees could sit beyond the adjournment date.

The third recommendation, Mr. Speaker, deals with the matter of continuing the membership of committees from one session to another. We think standing order No. 65 should be amended by the substitution in line 2 of the words "the first session of each parliament" for the words "each session". That would enable the membership of committees to be named for the duration of a parliament instead of for the duration of a session.

This becomes important, Mr. Speaker, because if we look back in the records of this session of the twenty sixth parliament we find that while the striking committee was set up on the first day of the session, as required under our standing orders, it was not until March 11, as reported at page 777 of *Hansard*, that the Prime Minister moved the motion that would set up the standing committees of this house. We believe the reason this action was taken even as early as March 11, which was nearly 30 days after the house

was in session, was that it was necessary to get the external affairs committee functioning to deal with a specific matter.

We also note, Mr. Speaker, that only one standing committee was set up on that date, and that it was not until April 10, as recorded at page 1989 of *Hansard*, that the chief government whip was in a position to make the motion naming the membership of all of the standing committees of the House of Commons. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that nearly two months had gone by after the commencement of the session before these committees were actually in existence; for certainly it cannot be argued that they were in existence before names of members were attached to them.

We believe that if this recommendation to amend standing order 65 were accepted by the house and by the government, and the motion was moved to set up these committees at the beginning of a parliament rather than at the beginning of each session, then the first day of each session when parliament gets under way the committees would be in existence and the membership would be named. In this event there would be no waiting for the various parties to supply names each session for the different committees.

The fourth recommendation, Mr. Speaker, deals with the terms of reference. We believe that a committee's terms of reference, particularly a standing committee, should automatically include the power to appoint subcommittees. The motion relating to the powers of standing committees should in the future be moved, we think, in the following terms. First of all, this was the motion moved by the Prime Minister, as appears at page 777 of *Hansard*:

> That the standing committees of this house be severally empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the house; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Our recommendation is that these words be included:

> —and to delegate to subcommittees all or any of their powers except the power to report direct to the house.

It appeared that even during this session it would have been expedient for at least one or two committees to have the power to set up subcommittees, and I refer specifically again to Bill C-120, which deals with three separate areas of railway transport matters in Canada. It seems to me that it would be well for the house to delegate this power to that committee so that three separate studies could be carried on at the same time.

It will be recognized that these recommendations being made today by your committee must be the subject of action on the part of the government so that effect can be given to them. While concurrence today would not necessarily mean that these recommendations would automatically be put into effect, it would give to the government an indication that we believe the things we suggest should be done. Therefore, on behalf of the committee, I recommend to hon. members of this house that this report be concurred in, giving an indication that they think these recommendations are desirable.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in so far as a complete study of recommendations respecting the committee structure of the house is concerned, this eleventh report must be considered as an interim report. Your committee is continuing to study this matter and will be coming forward at a later date with other recommendations as to committee size, function and vested authority. It is the opinion of the committee on procedure and organization that these matters we are now recommending for consideration today require immediate attention for the business of this particular session.

Miss Pauline Jewett (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, as seconder of this motion I am pleased to join with the hon. member for Medicine Hat in asking for the concurrence of the house in the eleventh report of the special committee on procedure and organization. I hope all hon. members have read this report which can be found in *Votes and Proceedings* of October 7 last; because it outlines not only the three immediate proposals we are recommending to the government, but also some of the problem areas in this whole field of committees which the committee on procedure and organization, through its subcommittee on committees, is planning to undertake and study.

I think it is accurate to say that all hon. members of that committee, and I hope all hon. members of this house, feel there is a great deal to be done to both rationalize and strengthen the committee system of this house, not only to make the committees themselves more effective but also indeed to make the house itself more effective. It seems to me that if we have a stronger, more rational and more effective committee system we will be able to cover a great deal more ground in our committees and accomplish much more by

way of tightening debate in this chamber. The two seem to me to go hand in hand.

For all these reasons I hope all hon. members will again read this whole report, since it does outline some of the areas we plan to study. I know the members of the committee will be grateful for suggestions from hon. members as to what other areas they think we might look into.

Our immediate request is for concurrence in essentially three recommendations. One is that the government give consideration at some time to introducing legislation which will make it possible permanently for committees to continue from one session to another within a parliament. As has already been said, this will involve some limitation on the royal prerogative; therefore the Queen's consent will have to be secured before this legislation is introduced. The committee felt, however, that this was the appropriate way of going about it, and we hope that at some time the government will make it possible for committees to sit between sessions within a parliament, as a routine or automatic thing. In the meantime, until that is done, we suggest either of two courses of action, and particularly favour the course of action which would allow committees to continue sitting by, in effect, postponing prorogation as was done during the war, I believe, until the day before a new session begins.

As the hon. member for Medicine Hat has said, our second proposal is to make it possible for the membership of committees to be named for an entire parliament. I am sure there should not be any disagreement with that.

The next proposal is to allow committees to appoint subcommittees. This latter recommendation will be particularly important if in the reorganization of the committee structure of this house we should decide that it would be preferable to have fairly large committees covering broad fields of action, functional areas as they are called, rather than a large number of very small committees. If we have fairly large ones it will be absolutely essential that they be enabled to appoint subcommittees.

Beyond this immediate report we hope to go into the whole question of what powers committees should have. For example, should committees have the power to initiate? Should committees discuss estimates as well as legislation in their appropriate fields? Should there be new committees to which we have not given any thought at all in this house, as for instance a committee on statutory instruments or delegated legislation such as they have in the United Kingdom? Should there be only standing committees and should all the work be done by these, through subcommittees, or will we still require the occasional special committee? How many members should be on each committee or on each subcommittee? Most important, what powers should committees have? It seems to me this will be by far the most crucial problem we will be discussing. No doubt there will be further reports brought to this house.

I think we are all aware of the fact that we do operate under a system of responsible cabinet government. We have not thought of creating a series of small cabinets within the House of Commons in rivalry to the cabinet itself. There could be no thought, therefore, of copying the United States system, as has been suggested, unless we change our whole system of government, which we are not thinking of doing, at any rate in this committee. However, within the confines of the system of responsible cabinet government surely it is possible to give larger functions and stronger and clearer powers—I would hope even the power of initiation—to our standing committees of this house. As I say, this will come up in the future. It is not something for which we are asking concurrence today; it is something for the future. It is something that, if the recommendations we are making today are concurred in, will be easier for the committee to discuss.

Nor is there any reason why we should limit our discussion to these problem areas mentioned in this report. There are other suggestions that might be made, and I hope that in the course of the next few months as this committee continues its work, hon. members will be bringing forward other suggestions as to ways in which the committee system, and parliament itself through its committee system, can be strengthened.

For example, I have always felt that there are some bills which could be referred to committees after first reading. This is quite contrary to the general practice under our parliamentary system where the principle is always decided upon before the bill goes to committee. There are occasions, particularly when our parliamentary timetable is so crowded, upon which we could send non-controversial, non-partisan bills to a committee after first reading, provided the committees themselves were representative and that there would be a full discussion there of this type

of bill. There are bills right now on the order paper which I believe could be referred to a committee.

This is one kind of suggestion which is not made here and to which I think we could give some serious consideration. I urge all hon. members to try to stretch their imaginations a little on the use of the committee system of this house to see if they cannot come up with something that will be compatible with the system we have of responsible cabinet government, and at the same time compatible with the needs of the kind of complex system in which we live today.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words with respect to the motion for concurrence in this eleventh report. I do so both as a member of the committee and on behalf of this party.

The adoption of this motion, Mr. Speaker, does not have the precise effect that the adoption of some other motions for concurrence in reports of Your Honour's committee have had. The adoption does not actually effect any change. Nevertheless, we as members of the committee feel that this is a very important report we are presenting to the house, and that the heart of it is something very significant. The heart of it, as we see it, is that the house should give consideration to the greater use of committees.

I agree with the position just stated both by the hon. member for Medicine Hat and the hon. member for Northumberland. We are not trying to change our system of government, but we do feel the house could benefit from a strengthening of its committees and from a greater use of them. As we see it, there are two things that are necessary if this is going to be done and in this instance both these things fall on the shoulders of the government.

In the first place, we have to do something about the royal prerogative that makes it necessary for us to re-establish committees at every session, and consequently prevents committees meeting between sessions. By the terms of the royal prerogative a session of parliament starts when we are called into session by the crown, and it ends with prorogation. Between prorogation and the next summoning of a session of parliament, there is nothing that parliament or its committees can do. This can be resolved by legislation affecting the royal prerogative and, as a committee, we are asking the house to ask the government to give serious study to this matter and take action upon it at an early date.

Another step that will be necessary if we are going to strengthen committees and use them more will be for the government to take a positive position and ask the house to refer more matters to committees so they can be studied thoroughly, and so that good use of the committees and of the members of those committees can be made. All of us feel, and I think the feeling is generally shared by the members of our committee on committees, that there should be certain times of the year when the house itself need not be in session but when the committees might be able to meet and deal on a full time basis with matters referred to them.

Without going into detail, which certainly is not necessary at this time, I join with the other two members who have spoken in saying that our studies have convinced us that a very much greater use can be made of committees. In this report all we are saying is that we hope the government will take the necessary steps to see that what is requested in this report is implemented at an early date.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): As a member of the committee, all I want to say is that I believe the committee made some very good suggestions, and I support the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO LABOUR MINISTER

Question No. 1,866—**Mr. Coates:**

1. On what date did Bernard Alasdair Graham's appointment become effective as a special assistant to the Minister of Labour?
2. How many days since Mr. Graham's appointment has he spent away from Ottawa on government business and into what provinces did this government business take him?
3. What is the total amount of Mr. Graham's expenses to date in relation to time spent away from Ottawa and what is the total amount of his expenses since the date of his employment if it varies from the aforementioned amount?
4. What is the breakdown of his total expenses?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour):

1. July 20, 1964.
2. Twelve days. Nova Scotia.
3 and 4. No expenses submitted.

RESEARCH GRANTS TO DENTAL SCHOOLS

Question No. 1,948—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Questions

1. In each of the last five years, what has been the total of dental research grants by the government to each Canadian dental school?
2. What has been the specific purpose of each such grant given in the last year?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Under the national health grants, for the fiscal years 1959-64, the following grants were made available to the provinces on behalf of the faculty of dentistry of the Canadian universities listed hereunder:

1959-60: University of Toronto, $169,304; University of Alberta, $960.

1960-61: University of Toronto, $31,373; University of Alberta, $4,490.

1961-62: University of Toronto, $34,936; University of Manitoba, $18,558; University of Alberta, $4,266.

1962-63: University of Toronto; $34,497; University of Alberta, $337.

1963-64: University of Toronto, $31,025; University of Alberta, $6,647.

2. At the request of the provinces, two projects related to dental research were approved in 1963-64, namely: (a) Evaluation of a program of interceptive orthodontics (faculty of dentistry, University of Toronto), and (b) A study of the eruption of teeth and growth of jaws in normal children from birth to three years of age and a survey of dental health in chronically ill Canadian children (faculty of dentistry, University of Alberta).

EXCHANGE OF STUDENTS AND PROFESSORS WITH RUSSIA

Question No. 1,960—**Mr. More:**

1. How many Canadian students have gone to work in or visit institutions in the U.S.S.R. in the past year or so?
2. What U.S.S.R. universities have they worked in or visited and what has been the length of their stay?
3. How many Canadian professors have been invited to go to the U.S.S.R. for a visiting professorship at a U.S.S.R. university during the last year or so?
4. (a) What are their names and qualifications (b) what U.S.S.R. institutions have offered these visiting professorships (c) what has been the length of each visiting professorship?
5. How many U.S.S.R. students have come to Canada to work in or visit our universities during the past year or so?
6. What universities have they worked in or visited and what has been their length of stay?
7. How many U.S.S.R. professors have come to Canada to fill invitations for a visiting professorship in the past year or so?
8. (a) What are their names and qualifications (b) at what Canadian universities have they filled these assignments (c) what has been the length of their assignment in each case?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. 4, 1963-64; 6, 1964-65.

[Mr. Howe (Hamilton South).]

2. Moscow University, one year.

3. Visiting professorships, six.

4. (a) Dr. W. W. Moorhouse, professor of geology, University of Toronto; (b) Academy of Sciences; (c) exact length of assignment not available.

Dr. S. G. Mason, head, physical chemistry division, Pulp and Paper Research Institute of Canada, Montreal; (b) institutes in Leningrad and Moscow; (c) three weeks.

Dr. H. E. Welch, research institute, Department of Agriculture, research branch, Belleville, Ontario; (b) Academy of Sciences; (c) exact length of assignment not available.

Dr. P. A. Kondra, associate professor of poultry science, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg; (b) Academy of Sciences; (c) six weeks.

Dr. J. D. Keys, physics and radiotracer subdivision, Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, Ottawa; (b) Academy of Sciences; (c) five months.

Professor L. G. Berry, Department of Geological Science, Queen's University; (b) Academy of Sciences (Geology); (c) two weeks.

5. 3, 1963-64; 6, 1964-65.

6. University of Toronto, Ontario Agricultural College in Guelph, University of British Columbia. One year.

7. 6 in 1963-64.

8. (1963-64).

(a) Dr. L. N. Andreev, Main Botanical Garden, Academy of Sciences; (b) University of Saskatchewan and Research Institute; (c) six months.

Academician L. I. Sedov; (b) Institute of Aeorospace Studies, Toronto University; (c) one month.

Dr. S. I. Berezin; (b) National Research Council and visits in Kingston; (c) eight months.

Mr. O. A. Kossov, Institute of Automation and Telemechanics, Academy of Sciences; (b) National Research Council (and visits); (c) ten weeks.

Dr. E. L. Franksvich, Academy of Sciences (chemistry); (b) University of Alberta, University of British Columbia, University of Manitoba; (c) one and a half months.

Dr. D. S. Korzinsky, geochemist; (b) McMaster University, Hamilton; (c) one week.

TENDERS FOR REFITS, FRIGATES AND DESTROYER ESCORTS

Question No. 1,963—**Mr. Bell:**

Have tenders or bids been called with respect to the program of refitting and conversion of frigates and destroyer escorts and, if so, what were

the original amounts, final costs, and the number of days for completion of each in both east and west coast yards?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Yes, for destroyer escorts H.M.C.S. *Skeena* and *Margaree*. Contract values were: $2-884,519.75 and $3,218,352 respectively.

Contract prices were the result of competitive tenders. They cover the total conversion work including helicopter platform and facilities, variable depth sonar and improved communications facilities. The contract prices also include all repair and refit requirements known at the time tenders were invited. However in any refit of a ship there is additional work which cannot be defined at the time of the contract award since its extent is known only after the opening up of machinery spaces and equipment. Such work will be extra to the contract but will be priced on the basis of firm labour overhead and profit rates quoted in the initial tenders, and will be relatively small in relation to the total contracts.

Work on H.M.C.S. *Skeena* commenced at an eastern yard on July 15, 1964, with completion scheduled 13 months later. Work on H.M.C.S. *Margaree* commenced at a west coast yard on September 15, 1964, with completion scheduled 13 months later.

ATOMIC ENERGY LTD.—PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, CARLETON COUNTY, ONT.

Question No. 1,993—**Mr. Nugent:**

1. Has Atomic Energy of Canada Limited acquired a site in the township of March in the county of Carleton and, if so (a) from whom was it acquired (b) how many acres (c) what was the price per acre (d) what, in detail, were the arrangements made for sanitary sewer, storm sewer and water connections (e) what amount of the cost of such services is to be contributed by (i) Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (ii) the land developer who sold it (iii) the township of March (iv) any other municipality or person (f) at what date will each of such services be available to the land purchased (g) for what purpose will the land be used?

2. Did Atomic Energy of Canada Limited negotiate with any other property owners in the township of March or the township of Nepean for a site and, if so (a) with whom (b) at what price per acre did each such person offer to sell (c) what arrangements were proposed by such persons for services (d) why was each such offer rejected in favour of the site acquired?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Atomic Energy of Canada Limited advises as follows: 1. Yes. (a) March Ridge Development Ltd., original owners, deeded from Fairfield Investments Ltd., (b) 44, (c) $3,000, (d) Sanitary sewer and water connections to be provided by Wm. Teron Ltd., from neighborhood No. 3, community No. 1, March ridge, to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited site and plant. No storm sewer, (e) (i) Nil (ii) 100 per cent (iii) Nil (iv) Nil, (f) April 30, 1965, (g) site for office and manufacturing building for commercial operations.

2. Yes. (a) Township of Nepean (1) national capital commission, two sites (2) Conarm Developments Limited, (b) (1) national capital commission, lease basis, (2) Conarm Developments Limited, $2,700 per acre, (c) (1) national capital commission, services available to property line (site 1) and by arrangement with defence research board at Atomic Energy of Canada Limited expense (site 2), (2) Conarm Developments Limited, a well on site. Sanitary sewer available on site property line, (d) the property acquired was the most desirable in terms of use and the evaluated cost per acre was lower than the two other sites referred to.

LANGUAGE USED IN UN SPEECHES

Question No. 1,994—**Mr. Fisher:**

In speeches made by members of Canada's permanent delegation to the last two United Nations assembly sessions, how many were given (a) in English (b) in French?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): According to the records of the permanent mission of Canada in New York, members of the Canadian delegation gave 19 speeches in English and four in French during the 1962 assembly; during the 1963 assembly, 18 statements were made in English and 10 in French. Those figures embrace all statements of substance made in plenary or in committees, but exclude minor and ad hoc intervention not based on a prepared text.

During the same period, the Secretary of State for External Affairs gave two speeches, one in English, one in French.

The normal practice for the Canadian representatives is to speak in their mother tongue.

CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN DESALINATION SYMPOSIUM

Question No. 2,015—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. Has the government now replied to the invitation of the United States to participate in the first international symposium on water desalination and, if so, what has been the reply?

2. Have delegates to the symposium been chosen and, if so, who are they?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Yes, the invitation has been accepted.

2. The delegates have as yet not been chosen. The conference takes place in October 1965.

FORT SMITH, N.W.T., AIRPORT FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT

Question No. 2,017—**Mr. Rhéaume:**

1. Has the Department of Transport purchased the additional firefighting equipment required to meet minimum standards of safety for the airport at Fort Smith, N.W.T., and, if so, is this equipment on site?
2. If this equipment has not yet been acquired, when will this be done and on what date will this equipment be installed on site?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): 1. No additional firefighting equipment has been purchased to augment the crash rescue vehicle presently at Fort Smith airport.

2. Specifications for the additional firefighting equipment for Fort Smith and other airports are being developed. It is now expected that a new aircraft crash firefighting vehicle will be delivered to Fort Smith airport during the late summer or early fall of 1965.

SHORE PROTECTION AND ROAD REPAIRS, CARIBOU ISLAND, N.S.

Question No. 2,020—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. Were public tenders called for new shore protection work and repairs to Lightstation road at Caribou island, N.S., and, if not, what individuals and firms were asked to tender on this work?
2. What were the names of the tenderers and the amount of the various tenders?
3. To whom was the contract awarded?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): 1. Tenders by invitation to the following were requested: R. C. Goodall and A. E. McMaster R.R. No. 3, Pictou, Nova Scotia; Ernest A. Falconer, R.R. No. 3, Pictou, Nova Scotia, Joseph Almon, New Glasgow, Nova Scotia.

2. Tenders received were from: Ernest A. Falconer, $3,929; Goodall and McMaster, $6,968.

3. The contract was awarded to Ernest A. Falconer.

REPORT ON UNEMPLOYMENT IN PICTOU COUNTY, N.S.

Question No. 2,029—**Mr. MacEwan:**

Has the Minister of Labour received a report from the Atlantic development board regarding unemployment in Pictou county, as a result of the reference to the board of this matter on the recommendation of the New Glasgow district labour council?

[Mr. Martin (**Essex East**).]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): The Atlantic development board, in acknowledging the request submitted by the New Glasgow district labour council, advised that the board would examine, in co-operation with other departments, the feasibility of carrying out the investigation requested. It is understood that under ARDA a detailed research program has been initiated of an area which includes the county of Pictou and the Atlantic development board is being kept informed of progress made on these studies. Three years ago the Department of Labour in co-operation with the government of Nova Scotia undertook a study of the manpower resources of the New Glasgow labour market area which includes the county of Pictou.

DISPOSITION OF AIR OBSERVER SCHOOL, CRUMLIN, ONT.

Question No. 2,037—**Mr. Irvine:**

Have the properties formerly known as No. 4 air observer school, Crumlin, Ontario, been turned over to war assets disposal corporation for disposition and, if so (a) what offers, if any, to purchase buildings and/or property have been received (b) what is the anticipated finalization date of disposition of these properties?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): In so far as Crown Assets Disposal Corporation is concerned, the answer is as follows:

1. Nine buildings of the former No. 4 air observer school at Crumlin, Ontario were declared surplus and offers thereon were invited by Crown Assets Disposal Corporation for September 23, 1964. Twelve offers were received but after the buildings were advertised and prior to the closing date, the Department of Transport requested two of the buildings, which were allocated to them. In view of the reduced quantity of buildings bidders were subsequently given an opportunity to revise their bids and the highest bidder on this second round has now been requested to forward the balance of his purchase price and performance deposit. Removal of the buildings and the restoration of the site is to be completed by May 1, 1965.

TENDERS FOR DRYDOCK CONSTRUCTION, CLARENVILLE, NFLD.

Question No. 2,043—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. Have tenders been called for the construction of a drydock at Clarenville, Newfoundland?
2. For what purpose will the drydock be used and who will use it?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): 1. Contract for the issue of the main haulout section of the drydock facilities at

Clarenville was awarded to Avalon Construction Company of St. John's, Newfoundland, in June 1963 and this portion of the drydock is now 98 per cent complete. Tenders for the transfer system and fitting out wharf have been called.

2. The purpose of the drydock is to inspect ships out of the water in compliance with the requirements of the Canada Shipping Act. The drydock will be operated by Newfoundland Ship Yards Limited of Clarenville, Newfoundland.

AREA SERVED BY NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT OFFICE, PEMBROKE, ONT.

Question No. 2,049—**Mr. Martineau:**

1. What area is included in the area served by the national employment service office located in the town of Pembroke in the province of Ontario?
2. Has this area been designated as a surplus labour area by the federal government?
3. Does this area include any portion of the county of Pontiac, province of Quebec?
4. What criteria were employed to designate the town of Pembroke and the area served by the national employment office in that town as a surplus labour area?
5. Were the number of claimants for unemployment benefits or the number registered at the national employment service office, at Pembroke, used as one of the criteria?
6. Did such statistics include claimants for unemployment benefits or applicants for positions who live in the county of Pontiac and, if so, how many such claimants and applicants were there from the county of Pontiac and what proportion of the total number of claimants and applicants of the Pembroke area did such claimants and applicants constitute?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): 1. The Pembroke national employment service area comprises some 2,700 square miles of territory, located in eastern Ontario and extending some 130 miles along the Ottawa river. The area takes in the following townships in Renfrew county: Alice, Brudenell, Buchanan, Burns, Clara, Fraser, Hagarty, Head, Jones, Lyndoch, Maria, McKay, North Algona, Pembroke, Petawawa, Radcliffe, Raglan, Richards, Rolph, Sebastopol, Sherwood, South Algona, Stafford, Westmeath, Wilberforce, Wylie and part of Bromley; and the following townships in Nipissing district: Airy, Dickens, Lyell, Murchison and Sabine.

2. Yes.

3. No.

4. The Pembroke national employment service area qualified for designation under the following set of conditions of the established criteria. It was classified by the Department of Labour as a labour surplus area for one half or more of the summer months, May to October, during the three years prior to designation and it experienced an employment decrease in each of these years.

5. The classification of national employment service areas by the Department of Labour is based on the number of persons registered in a given area expressed as a percentage of the number of wage and salary workers in that area. The N.E.S. registrations are taken into account in the unemployment criterion for designating areas. This criterion is based on the classification of the area over the years.

6. The statistics that have been used in this regard refer to the total number registered at the N.E.S. office. There is no information on the number of applicants that were from the county of Pontiac.

ESKASONI INDIAN RESERVE MEDICAL ADVISERS

Question No. 2,071—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

1. What are the names and addresses of the medical advisers or advisers who provide service to the Indians at the Eskasoni reserve?
2. On what date were they appointed and what is their remuneration?
3. Up to the present date, what remuneration have they received since they were appointed?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Medical officer in charge, Sydney clinic, medical services, Department of National Health and Welfare, 63 Charlotte street, Sydney, Nova Scotia. The staff of this clinic varies from time to time as it is rotated but all are full time employees of the Department of National Health and Welfare. The clinic includes on its staff public health nurses, a sanitary inspector and other health workers.

The public health services of the Nova Scotia department of health are available when these are required to supplement the federal department's program. The provincial department of health carries out the tuberculosis control program in this area on behalf of the federal department.

An occasional patient is referred to a privately practising specialist, chosen in accordance with the requirements of the case rather than according to any fixed rule. Except when referred by the department, In-

dians who consult privately practising physicians in the Sydney area do so at their own expense on a private patient basis.

2 and 3. See 1 above.

OLDER WORKERS INCENTIVE PLAN

Question No. 2,072—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

1. How much money was spent in advertising the older workers incentive plan?
2. How many were placed in employment as a result of this plan?
3. Does the government consider this a successful plan?
4. Is it the intention of the government to propose alterations to the plan and, if so, what are they?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): 1. $184,800, advertising and publicity.

2. 1,948.

3 and 4. The plan was introduced on an experimental one year basis and is currently being evaluated. Government policy with respect to the continuation of the plan will be announced when the evaluation study has been completed.

EXPORT CREDIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Question No. 2,076—**Mr. Côté (Chicoutimi):**

1. What is the total amount of operating capital of the Export Credit Insurance Corporation which comes from the consolidated revenue fund made up of public taxes or from the national treasury?
2. What is at present the total amount of current loans of the Export Finance Corporation Ltd. (a company belonging to the chartered banks) which are guaranteed by the Export Credit Insurance Corporation?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. The authorized and subcribed capital of the corporation is $15 million of which $5 million has been paid in by the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance has also paid in capital surplus of $5 million. The total amount thus paid in by the Minister of Finance is $10 million which is held in an interest free account of the consolidated revenue fund in accordance with the Financial Administration Act.

2. Export Credits Insurance Corporation has no knowledge of the loans of the Export Finance Corporation of Canada, Limited. Such loans are not guaranteed by the Export Credits Insurance Corporation.

[*Text*]

STATUS OF QUEBEC DELEGATION IN PARIS

Question No. 2,092—**Mr. Côté (Chicoutimi):**

1. Has the Canadian government officially asked France to award diplomatic status to the general delegation from the province of Quebec in Paris and, if so (a) when did the government of Canada make such a request (b) what reasons were given in support (c) was a reply received and what did it contain?
2. If no request was made does the government of Canada intend to make such a request to France and when?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, the Canadian government has not asked the government of France to grant diplomatic status to the Quebec delegation in Paris. For that matter, the government of Quebec has never at any time asked that its delegation in Paris be given diplomatic status. The government of Canada has therefore asked on several occasions, and in complete agreement with the government of Quebec, privileges and immunities for the Quebec delegation in Paris comparable to those which have been accorded for a long time by the British government to the agent general of Quebec and to other provincial representatives in London. Our discussions with the authorities of the government of France on this subject continue, especially through the intervention of our ambassador in Paris. I hope that the government of France will soon be in a position to grant to the Quebec delegation, and in due course to any other delegation of a province of Canada which might be established in Paris, appropriate privileges and immunities which would facilitate the effective accomplishment of their tasks.

[*Text*]

STILLBIRTHS AND CONGENITAL ABNORMALITIES

Question No. 2,095—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

In each province, in each of the last ten years, what has been the rate per 1,000 births of (a) stillbirths, and (b) congenital abnormalities (all types)?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): (a) Rate, per 1,000 births, of stillbirths (28+ weeks gestation) Canada and provinces, 1954-63:

Year	Canada	Nfld.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	Yukon	N.W.T.
1954....	16.3	17.4	21.2	16.9	18.5	20.6	14.7	14.3	12.9	12.3	11.2	11.6	20.2
1955....	15.4	16.1	15.6	17.2	15.6	18.8	14.4	13.6	12.0	12.4	11.0	11.3	13.5
1956....	15.2	17.6	18.8	17.3	19.6	18.7	13.5	14.2	12.0	11.6	11.3	8.2	13.8
1957....	14.4	16.6	16.9	16.5	14.6	17.7	13.1	13.3	11.6	10.7	10.8	10.0	12.1
1958....	14.1	17.7	16.0	16.6	15.2	16.9	13.0	14.0	11.2	10.6	10.4	10.5	10.5
1959....	13.5	20.3	19.5	13.5	15.1	16.1	12.7	12.9	10.1	9.8	10.0	11.0	13.9
1960....	13.3	17.8	13.0	14.4	14.8	16.7	12.2	11.9	9.1	9.5	10.8	12.8	10.8
1961....	12.5	17.7	16.0	15.2	13.2	13.9	11.7	12.8	11.0	9.5	10.6	7.1	14.1
1962....	12.4	16.3	20.3	14.1	14.2	13.3	12.2	11.9	10.5	9.9	9.8	5.5	16.5
1963....	12.2	16.9	17.3	12.5	14.7	13.3	11.9	11.7	10.2	9.5	9.6	9.9	14.4

(b) No information available in the dominion bureau of statistics.

CANADA SAVINGS BONDS ADVERTISING COSTS

Question No. 2,100—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

What is the cost to the government of advertising the current issue of Canada savings bonds?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): It is expected that the cost of advertising for the 1964 Canada savings bonds campaign will be $972,000.

NATIONAL DEBT

Question No. 2,105—**Mr. Mather:**

What was the amount in dollars of the federal debt in 1940, 1950, 1960 and 1963?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Unmatured funded debt and treasury bills as of March 31: 1940, $3,695,685,192; 1950, $15,188,138,961 (including $115,651,082 refundable portion of excess profits tax); 1960, $15,890,151,803; 1963, $17,961,836,331.

INMATES OF MENTAL INSTITUTIONS

Question No. 2,106—**Mr. Mather:**

1. How many persons were in Canadian mental institutions at the end of the calendar years 1961, 1962 and 1963?

2. What percentage, or ratio, of the population did they represent in the years indicated?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1 and 2. Persons in Canadian mental institutions at the end of calendar year:

1961: (117 institutions reporting out of 146 in operation, representing 98.4 per cent of the operating rated bed capacity.) Patients on books[1], 75,372 or 413 per 100,000 population[2]; patients in institutions, 65,312 or 358 per 100,000 population[2].

1962: (137 institutions reporting out of 150 in operation, representing 97.9 per cent of the operating rated bed capacity.) Patients on books[1], 76,140 or 410 per 100,000 population[2]; patients in institutions, 66,096 or 356 per 100,000 population[2].

1963: Data not yet available.

[1] Includes on probation, boarding out or otherwise absent.

[2] June 1 population figures as enumerated in census years or estimated for inter-censal years.

STUDENT LOANS GRANTED

Question No. 2,119—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. As of September 20, 1963, how many students in each province and territory, have been granted Canada student loans?

2. In each province and territory what was the total of loans granted as of September 30, 1964?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1. This information is not yet available.

2. This information is not yet available.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CANADIAN MEMBERSHIP IN INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS, ETC.

Question No. 1,669—**Mr. Latulippe:**

1. On what international commissions, committees or other agencies is Canada represented within

the framework of the United Nations organization or otherwise?

2. What is the nature and purpose of each such commission, committee or agency; what is Canada's role in each; and what countries are members?

3. Who are the Canadian personnel on each such commission, committee or agency; who directs each; and what proportion do they represent in comparison with other countries?

4. What were Canada's yearly expenditures in connection with each such commission, committee or agency since its creation?

5. What were the increases or decreases in personnel and appropriations of each such commission, committee or agency since its inception, and in each case, for what reasons were those increases or decreases made?

6. During the past ten years, did Canada withdraw from any such commission, committee or agency and, if so, from which body and for what reason?

7. What conditions are generally required before Canada participates as a member of an international commission of the United Nations?

Return tabled.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR MEDICAL CARE

Question No. 1,805—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. How many people by provinces, receive medical care paid in full by the federal government?

2. How many people, by provinces, receive medical care paid in part by the federal government?

Return tabled.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT USE OF COMPUTERS

Question No. 1,854—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. How many computers, of all types, are now being used by the federal government?

2. How many civil service positions have been pre-empted by computers in each of the last five years?

3. What has been the total operating cost to the government of computers in each of the last five years?

Return tabled.

RESEARCH GRANTS TO MEDICAL SCHOOLS

Question No. 1,947—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. In each of the last five years, what has been the total of medical research grants by the government to each Canadian medical school?

2. What has been the specific purpose of each such grant given in the last year?

Return tabled.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

COMMUNIST CHINA—METHOD OF EXPLODING NUCLEAR DEVICE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and ask him whether the government of Canada has any information on whether the detonation of the nuclear device by communist China was done in the air. If so, has the government given consideration to the request of the Voice of Women, calling on the government to step up and expand immediately all existing monitoring procedures for the detection of radioactive fall-out, in particular iodine 131, which is expected to fall on Canada as a result of this test?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I understand that the measurement of this type of radioactive fall-out cannot be undertaken for an indefinite period, perhaps I had better take my right hon. friend's question as notice, and give him a detailed answer tomorrow.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Could the minister say whether the government of Canada has any knowledge as to whether this explosion was in the air, in the atmosphere or underground?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, to the best of our knowledge it was in the atmosphere.

DISCUSSIONS WITH LEADERS OF NEW U.K. GOVERNMENT

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 view of the fact that the new foreign secretary for Great Britain, Patrick Walker, has announced that arrangements for a visit and consultation with U.S. secretary of state Dean Rusk within the next few days, could the minister say whether he has had any communication with the new foreign secretary, and will Mr. Walker be including Canada in his itinerary?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in the event that the arrangements made with the U.S. secretary of state are firm, and notwithstanding the fact that I shall shortly have an opportunity at the United Nations to meet Mr Walker in his new capacity, I have indicated that we would be very happy if he would come here, and in fact that we believe we would find such a meeting useful.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcement of the pending visit of Right Hon. Harold Wilson, Prime Minister of Great Britain, to Washington, would the government give consideration to extending

an invitation to him to visit Ottawa while he is on this continent?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have already sent a message to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom expressing hope for an early exchange of views, and I have had a telephone conversation with him as well. His reaction to this idea was a very positive one, and I think he will visit Ottawa on his next crossing of the Atlantic.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): As a supplementary question, in view of—

Mr. Fisher: Socialists all.

Mr. Gordon: Listen to who is talking, of all people.

Mr. Douglas: —in view of the interest expressed by the government of the United Kingdom in extending commonwealth trade, are any plans being made for discussion of this subject with the United Kingdom government?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, that is certainly one of the matters we would wish to discuss most with the Prime Minister and foreign secretary of the United Kingdom.

FINANCE

INTEREST RATES ON SHORT AND LONG TERM BORROWINGS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. I am pleased to note that the yield on 90 day treasury bills has been reduced to some 3.68 per cent as a means of discouraging the inflow of foreign, short term capital, and I wish to ask the minister whether he is planning to take any similar steps with respect to long term borrowings in the Canadian market?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend knows, the weekly treasury bill rate fluctuates from time to time. Among other things it is influenced by short term rates in the United States. Dealing with the second part of the question, I think it is fair to say that the spread between Canadian and U.S. rates both long and short term, have been narrower in the past year than they were prior to that period, and this has a tendency to influence the inflow of capital in the way my hon. friend suggested.

Mr. Douglas: As a supplementary question may I ask the minister whether he is planning to introduce at this session any measures to deal with the deficit in our balance of payments with the United States, which in the first half of this year was approximately $1,070 million?

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, I shall be surprised if the current account deficit in total reaches anything like that figure this year. The imbalance on a bilateral basis with the United States has been of this order for some time, and this is one of the things of which the government is very conscious. I may add that the government's policies are directed over the long term toward correcting this imbalance, but I do not think it is something which should be done in a precipitate manner. I believe we should work at it carefully. One of the most important things is to encourage greater exports to the United States, in particular greater exports of Canadian manufactured goods, and this is something to which the government is giving its close attention.

BANK OF CANADA COMMITMENT UNDER AGREEMENT WITH U.K. GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Can the minister tell us whether he has yet had an opportunity to consult with the new chancellor of the exchequer of Great Britain; and if so, is he now in a position to tell the house the extent to which the Bank of Canada is committed under the recent stand-by agreement with the British government?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the first part of the question I would say that I had the pleasure of a long conversation with the new chancellor of the exchequer when I was in London last June, and I have written to him subsequently to congratulate him on his appointment and also to say that, while the newspapers are commenting a great deal upon the fact that the government of which he is a member has a majority of only four seats, these things are relative and from this distance that does not look so bad.

With regard to the last part of the question, I do not think my opinion has changed. With great respect, I do not think there would be any advantage in disclosing details at this stage.

Inquiries of the Ministry

REPORTED INTENTION TO APPLY TIGHT MONEY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. It concerns a report issued by the Canadian stock exchange this morning to the effect that the government is fearing inflation and is now applying a tight money policy. Is that so?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the report, which sounds to me as if it were highly exaggerated.

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, my question is a related one. Is the government considering action to prevent the creeping inflation which is destroying the value of the consumer's dollar?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

STUDY OF PROVINCIAL ALLOCATIONS OF FEDERAL REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister of Finance?

Could the minister tell us whether he has now obtained the report he asked his department to prepare concerning federal expenditures in every Canadian province?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, some three months ago I asked for a study to be made in order that I might be able to answer some questions that in the interim have been made orders for returns. Those studies have taken a great deal of time. They have taken up the work of several members of my department over several months. They are extremely difficult and complex studies. I have not received them as yet, but I hope to have them in the not too distant future.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Does the Minister of Finance intend to table the report in the house as soon as he receives it?

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, I intend to answer the questions that have now been made orders for returns, and I shall do that at the earliest possible date.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: A further question, Mr. Speaker.

Will the minister table only parts of the report so as to answer questions on the order paper or does he intend to table the whole report of the investigation made by his officials?

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: I do not know what is meant by a report, Mr. Speaker. Certain studies are being made with a view to answering the questions that were placed on the order paper, and those questions will be answered as fully and completely as it is possible to do.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

REPORTED THREATS AND PROPERTY DAMAGE RESPECTING MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Justice, which question is pressing and is of capital as well as national importance with regard to the safety of the members of parliament.

Over the week end we learned that the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) as well as the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer) had been threatened by the F.L.Q. (Front de Libération du Québec).

Has the Minister of Justice investigated this matter, with a view to establishing whether, since the member for Three Rivers was concerned, the F.L.Q. had indeed made such threats, or whether they were made instead by the Quebec Liberal federation?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the first incident mentioned by the hon. member for Mégantic, I must say that I have had, personally, no information on the matter.

Still, I have been much concerned by yesterday's news relating what had occurred in the case of the hon. member for Three Rivers. As he is obviously one of the most likeable and popular members of this house, I hastened, upon arriving at the office, and without interfering in provincial "jurisdiction" with regard to the administration of justice, to request a full report or at least full information on this matter.

[*Text*]

POSSIBLE ACTION RESPECTING ONTARIO SUPREME COURT JUDGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gene Rhéaume (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Justice. Is he in a position to answer the question put to him on October 13 by my colleague the hon. member for Yukon, which was as follows:

—I should like to ask the Minister of Justice . . . whether the federal government is considering taking any action under the Judges Act with respect to Mr. Justice Landreville.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the charge which had been laid against Mr. Justice Landreville was dismissed at the preliminary hearing stage; that is to say, the judge decided there was insufficient evidence for the case to go to trial. Of course there is nothing that ought to be done or can be done under the Judges Act except to take into account the normal course of judicial process.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, is the minister entirely correct in that? Even though there was insufficient evidence to establish a criminal charge and send this matter for trial, is it not proper that a judge, under the circumstances, should have his conduct examined by way of a commission, in order to ascertain whether the action taken was such that it constituted on his part such a dereliction of duty as not to be in keeping with the position of a high court justice?

Miss LaMarsh: Like Courtemanche.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I would much rather take that question as notice.

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON STABBING OF GUARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): I have a question for the Minister of Justice. Is the minister now in a position to report to the house on the investigation carried out by Mr. D. M. McLean into the murder of Edwin James Masterton while he carried out his duties as a guard at Dorchester penitentiary, which report the minister informed me on September 29 would be ready within 10 days?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am not, but I will inquire about the state of the report.

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the minister's recent statement to the house that the fatal stabbing of a guard at Dorchester was not connected with the serious overcrowding at that institution, and in view of the fact that this opinion has now been publicly seconded by the commissioner of penitentiaries, will the minister enlighten the house as to what purpose will be served by the appointment of a commission of inquiry into the incident when both the minister and the commissioner of penitentiaries have already drawn and published their own conclusions?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, the reason for appointing a board of inquiry or a commission of inquiry is obvious, and I think it is only fair that I be allowed to look into the report when I receive it.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

STATEMENT BY JUSTICE MINISTER RESPECTING RADIO INTERVIEW

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, while I have the floor I should like to reply to a question directed to me by the right hon. leader of the official opposition last Friday, which appears at the bottom of page 9116 of the English version of *Hansard* of October 16, 1964. I shall quote the exact text in the language in which it was asked as this is always the best way to proceed. I quote:

[*Text*]

I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether in the course of an interview on the C.B.C. yesterday, dealing in particular with the formula for the amendment of the constitution, he was asked a question to this effect: "Does this formula mean that the door is now open for an associate state?" And did he reply thereto in approximately these words: "You might put it that way"?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have now obtained a transcript of the question as put to me and the answer I gave, and I wish now to read it into the record as being my answer to the question.

[*Translation*]

Q.—If, for instance, it should happen at a given moment that four provinces, if not more, decide to delegate important powers to the federal government in years to come and that the province of Quebec, for reasons of her own which we can all

understand, should decide to keep such jurisdictional powers would it not be possible to arrive at some sort of associate state status for the two ethnic groups, the two nations?

A.—Up to a point, it would be possible. The reason is that in at least four important sectors—for instance, the one dealing with civil rights and property, which the province of Quebec looks upon as something sacred—well, we could have a delegation of authority to the Canadian parliament by seven, eight or nine provinces and then, of course, for that purpose, well, there could exist between Quebec and the other provinces, let us say a difference, if not in actual status—for the constitution would remain the same—at least a difference in fact.

[*Text*]

Those are the facts, and this is the record.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): A supplementary question. In view of the minister's qualifying remarks preceding his statement, would the same consideration be given to any member of the house who is not a nice man?

CONSIDERATION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE OF AMENDMENT FORMULA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): My question is for the Minister of Justice. Last Thursday the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam asked the minister whether he would consider having the house set up a special committee to consider the problem of an amending formula for the Canadian constitution, in view of its transcendent importance. The minister said he would take the question as notice and answer it later. I wonder if he is now in a position to answer that question.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): I am not yet in a position to answer that question either in the negative or in the affirmative, but the matter will be taken up with my colleagues.

Mr. Brewin: Is the minister in a position to tell the house whether before introducing any resolution in parliament requesting the imperial parliament to enact an amending formula, he would first ascertain that the legislatures of all the provinces have agreed to the proposed amending formula?

Mr. Favreau: I thought I had answered that question. But I will add that this is a matter on which I shall be making a statement very shortly.

[Mr. Favreau.]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

PROTEST RESPECTING PLAY ON PROGRAM "FESTIVAL"

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey North): I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State. On October 13 I asked the hon. gentleman a question regarding a production in the C.B.C. program "Festival". What justification was there for the second program in the series last Wednesday, which has been widely criticized because of its demoralizing influence?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I will be very glad to ask the C.B.C. for that information.

REQUEST FOR SETTING UP OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): In view of the eulogies which have been paid to committees this afternoon by several speakers, and in view of the motion which was concurred in, I should like to ask the Secretary of State whether, because of widespread criticism of some of the C.B.C. programs, he would have a committee set up so the house might have the officers of the C.B.C. before it and so that matters such as, for instance, the Kitsilano reserve property in British Columbia could be considered. These are matters which parliament has a right to know about. Will the hon. gentleman have the committee set up, now that he and his associates have given such support to the further extension of committee work in parliament?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): As the right hon. gentleman knows, all these matters are now before a special advisory committee which is preparing a report for the government. As I have said several times in this house, when this report has been received the government will consider its recommendations and prepare new legislation. Then the house will be asked to form a committee to consider the legislation and to study the new set-up.

Mr. Diefenbaker: With great respect, it is not a question of studying the legislation but of examining what is being done by the C.B.C. in the expenditure of $86 million a year. We want to know about that, and the house has the right to this information without having

to wait until some committee set up by the government makes some report, some time, somewhere.

ARTS, LETTERS AND SCIENCES

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT BY ROYAL COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the evident need for action to bring about greater unity in Canada, can the Prime Minister advise the house when the royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism is expected to render a report?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I have already indicated to the house that we hope to have an interim report from the commission in the matter of a few weeks.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

LOUISBURG, N.S.—STRIKE OF WORKERS AT HISTORIC SITE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I had a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources but I see the hon. gentleman is absent, undoubtedly due to illness or official business. May I direct it to the acting minister or to the Prime Minister, in view of the urgency of the matter. In the light of the statement by the minister of northern affairs as reported in the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* on Saturday, that he is prepared to meet at any time with representatives of striking workers on the Louisburg restoration program, will the acting minister or the Prime Minister say whether any steps have been taken to arrange a meeting with the workers' representatives?

Mr. Speaker: Surely this is a question for the order paper. I do not see how the minister could be expected to answer.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): With all due deference, I can understand that Your Honour is probably not aware that these workers are on strike. It started on Thursday or Friday, of last week and it is an urgent matter.

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): My colleague communicated with me earlier today, and I hoped to have some information on hand. However, it has not yet been received. I understand the minister concerned will be back, and I gather there will be a report tomorrow.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Would the hon. gentleman prevail on the minister of northern affairs to keep in close touch with the situation so the matter does not get out of hand, as have his dealings with the advisory board in Banff?

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the Minister of Labour could tell the house the reasons for the strike at the Fort Louisburg restoration project, and whether his department is attempting to reconcile the differences that caused the strike.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): I am attempting to reconcile the differences, Mr. Speaker, because the project is located in my constituency.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacEachen: But I am not acting in that way as Minister of Labour, because this is a matter of provincial jurisdiction. I think the dispute arises over travel allowances that have been assimilated as part of the wage rates, and with respect to a new flexibility employment plan instituted at the Louisburg project. I have been in touch with the office of the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, and I understand today that there are in motion procedures that will lead to an early solution of this problem.

UNITED NATIONS

CANADIAN POSITION ON ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the remarks by President Johnson last night respecting communist China's changed status in the world, and the remarks of the minister last week, I think it was, when he said words to the effect that we must face up to the recognition of communist China very soon, is Canada going to initiate or support some action to admit communist China to the United Nations, or is Canada now contemplating recognition of red China?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I cannot add anything to what I stated as government policy on May 22.

Inquiries of the Ministry

AGRICULTURE

EGGS—REQUEST FOR CHANGE IN DEFICIENCY PAYMENT METHOD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture in connection with the 2 cents deficiency payment in regard to eggs. Since these payments are really small and are unfair to the western egg producers, would the minister give serious consideration to providing deficiency payments on a cumulative regional price basis, instead of the basis used at the present time? Would the minister give serious consideration to this matter, in view of the shortcomings of the method used at the present time by the agricultural stabilization board?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, these matters are under consideration and study at all times, and at this particular time they have not been resolved.

Mr. Rapp: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I cannot accept that as an answer, and I would like to debate this issue at ten o'clock this evening.

[*Later:*]

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Would the minister consider allowing the stabilization board officials to come before the agricultural committee to study the situation with regard to eggs and the price of eggs which was recently announced?

Mr. Hays: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to take this question under consideration.

STEPS TO IMPROVE POSITION OF EASTERN FARMERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder whether the minister has been considering the very serious position of eastern farmers in regard to the depressed income situation in which they find themselves. Has he any announcement to make with regard to the policy to be followed or the action it is intended to take in this regard?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, we have had four bills before the house since June 16. I believe these measures will give them some help in so far as credit is concerned. Also, at the first of next year we expect to introduce some more bills that we think will also help.

Mr. Winkler: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the minister whether he does not really believe that the farmers are in a position where they need income, not credit.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Mégantic.

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): It is all right, Mr. Speaker; the hon. member just asked the question for me.

RAPESEED—REQUEST FOR ADVANCE OF QUOTAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Would the minister ask the Canadian wheat board to consider the urgency of an early advance of the quotas for rapeseed?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is referring to quotas of the Canadian wheat board which falls under my jurisdiction, I will take the question as notice.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

CONSIDERATION OF ROYAL COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS BY DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the government has now had the Hall commission report for a full four months, is the Prime Minister now in a position to announce a date for the federal-provincial conference within the six months recommended by that report?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker. A good deal of time will still be required, and that was made clear at the federal-provincial conference last week.

SUGGESTED MONITORING OF DAIRY PRODUCTS FOR RADIOACTIVITY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the recent Chinese atomic explosion and

in view of week end reports that many dairy herds are still grazing outside, will the minister reconsider her decision not to monitor dairy products for radioactive elements?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): As of this date, Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to ascertain what has happened as a result of this single explosion. As my hon. friend knows, we receive daily reports with respect to air samples, and none of them has yet shown any significant change.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF GILL REPORT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Labour. It concerns a question that has been asked in this house a great many times and is of the utmost importance, particularly at this time of year. Is the minister willing to consider as soon as possible the formation of a committee to study the Gill committee report with regard to the lamentable, abnormal situation that exists at the moment with regard to the administration and functioning of the unemployment insurance commission?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): No, Mr. Speaker. The unemployment insurance fund is in a solvent condition at the moment, reflecting the improved employment situation. This is the best answer I can give to the hon. member's question.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I think the minister did not quite get the point of my question. It referred to the formation of a committee to study the Gill committee report, and was not so much concerned about the financial situation of the unemployment insurance fund as with the administration of the commission. I refer to the administration itself and the effect of applying the law as it exists, which is causing hardship across this country at the moment.

Mr. MacEachen: It is not the intention of the government to send the Gill committee report to a committee of the house. When legislation is put forward based on the Gill committee report, or arising out of that report, that will perhaps be the time to send this matter to a committee for study.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, would the minister consider forming a committee so some of the government representatives in this administration can come before the committee and answer questions?

Mr. MacEachen: No, Mr. Speaker. That would not be in accord with the statement I have already made as to the policy to be followed.

TRADE

FAILURE TO INCLUDE FISHERIES REPRESENTATIVE IN MISSION TO CARIBBEAN

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer a question directed to me last Friday by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg, in which he asked why it was that a representative of the fresh and salt fishing industry was not included in the trade mission which is going to the West Indies, sponsored by my department.

The reason we did not include a fisheries representative in the Caribbean food products trade mission was that we had sent a specialized Canadian products trade mission to the Caribbean and to Latin America in 1962. Last year, in 1963, we sent a fisheries specialist to the Caribbean to reassess and report on this market, and the information was provided to the industry. In planning its trade promotion program the department has always treated fish and fish products as a special subject, not part of any generalized trade mission with respect to market development projects. We are keeping this whole matter under continual review, and intend sending a fisheries mission for reconnaissance purposes to a number of key markets. This year we have already sent some to Japan and Scandinavia.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

REPORTED INTENTION TO INCREASE LOCAL POSTAL RATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General. I should like to ask the Postmaster General whether, as a result of a public statement made by him over the week end in the city of Windsor, Canadians must now expect a general increase in postal rates.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no, certainly not as the result of any statement I made there.

[*Later:*]

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General supplementary to the question asked by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce. Does the Postmaster General intend to raise the local postal rate from 4 cents to 5 cents, and would this apply to smaller communities?

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question I have nothing to add to the statement that I made earlier this year when I introduced the bill which I hope will eventually lead to an amendment to the Post Office Act, and to the further statement I made when the estimates of the Post Office Department were before the house. I think the time has come when we will have to abolish the local delivery rate; I think such action is long overdue, but that is a matter for this house to decide.

IMMIGRATION

TORONTO—STATUS OF PERSONS CONCERNED WITH NEWSPAPER STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. My question arises out of an answer given on his behalf on Friday by his parliamentary secretary to a question asked earlier by the hon. member for Danforth, and it relates to the six persons in Canada without status who are involved in the I.T.U. dispute in Toronto. Has the minister been able to resolve this issue or do anything about it since the answer was made on Friday?

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No, Mr. Speaker. I was informed of that supplementary question this morning. I shall inquire and I shall be very happy, within a few days, to supply the hon. member with information.

[*Text*]

MARITIME FREIGHT RATES

INQUIRY AS TO PROVISION FOR STUDY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the request made by Premier Stanfield last week of the maritime transportation commission concerning fears of further intrusion on the Maritime Freight Rates Act, would the Prime Minister restate the guarantees which I believe he gave to Premier Stanfield, and more particularly would he announce that the special study as promised on this whole matter will be set up fairly soon?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we had a very useful exchange of views on this matter. If my hon. friend would put his question on the order paper I would be able to give the details in my reply to that question. I have not all of them in my mind at the moment.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister not think, in view of the railway legislation which is going to be considered very soon and the fact there may be exceptions to the Maritime Freight Rates Act provided therein, that this study should be announced before this hearing proceeds?

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, in order to avoid any delay I will be glad to take my hon. friend's question as notice, and perhaps I can reply to it orally tomorrow.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

MEASURE RESPECTING HOURS OF WORK, MINIMUM WAGES, ETC.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour) moved that the house go into committee to consider Bill No. C-126, respecting hours of work, minimum wages, etc.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

On clause 2—*Definitions.*

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words with respect to clause 2. I propose to move an amendment to this clause, but let me say it is only the first of two or three amendments which we may wish to move to this clause. As you are aware, sir, we are now operating under a rule which gets us right down to business; therefore I shall come straight to the point concerning which I wish to move an amendment.

Clause 2 paragraph (f) lists a certain number of general holidays. Or, to put it another way, this paragraph defines a general holiday as meaning New Year's day, Good Friday, Victoria day, Dominion day, Labour day, Thanksgiving day and Christmas day, and includes any day substituted for any such holiday pursuant to section 28.

As the minister and hon. members of the committee will realize, we feel that providing for only seven general holidays, which those individuals who come under the provisions of this act will receive with pay, is not sufficient. We feel that the number should be either eight or nine.

I may say that we were not impressed by the arguments the minister advanced with respect to this point when he concluded the debate on second reading. As a matter of fact his submission at that stage of the debate suggested that all this bill is doing is simply making law of what now is the practice or fact, so far as most of the workers who come under federal labour jurisdiction are concerned. We feel that the number of holidays should be increased to nine, but we realize that we may run into difficulty in proposing an amendment increasing the number from seven to nine. Therefore, in the hope that by making our request a reasonable one it will be accepted, we propose that there be eight general holidays or in other words that to the list of holidays set out in this paragraph there be added one more, namely Remembrance day.

I point out, Mr. Chairman, that Remembrance day is included in the list of holidays in the Civil Service Act, and also in the list of days that we in this house have decided not to sit. There is a general feeling throughout Canada that this day ought to be recognized as a holiday. We feel very strongly that Remembrance day should be added to the list as set out in paargraph (f).

The arguments for such an addition are so obvious and clear it is hardly necessary to debate the proposal at any length; therefore I move:

That paragraph (f) of clause 2 be amended by inserting a comma immediately after the words "Thanksgiving day" and by inserting immediately after the said comma the words "Remembrance day".

If this amendment is accepted then paragraph (f) of clause 2 in its entirety would read as follows:

"general holiday" means New Year's day, Good Friday, Victoria day, Dominion day, Labour day, Thanksgiving day, Remembrance day and Christmas day and includes any day substituted for any such holiday pursuant to section 28.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the minister, having thought this matter over since the second reading stage of the debate, will see fit to agree to this amendment, and that he will appreciate our reasonableness in asking for an increase from seven to eight rather than to nine holidays, which we would like to ask for; and that therefore the house will unanimously concur in this amendment providing for eight general holidays under this legislation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Chairman, I only wish to say a few words about the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

I feel that the reasons he put forward were perhaps sufficient when he said that those holidays corresponded with those provided by the house under the report of the committee on procedure. I believe he is right and it is precisely for those reasons that I would ask the minister to consider at the same time adding St. John the Baptist day, which is the feast day of French Canadians observed throughout the province of Quebec, not only by private enterprise but also by government agencies.

If the minister will take it upon himself to introduce his own amendment, we would have nine statutory holidays instead of seven and he would then obtain the unanimous consent, just as he would in order to increase the number of holidays to eight, by including Remembrance day.

It is the only intervention I wanted to make and I hope the minister will take my recommendations into consideration and take upon himself to move an amendment so that from now on we will have nine statutory holidays instead of seven.

[*Text*]

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, we in the official opposition support the proposed amendment, and feel that Remembrance day is a worthy addition to the list of general holidays provided for in this bill.

I must say in respect to the words of the speaker who has just resumed his seat, without the significance of that day referred to by the member for Winnipeg North Centre in his amendment, there would be no need to celebrate any other holiday. I sometimes feel that Remembrance day is one of the more important holidays that should be observed. If there was no reason to celebrate that day I suggest there would be no need to celebrate days such as the Queen's birthday or Saint John the Baptist day.

There is one other important aspect of this question which I think all hon. members should recognize. In some municipalities, where feeling is strong about Remembrance day, this day is set aside and dedicated to this purpose, where as in other

communities it is not so recognized. By accepting this amendment we will eliminate any discriminatory attitude which exists between and among communities across this country.

The members of this party feel that the thought behind the amendment including Remembrance day in the list of general holidays under the provisions of this bill is an exceptionally good thought, and we therefore support the amendment.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I rise to give my wholehearted support to the amendment as one who has for many years urged that Remembrance day be included as a national holiday. Many veterans and other organizations in all sections across Canada have requested that Remembrance day be set aside as a national holiday. By including this day in this list of holidays we will recognize, in a fitting and proper way, a day that means very much to many Canadians, a day that will never be forgotten by many Canadians, and at the same time provide an opportunity for regularizing its celebration across Canada. This day has been recognized in some sections of the country while not in others, in some municipalities and not in others. By accepting the proposed amendment we will give national recognition to this important day, and provide an opportunity for all those who wish to honour it from year to year.

With those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I will resume my seat, and I trust that the minister will respond favourably to this amendment which represents the views of a very wide section of the Canadian people.

Mr. Cantelon: When I introduced this subject on Wednesday I was ruled out of order, and I believe quite properly. It was my thought at the time that of all the holidays Remembrance day was the one we could least afford to eliminate. I must confess I was not very much impressed by the minister's argument in which he suggested that seven holidays were sufficient. It seems to me that if seven holidays are enough this is one which should not have been eliminated. As a school teacher, I say that we have few enough days in this country which we can point out to the young children as being of national significance. This is one day that certainly does have national significance. If it is a holiday I am sure it will be brought very strongly to the attention of the young people. This, I feel, is a pre-eminent reason for its being included in the list of holidays.

[Mr. Winkler.]

In addition, I feel that it really should be a holiday, to remind us of all the sacrifices which the young men of this country made during two great wars. This again would be an example to the young people of this country.

Mr. MacEachen: Before the bill was introduced, Mr. Chairman, and since our discussion on second reading I have given consideration to the addition of a further holiday to the list set out in paragraph (f) of clause 2. I think one should start with the argument that, having decided upon seven statutory holidays, we are then obliged to examine which holidays are most generally observed in Canada, in all regions.

Mr. Orlikow: I wonder if the minister could tell us what the magic is about seven? Why does it have to be seven?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, I shall be glad to deal with that, because in establishing standards we are in a sense entering a field that is normally reserved to collective bargaining. It is certainly not the privilege of this House of Commons to legislate completely and fully the working conditions of the work force under our jurisdiction. If we established eight statutory holidays we would be legislating in this respect for 46 per cent of the work force under federal jurisdiction.

I believe, on balance, that having established seven statutory holidays it is desirable to leave the remainder for the field of collective bargaining. Bear in mind that on this continent the United States has never entered the field of establishing statutory holidays. The provinces have not entered this field, either, but we have entered it by establishing seven statutory holidays. We will affect directly at least 10 per cent of the work force under our jurisdiction, which I regard as a very substantial body of men. For example the running trades on the railways at present have no statutory holidays, and they have bargained for their working conditions. We are in that sense establishing seven statutory holidays when no holidays exist at the moment.

I would remind the committee, therefore, that we are taking a very big step in this direction. When you combine the action we are taking on holidays with minimum wages, with vacations with pay and hours of work, as a total package we are asking the employers under our jurisdiction to take, in my view it would be unreasonable to extend it at this time.

Mr. Knowles: Will the minister permit a question before he leaves this aspect of the question? Is he not defeating his own argument? He said at one moment that we must not make it eight because the non-operating railway employees, by and large, have won only seven through collective bargaining. He says we must not therefore interfere with that. On the other hand he says that by providing for seven statutory holidays he is doing something for the running trades employees on the railways because they have not established any statutory holidays through collective bargaining. One argument cancels the other. If we are entering the field at all, and if we are legislating standards in a field in which there is collective bargaining, have we not the right to decide ourselves what these minimum standards should be? Does the minister not realize that that is the basis upon which we feel that eight would be better than seven?

Mr. MacEachen: I think that the apparent contradiction is really only apparent because in the running trades, to which I have referred, they have voluntarily decided to bargain and settle for other matters. In this process of bargaining, they have come down on some other working conditions which they have regarded as more important. Notwithstanding that, we say in this case that to meet the standards that have been established and to which I referred last week, seven statutory holidays should be established.

I do appreciate the views that have been expressed with regard to Remembrance day. There are other days that could be mentioned, but it is a fact that in Canada the most generally observed holidays are those that we have mentioned, namely New Year's day, Labour day, Christmas day, Dominion day, Good Friday, Thanksgiving and Victoria day. Should we then add a further holiday, Remembrance day, which is not fully observed in this way throughout Canada as the schedules of the industrial standards in various provinces will indicate? There is a provision in the bill that will permit employers or employees to substitute a holiday for any of the seven enumerated holidays. This is a clause in certain collective agreements now in the province of Quebec, for example, so that any particular area or industry which felt strongly about observing Remembrance day could do so, and could substitute it for one of the days enumerated.

We have attempted to meet this problem by making this provision. Bear in mind, that we are taking a very big step in this field. We are taking the lead on the continent. We are establishing a standard that has been established through collective bargaining by one of the strongest unions in Canada, namely seven statutory holidays. If we went to eight, we would be legislating for 46 per cent of the work force, which I think goes beyond the intent of a bill that establishes minimum standards. This is my argument, Mr. Chairman, and I regret that I cannot accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Winkler: If I heard the minister properly, he mentioned that great strides forward are indicated in the legislation before us. He referred also to the fact that certain standards had been established by collective bargaining, so obviously he has consulted with one of the larger unions. He referred to this one extra holiday as being burdensome. If we are to take a step forward at all, surely the inclusion of this day, which is so important in comparison with some of those included in this package deal, will not be a burdensome thing. As I said before, it will eliminate a certain amount of intercommunity discrepancy which exists at the moment.

This is not something about which we will get involved in great argument, but I do not think the minister has advocated the proper view. Let us include this day in the package deal, even if it means one of the other days being eliminated. He will not gain anything by saying, "If you want to celebrate this day six months from now, O.K., but pick your own day." There is a lot of significance attached to this particular day and we shall stand firm with the mover of the amendment in support of it.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, I am certainly prepared to support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and though up to a point I can see the arguments presented by the minister, nevertheless Remembrance day is a day of great significance and importance to a large majority of people. I do not suggest for one minute that any other day be eliminated, but I think the minister would agree that Remembrance day has greater significance for most Canadians than, for instance, Thanksgiving day. I would like to see eight days stipulated; and to suggest that Remembrance day is of less importance than some of the other days included is something which I, and I am sure most Canadians, would find difficult to follow.

Many persons in this chamber lost relatives or friends in one war or another. Canada has been engaged in a number of conflicts since the beginning of the century, and Remembrance day is the most significant in the year to our people. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, many of the other statutory holidays could not be celebrated if it were not for the reasons we celebrate Remembrance day.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment and I find the minister's arguments strange. His main reason for opposing the amendment is that the running trades in the railways have no statutory holidays and that the employees belonging to other railway unions have only seven statutory holidays by virtue of their collective bargaining agreement. To argue this is to ignore the whole history of the railway industry, which is about the only one in Canada that operates seven days a week, 24 hours a day, from one end of the country to the other.

It is one of the few industries I know in which workers do not get premium pay for working evenings or nights. It is one of the few industries in which organized workers do not get time and a half for working Saturdays, and double or triple time for working Sundays. This is no criticism of the unions concerned. To a large extent it is due to the nature of the industry which must operate all the time; but simply because railway workers have not been able to win this in their collective agreement, or because they take another day in lieu of Remembrance day, as the minister seemed to suggest, is no argument for saying they ought not have statutory holidays. One might as well argue that they are not entitled to any statutory holidays.

In my own province the provincial government has made Remembrance day a statutory holiday. In fact it has drawn up some pretty stiff regulations prohibiting work on that day without a special permit, and stipulating stiff penalties for anybody who violates them. I join with other members who have spoken on the importance of Remembrance day to people who fought in the forces and to people who lost relatives and friends during the world wars in which Canada has participated.

Now that we have adopted the principle of providing statutory holidays I think we ought not try to make them as few as possible. I am not being too critical of the minister, but having proposed seven statutory holidays I do not think he should refuse to write in Remembrance day as the eighth, because it has great importance to many people in Canada.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, listening to the minister I thought his arguments were convincing in favour of the inclusion of Remembrance day rather than the conclusion he finally made. This is one of the few places where the government can show a little bit of leadership. It is important that we impress upon our younger people the price at which peace has been won, and it is important that we take advantage of Remembrance day to dwell on the nation's role and stake in international affairs. It is also important that we renew that spirit of sacrifice upon which our national purpose depends. For these reasons I hope the minister will reconsider the position he has taken.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the minister's argument is rather weak when he suggests the purpose of this legislation is not to deal with matters which can properly be dealt with by collective bargaining. As I understand the whole purpose of this bill, it is to set fairly high, minimum labour standards. The minister is doing this in the matter of minimum wages, and in arguing as he has done it would be equally valid for him to argue that, because the minimum wage in one province is 50 cents or 75 cents an hour, by suggesting $1.25 an hour he is invading the field of collective bargaining.

When we suggest to him that he add another statutory holiday this is not raising the minimum labour standard for purposes beyond what already exist. Several provinces have provision for statutory holidays with pay. One province provides for eight statutory holidays with pay, and federal employees in it ought not to be treated differently from persons who come under provincial jurisdiction.

Federal civil servants, who unfortunately do not yet come under collective bargaining, are provided by statute with eight statutory holidays.

Mr. Knowles: Nine.

Mr. Douglas: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre corrects me—nine statutory holidays—and surely persons coming under federal jurisdiction ought not to get that much less under this labour legislation than the government is already providing for its own employees. I do not think the minister would invade the field of collective bargaining

by agreeing to eight statutory holidays, a provision which already exists in at least one province, which other provinces come close to providing, and which is exceeded in the federal government's relations with its own employees.

After all, the minister with considerable fanfare advertised this bill as advanced labour legislation, as setting up a standard for the provinces to aim at a standard which would provide an incentive to any provinces which are laggard in this regard. Surely in these circumstances the minister does not intend to provide for a lower number of statutory holidays in this legislation than is provided in any provincial legislation.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): May I say to the minister, a fellow Cape Bretoner, that he is deserving of every commendation for bringing in this bill. He deserves full marks for it. May I say also that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre deserves full marks for bringing in the amendment. I agree with the comments which have been made from this side of the house, particularly in regard to Remembrance day. By putting this day in the bill we would not only be providing another holiday but we would be paying a debt to the veteran, a debt which we truly owe to the veterans; we would be expressing appreciation of all they have done for humanity. If these men who fought for us had not done what they did, I doubt very much whether we would have any House of Commons in which to speak today.

The minister may be thinking that if he were to accept such an amendment the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre or the opposition generally might be given the credit for bringing in this extra holiday. I would ask him to put aside such thoughts. Someone said in years gone by: "Come, let us reason together". Why cannot we get together? I see the minister smiling, but I say this sincerely. Why do we not get together and agree on this amendment, and I am sure the minister would receive full marks for everything he has done so far in connection with this legislation.

Mr. Barnett: If the Minister of Labour is beginning to feel a little badgered on this subject, all I can say is that he deserves to feel badgered.

I know from experience that the minister can from time to time advance arguments which are persuasive, arguments which I am willing to admit are sound and logical. But though I listened to him as carefully as I could today I felt this was not one of the occasions on which he was being either persuasive or logical. He made great play with his assertion that this proposal for seven holidays was really going a great distance. Then he suggested that because in all areas of Canada collective bargaining had not resulted in the achievement of eight or more, we should stop at seven as far as this legislation is concerned. I cannot see the logic of this. As all members know, certain holidays are generally recognized as such in all parts of this country and Remembrance day is one of them. If the minister had brought a proposal before us in this legislation providing for, say, three statutory holidays, I might have seen some force in his argument that this was a minimum standard beyond which we should not proceed. But the hon. gentleman will recall that it was not too many years ago when it was considered an achievement in the process of collective bargaining to have provision for three holidays made in an agreement. The particular union with which I have been associated for a number of years did just that in its first breakthrough in the field of provision for paid statutory holidays in an agreement. Over the years the number has grown until today the collective agreement includes provision for nine; this is in a field which is not within federal jurisdiction.

The objective which the minister announced with respect to this proposed code was that we in this parliament should fix by law certain basic and reasonable standards. It seems to me that having gone as far as to set seven statutory holidays as being a suitable standard the minister should not quibble about adding a further day, a generally recognized holiday. Not to do so would be to defeat his own purpose. The minister appeared extremely uncomfortable as he sought to oppose the amendment which was put forward by hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre. He surely will not argue that the addition of one holiday falling in a month distinct from those in which the other listed holidays occur would raise the minimum standards in this country so high that the balanced package, if that is what he considers this proposed code to be, would be seriously upset. I think it is foolish when we are considering an important piece of legislation such as the bill before us to create a situation which will result in arguments brought forward in the house from time to time in the years which lie ahead. Surely the minister, if he expects

to remain in his present portfolio for any appreciable length of time, cannot relish the prospect of having to face, as undoubtedly he will have to do unless the amendment is adopted, the introduction of bills by private members of this house, probably by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, next year and the year after that and in all the years following seeking to incorporate into this labour code this one extra statutory holiday. Some of us hoped that with the introduction of a new labour code this long process of erosion over the years would not be necessary; that the putting forward of what often appear to be futile arguments session after session would no longer be required.

At any rate, along with other members of the committee I join in appealing to the minister to accept the proposal which has been made. Let us agree on this point and accept this relatively minor amendment. There may be more fundamental matters which we would like to see changed, and with regard to these the minister might well be unprepared to make concessions at this time. Perhaps we could understand this attitude. But the amendment before us now is not one of them.

Mr. Churchill: I should like to speak in support of the proposed amendment. While I am speaking the Minister of Labour might take the opportunity of conferring on this particular point with his experienced colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs; he might tell the hon. gentleman what we are discussing and see what he has to say about it. I say this because the Secretary of State for External Affairs has had a good many years of experience in the House of Commons and realizes, as the present Minister of Labour does not realize, that there are occasions when a government should accept suggestions which come forward from the opposition benches, and yield without losing face.

The Minister of Labour is using the same method as was adopted by the Minister of Agriculture a few days ago—refusing to accept any suggestions from this side of the house, as a result of which a prolonged debate developed. Here you have a reasonable suggestion put forward from the opposition side to include one more holiday in the list of statutory holidays; and of all days that should be suggested, it is Remembrance day. A government that was not completely insensitive to the feelings of the people of this country would accept that amendment, apologize for the error of omission, and we would get on with the rest of the bill.

Over the years the Royal Canadian Legion, army and navy veterans, and other veterans organizations, have suggested that Remembrance day should be observed as a holiday, and observed not simply for a day off from work or from the troubles that beset us month by month but a day of actual remembrance of the sacrifices made in warfare. I think it is high time that the parliament of Canada recognized this day for what it is, a day in which the people of this country and the leaders of the country as represented by the various governments, dominion and provincial, take note of the fact that our freedom has been preserved by the sacrifices of Canadians in the past. That is what Remembrance day is.

During the time that I had the privilege of serving as minister of veterans affairs I examined with the officials of that department this problem of the observance of Remembrance day, and I raised this point with them, pointing out that I had observed that there had been a tendency to let the importance of this day slip a little bit as the years go by. It happened between the two world wars. I know from my experience then, when I was engaged in the field of education, that the tendency in many areas was to let the school children and teachers observe Remembrance day, whereas the adults should have been the ones who were setting the example. In some areas that was changed. Then we had the second world war. Remembrance day means even more now than it did in between the two world wars. So I discussed this problem with the officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs and said, "We must do something to assist the serious people in this country who want to properly observe Remembrance day". As a result of some of those discussions we had produced by the national film board the film "The Fields of Sacrifice", which was shown last year for the first time and is now available for all communities across Canada in the 16 millimetre version. This was a government response to the observance of Remembrance day. I had some other ideas with regard to that day, which I was not able to bring into effect due to various changes that took place.

However, here we have the opportunity now presented to us for government recognition, recognition by parliament, of the importance of Remembrance day by adding it to the list of statutory holidays. Amongst these other holidays it ranks very high in the list.

As has already been mentioned, Mr. Chairman, one or two of the days mentioned in this bill cannot conceivably be raised to the level of Remembrance day when it is properly considered. I suggest this government should really consider this matter seriously now, pause for reflection if you wish, and take this matter under consideration; but I would think even better still would be to accept immediately the proposal put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and supported by people on this side of the house. This is a day that should be recognized as a statutory holiday, and if it becomes a statutory holiday the adult population of this country can set the proper example to our young people as to what this day means. As it is now, it is a school holiday and school children will recognize it as they do any other holiday. But this should be a day of dedication on the part of the adult population of this country, which understands the sacrifices involved in warfare, on which to express our hope that we will not be involved in war again; that the younger generation will not in their turn have to go through the holocaust of a great war. This is the purpose, as I see it, of Remembrance day. We should make this day available to veterans and the friends and relatives of veterans so they may solemnly observe this day as it should be observed. Mr. Chairman, those are some of the reasons why we feel this amendment should be accepted immediately by the government.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Knowles) agreed to: Yeas, 49; nays, 44.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment carried. Shall the clause as amended carry?

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I want to move another amendment to clause 2. I would refer hon. members to the discussion we had last week when considering this bill, when the hon. member for Yukon, the hon. member for Northwest Territories and myself drew the attention of the house to the fact that clause 2(e) excludes from the provisions of this bill the people of the Yukon and Northwest Territories. It is not my intention this afternoon to go over in detail the arguments that were advanced at that time. However, I think it is worth putting on the record the fact that living in the Yukon and Northwest Territories we have in the neighbourhood of 20,000 people of Indian origin, and according to statistics prepared by the dominion bureau of statistics after the 1961 census was taken, the average annual earnings of the Indian people of Canada was about half the average annual earnings of the people of Canada as a whole. The average annual earnings of the Canadian Indian was just $1,660, while the average annual earnings of Canadian workers as a whole was about $3,250.

In the light of that and also the fact that the Yukon and Northwest Territories have no governments to set minimum wages, as have the other 10 provinces, it seems strange to me that the government proposes in this bill that the Yukon and Northwest Territories be excluded. The minister pointed out when we raised the matter the other day that the Yukon and Northwest Territories are not excluded in terms of people who work in industries which come under federal jurisdiction, but I think this covers only 10 per cent of the people. Since these territories do not have their own provincial governments to pass minimum wage legislation it seems to me there is no reason to exclude the Yukon and Northwest Territories from the provisions of this bill.

I would further point out that we ought to keep in mind that the cost of living in these areas as a result of transportation costs and the fact that there is no basic industry there is very substantially greater than it is in the rest of Canada. Therefore we would only be helping to provide some kind of equality between these two areas and the rest of Canada if we provided as part of this legislation that all of the people in the Yukon and Northwest Territories who work for their living should be entitled to a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour. Therefore I move:

That paragraph (e) of clause 2 be amended by deleting therefrom the words "other than a work, undertaking or business of a local or private nature in the Yukon Territory or the Northwest Territories".

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, before the committee goes any further in this matter may I ask whether the minister is in a position today to do what he promised the committee he would do—in fact, he said he would be delighted to do it—and that is to check into some of the objections which have been raised by my colleague the hon. member for Yukon and myself on the last occasion concerning the reasoning behind this bill. There is a certain element of confusion here and until such time as that is cleared up it is difficult to say whether an hon. member should or should not go along with this

amendment. While supporting the principle and the objective which my hon. friend from Winnipeg North is trying to achieve, it may be that we would do precisely the opposite if we went along with the amendment, unless the minister explained his thinking behind the bill.

Perhaps when he rises to do this he would also answer some of the questions I asked him previously. I realize that at the time the minister was bombarded with questions and had only a few minutes to try to answer many of them, but the point I made at the time and which I will make again now to refresh the minister's mind is this: I want to know with whom his department consulted when they were preparing this legislation. I know they did not ask the hon. member for Yukon for advice, which I am sure he could have given them, and they did not ask me. I am not aware that they made any approach to the councils of the Yukon and Northwest Territories for any advice. The minister will recall, and I repeat, that I had asked him, before he held the federal-provincial conference, to be gracious enough to allow the councils of the Yukon and Northwest Territories to sit in and give him advice about this sort of thing, but as far as I know he did none of this.

Therefore the question I put to him now, and it relates to this amendment, is not only what was the thinking of the officials, but whom they consulted in relation to making these decisions concerning the Yukon and Northwest Territories? In the minister's explanation as recorded at page 9063 of *Hansard* he said he was not sure whether it was a good thing for the Yukon and Northwest Territories even if these provisions were maintained. But what I want to know is whether consultation was had with any of the elected officials of the councils of the Yukon and Northwest Territories, or even with the commissioners of either the Yukon or Northwest Territories, in relation to this specific bill.

I would point out to the minister that it was suggested that the Yukon and Northwest Territories in fact have labour legislation on these matters at this moment, and the minister indicated that yes, labour ordinances have been passed by the two territories. But in fact this is true in the Yukon Territory whereas it is not true in the Northwest Territories. At the present time there is no legislation anywhere in the Northwest Territories relating to minimum hours of work, minimum pay, annual paid vacations or overtime. It would certainly help me as a member of this committee of the whole if the minister would take time now to do what he said he would do and tell the committee in detail what was the purpose of excluding these two territories. He might also explain once more the technicalities of the matter, which I am sure all of us did not understand on Friday. At the same time will he tell me who advised his department before they decided to put this exclusion into clause 2.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, in clause 2 we exempt from the application of this bill works in the Yukon and Northwest Territories of a local and private nature. I think our thinking on this is understandable: This bill will cover in the Yukon and Northwest Territories industries under federal jurisdiction. In other words, we will claim our jurisdiction over federal industries in the Yukon and Northwest Territories in the same way as we do in the provinces.

I would draw to the attention of the committee the fact that in the past ten years this has been the consistent practice of both governments. For example in 1956 the Female Employees Equal Pay Act was passed from the application of which act works of a local and private nature were exempted.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What are works of a local or private nature, just for purposes of information?

Mr. MacEachen: Works which would normally fall under provincial jurisdiction, such as hotels, restaurants, stores and so on. In addition to the Female Employees Equal Pay Act of 1956, the Annual Vacations Act of 1958 which was proposed to the house by the former minister of labour and the safety in employment bill proposed two years ago but which did not receive second reading also made this exemption. I think the reason is simple, and it is because the councils in these territories are already in the field of making ordinances for works of a local or private nature. For example, the labour provisions ordinance of the Yukon prohibits work on six public holidays unless time and a half the regular rate is paid. So they are moving into this field, and in a sense doing that which the provinces are doing in areas under provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What about the Northwest Territories?

Mr. MacEachen: I understand in the Northwest Territories there is a mining ordinance for an eight-hour day for workers below

ground in the mines. I understand there are presently under consideration, or will be, by the council of the Northwest Territories, other provisions in respect of the operation or extension of labour ordinances there. We have thought that the areas of jurisdiction which now fall to the provinces should be left to the councils of those territories, so that those councils may exercise the authority in their areas that is being exercised by provinces in provincial areas of jurisdiction.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the minister can tell us whether the Yukon or Northwest Territories councils have put through any ordinance setting a minimum hourly rate?

Mr. MacEachen: No, Mr. Chairman, they have not.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, the minister has answered my question by saying that neither the Northwest Territories council nor the Yukon council have passed any ordinances setting a minimum hourly rate. Assuming we pass this bill as drafted by the government, no protection will be provided to 90 per cent of the people who work in those territories by virtue of either federal or territorial councils action.

Again I should like to say that under the present constitutional set-up, all the people who live and work in the Northwest Territories or the Yukon are the legal responsibility of the federal government. While it is true that in the ten provinces of Canada there is divided jurisdiction and all the provinces, as is their right, have passed legislation setting minimum hourly rates, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon are exclusively under federal jurisdiction and are not included in the provisions of this bill.

There may be some hon. members who think the government has gone too far in setting the rates too high. Every member of this group feels that not one province has set the minimum wage of the workers in that province high enough. That is however a responsibility of the provinces, and the people of those provinces, under our democratic system, have recourse at a future election if they see fit.

In respect of these two areas which come under the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government, it is the responsibility of the federal parliament to legislate for those people. It seems to me we ought to exercise our legal authority, and fulfil our moral responsibilities by setting a standard for those areas, thus providing the people with a minimum decent standard of living.

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, would the minister give an answer to the other part of my question, which I think is important both in terms of the legislation now before us and in terms of any future legislation? Who are the officials with whom his department consulted, as a result of which he refused to invite representatives of the councils of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon to the labour conferences?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, you will recall that when this question of inviting representatives of the Yukon and Northwest Territories to the conferences of labour ministers was asked, the matter was raised with the provincial premiers by the Prime Minister. It is a matter of policy established by the participants to the conferences that in such cases representatives of the councils are not invited. We did make an effort in respect of that particular conference to have representatives from the territories in attendance, and I have indicated the result of that effort.

In this bill I have followed a pattern set over a ten year period, that it is desirable to set up local governments within these areas, and to assign to those local governments responsibilities of the type normally discharged by provincial governments. If we accept this amendment we will be overriding declarations and acts already adopted by parliament, including the Yukon Act and Northwest Territories Act. Those acts would be superseded by the acceptance of this amendment in respect of that matter proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Chairman, there is one point that I should like to see cleared up with regard to this clause, as well as clause 3 which includes an exception for the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

The minister said that in those cases it was the same legislation which was applied in other provinces and that, literally speaking, they were not federal workers.

Therefore, I would ask the minister why are the Northwest Territories and the Yukon mentioned if it is merely a policy which applies to the ten provinces. Why have these two territories been specifically mentioned in the legislation while there is no reference at all to the other provinces?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, we are now entering a discussion on a point of law,

but under the British North America Act provinces are now responsible for those labour areas which are left to the territories and assigned to them, as I understand it, under the Yukon Act and Northwest Territories Act. If parliament saw fit it could supersede these acts, but if it should do so it would be taking away what presumably it thought ought to be a matter for provincial or local determination.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister appreciates the fact that this house is faced with a problem, in that while it recognizes the jurisdiction of the provinces in dealing with things of this nature, there is a desire to encourage the territorial councils to act in this regard. The minister suggests we should not get into this field, but what assurance has he from his colleague, the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, that the two councils in question are going to take some action?

It is all very well to say that we would be impinging upon what really is a trend toward local government by accepting this amendment, but if the house passes the bill as proposed by the government it will be creating a vacuum. If I understand the purport of the amendment correctly, it is to make sure that there is no vacuum, because as far as we know there is no guarantee that the councils will act in this way within the next two or three years. If we now accept the amendment as proposed we will deal with this situation as far as the people working in the territories are concerned, and remedial action may be taken three or four years hence, should the councils then decide they want to move into this field. In the interval these workers will be protected. If the minister is as proud of this measure as he indicates, I am sure he will want to extend it as far as possible, rather than create a vacuum.

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, by what strange thought process has the minister come to the conclusion that a law which is necessary and overdue to protect the workingman of southern Canada does not have the same virtue as far as the worker in the Northwest Territories is concerned?

Mr. MacEachen: The territories, to which reference has been made, were excluded as far as this bill is concerned as a result of the same thought processes and reasons they were excluded from the provisions of the Annual Vacations Act by the former minister of labour.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Mr. Rhéaume: I cannot accept the minister's statement that because the previous minister did this or because the practice has been followed for ten years, he is going to do it. As a new member of this house, I cannot take responsibility for what went on prior to my arrival. This statement has not changed my thinking. I want an answer to my question. If this labour code is so good, and we have heard paeans of praise for it, by what process of logic is it not made applicable to the 40,000 people who live north of the 60th parallel in this country, where protection is every bit as necessary as it is anywhere else in softer climates? I want to know the answer before we vote. I want an explanation. It is not good enough for the minister to say that ten years ago we did this, and it was pretty good so I think we will stick by it. What strange process of conversion has taken place if the minister suggests that the reason we are going to go ahead with it is that the previous minister did? Surely, we are entitled to a more intelligent explanation than that.

Mr. Douglas: It seems to me the minister's argument only holds up if these two territories in question were to become provinces, or if in the interim they were self-governing, governed by elected councils. What we have here, actually, are two territories whose councils, in very considerable part, are made up of appointees from the federal government. From the minister's own answer, it is apparent that the councils have taken no action to provide minimum labour protection for the workers in these two areas. It seems to me that the minister, as Minister of Labour for Canada, cannot slough off his responsibility by saying it is up to these two councils, the members of whom are appointed by his own government, to take action in these areas. If the councils themselves have not passed the necessary ordinances to provide adequate minimum wages, holidays with pay, and so on, then surely this parliament has no right to deprive the people of the benefits of this legislation. If and when the time comes that these two areas have provincial governments, then of course the parliament of Canada can always transfer to them the same jurisdiction in labour matters which the other provinces have.

I suggest to the minister that in the interim the parliament of Canada has a responsibility to legislate for these people, and the minister, as Minister of Labour, has responsibility for seeing that they are given protection which

this legislation is going to provide for other persons coming under federal jurisdiction.

Mr. MacEachen: I am as interested as any hon. member in having the standards apply everywhere, including the territories. We want to know whether standards, perhaps establishing wage rates and hours of work, would be immediately suitable to the small businesses, for example, such as retail stores in the territories. These would be affected if this particular amendment were accepted. These provisions would apply to such local businesses as of January 1. Now, our thinking was based on the area of jurisdiction that we have, namely in the high wage industries like railways and so on. This is one practical difficulty.

A second difficulty is that if we did accept the amendment we would be taking this vital area out of the jurisdiction of the councils, and the purpose apparently is to build up the strength of these councils. Finally I think I ought to tell the committee that the commissioner of the Northwest Territories, for example, has prepared a reference requesting the advice of his council on the introduction of labour legislation in the Northwest Territories. I understand that the principal proposals or recommendations of the reference were considered by the council in June of this year and they have not proceeded further with the preparation of the draft ordinance because the commissioner and the council have been waiting to see the Canada labour code. They are moving in this direction and taking into account, we hope, the effect of this bill. If I could ignore the considerations I have mentioned I would be quite prepared to accept the amendment. But bearing in mind the development of local government and bearing in mind that the councils are moving in this direction, I think it would be desirable for us to allow them to proceed to establish ordinances that are locally suitable.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the minister, what are the terms contained in this recommendation which the council is considering? What, for instance, is provided as a minimum wage; what hours are provided? Are holidays with pay set forth and vacations with pay?

Mr. MacEachen: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have the reference here. I do not have any authority to release it, but I will talk to the commissioner and make it available to my hon. friend. This document covers quite a range of labour standards, vacations with pay, statutory holidays, workmen's compensation and so on.

Mr. Douglas: Have you got the minimum wage?

Mr. MacEachen: I do not believe there was a minimum wage in this reference. I would be glad to let the hon. member have it.

Mr. Rhéaume: The minister has said they were not sure whether or not it would be a good thing to have some of these rates apply at this stage of development. What I want to know is, before the minister excluded the Yukon and Northwest Territories he must have had some advice telling him to exclude the area. It is not enough to say that this has been going on for ten years. The minister knows my explanation for that ten year period. I am convinced that somewhere in the civil service there is a minor and evil official whose sole job it is to exclude the north from all beneficial legislation that is passed.

The minister must have obtained advice from somewhere, and I want to know who the adviser was. Was it the minister of northern affairs? Was it the council of the Yukon or the Northwest Territories? I am not satisfied to have the minister say, by way of explanation, "Someone told us perhaps we should leave it out, since that had been done before". I want to tell the minister that it would be an easy, practical step if the federal government were to move into this vacuum. I think we have to get the details about that reference for advice. I have not knocked around the council of the Northwest Territories for quite a few years, but I know that a reference for advice is a document prepared by civil servants who work in the department of northern affairs. That document advises the minister on what the problems are, and it occasionally recommends specific solutions. It is a document prepared by federal officers hired by the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, and I think the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has raised a very valid point.

Before the committee accepts the minister's statement that someone suggested it to him, it might not be a bad idea if we were given the terms of that reference for advice, because it is possible members of the committee would want to do something entirely different if they found the reference for advice unacceptable in terms, or unacceptable on the grounds of the pace at which such legislation will be introduced into these two northern

territories. Can the minister give us the details?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, while listening to the interesting observations of the hon. member for Northwest Territories it occurred to me that, in a way, his remarks reflect in what I consider a most unkind and unfair manner on the former minister of northern affairs and national resources, the hon. member for Brandon-Souris. Though we may differ politically, I think I can suggest the hon. member for Brandon-Souris attempted to carry out his duties with the utmost diligence, and with due regard for the people of the Northwest Territories. Yet the hon. member for Northwest Territories suggested that some civil servant, hidden in a little room, whom he termed an evil spirit, was able to put something over on that diligent and capable member for Brandon-Souris.

Mr. Nugent: And on the minister before him, and the minister before that.

Mr. Gray: That is a most unfair reflection. It would seem to me that if the hon. member for Brandon-Souris, having dealt with a similar problem, considered it in the interests of the people of the Northwest Territories to exclude strictly private undertakings from legislation designed to operate in a similar way, this helps confirm the soundness of the approach taken by the Minister of Labour with respect to this particular legislation.

I may have misread the bill, but I think the hon. member for Northwest Territories fell into some misconception when he suggested that the bill is applying to the working people of the southern part of Canada in a way that it does not apply to the people of the north of Canada. I hope the hon. member or the minister will correct me if I am wrong, because it seems to me from my reading of this bill—

Some hon. Members: You are wrong.

Mr. MacEachen: No, he is not.

Mr. Gray: —that it applies to exactly the same industries in the north as it does in the south. When I have completed my remarks I would be happy to have any hon. member get up to give me details and facts to show where I am wrong. As I understand this bill, the undertakings, businesses and industries not covered in the north are the very same ones not covered in the south, because in the south in the provinces they are deemed to come under provincial jurisdiction. But the industries, which in the south in the provinces are deemed to come under federal jurisdiction, and which are covered by this bill, will also be covered in the north, and therefore people in the north who may be employed by these so-called federal industries will also be covered by this bill.

The hon. member for Northwest Territories, while expressing a very commendable regard for the interests of the people of the north, is falling into a position which is somewhat contradictory. On one hand he is criticizing the Minister of Labour and the government for not permitting or enabling the Yukon and Northwest Territories to participate in federal-provincial conferences in a manner similar to the way in which the provinces participate, I suppose the basis being that the Yukon and Northwest Territories have already reached a high degree of self-government and should be moving swiftly to an even greater degree of self-government.

Now, however, the hon. member is coming to us and saying that, even though this parliament has delegated to the councils of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon the authority to act in certain spheres by legislating with respect to strictly private business, we should ignore this delegation, ignore this degree of self-government and make this bill apply to them. In this he seems to be contradicting the very sensible position he has taken in the past, of according an even greater degree of self-government to the Northwest Territories and the Yukon as the days go on.

I might add further that the argument made by one of the N.D.P. members, that the councils for the Yukon and Northwest Territories have not as yet acted fully, or even at all in this area, is not really an argument for having this bill apply to them, because I am sure there are many other areas in which power has been delegated by this parliament to the Yukon and Northwest Territories, but in which they have not fully exercised the authority given them. If this principle were sound we should be spending almost all our time dealing with a whole host of private matters such as sewerage, parking and so on, matters which are of importance but perhaps not as important as this question of labour standards, for which we have apparently delegated the power to the councils of these territories.

Mr. Clancy: I would like to ask the minister one question. Is this bill designed to set a standard minimum wage across Canada of $1.25 an hour?

Mr. MacEachen: For employees under federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Clancy: Is it for all federal employees no matter where they live? Is this $1.25 an hour for casual labour? Is that the proposal you are putting forward? If so, what is this argument just put forward by the former speaker? What is wrong with having a basic wage across Canada? In my province the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam was the man instrumental in giving us a basic wage which is a great deal higher. Where is your argument?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Clancy: Just a minute, I have listened to you boys talking about two types of citizens. There are not any. The basic matter is $1.25 an hour. I say if you can get $3 an hour, take it.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, the name suggested for this bill is the Canada labour standards code, and the minister has told us that one of its purposes is to set an example which might be followed by provincial legislatures within their own jurisdictions. It is completely illogical to proceed to exclude areas which have no legislatures and in which the federal government has jurisdiction, because if that is done this parliament can hardly anticipate that the bill will have great effect upon other legislatures in setting standards. I believe the amendment should be passed.

Mr. Rhéaume: Has the minister had a chance to skim through that reference for advice, and can he give us the details of what is proposed? What advice has the commissioner been given by the officials in the federal department of northern affairs who advise him on hours of work? How does the reference for advice stack up against the labour standards code which he is proposing in this bill?

Mr. MacEachen: I called attention to the reference merely to underline the fact that the councils, especially the Northwest Territories council, have the question of standards under consideration at the present time. I should like to talk with the commissioner from whom I received this reference to determine whether it is correct.

Mr. Orlikow: I was a great deal surprised that the hon. member for Essex West, who comes from the city of Windsor, one of the most highly organized cities in Canada, should have expressed the views he did. Though he denied it, what he did in effect was to seek to divide the people who live in the far north from those who live in the rest of Canada. He wanted to make them legally, not just in actual fact, second class citizens.

In all the rest of Canada, if this bill is passed, the people who work for a living will have certain minimum rates of pay. Either they come under provincial jursdiction, in which case their minimum rates of pay will be set by the provincial minimum wage legislation, or they come under federal jurisdiction and their minimum rates will be set by this government. As hon. members know, the councils in the territories are not elected by the people. They are councillors who are appointed, but we do not need to go into that today. The fact is that the federal government still has jurisdiction over the people who live in the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon, and the minister does not convince me when he suggests that because there is a council which may, some day, next week, next month, or five years, or ten years from now, take action in this field, the federal government should refrain from doing anything at the present time. The hon. gentleman does not know whether the councils, if they do act, will set a rate of $1.50 or $1 or 75 cents or 50 cents. He is content to give them full authority without knowing what they are likely to recommend. As I say, I find this position an amazing one to be taken by a member who represents a constituency of the kind from which the hon. member for Essex West comes.

Mr. Nugent: The minister appears to hold the opinion that if this house were to take action along the lines suggested the power of the councils in the territories would be, in some way, usurped. It is true the councils have not legislated, and I do not imagine the minister can give us any assurance that they will in fact provide legislation of this type. It seems to me therefore that this parliament has the responsibility and the opportunity to make this protection available without delay. The minister feels he should drag his feet because this is a subject with which a provincial government should be able to deal. But as has been pointed out, the council is only partly elected; part of the voice of that council is a government voice and in this sense the minister seems to be saying: We do not want to grant this protection, now. There is an indication that if we do not give this protection, the council will not. There are only four on the council who are elected. Five of the members are appointed. I suggest that if the

government does not take steps to provide this protection now its action will be a clear indication to the five appointed members on the council that they should not legislate in this field. In other words, instead of the minister telling this committee that we are considering action which he hopes the council will take, and that we should allow them to take it in order that they may grow in stature by exercising this greater responsibility, he is, in effect, directing the appointed members not to give any protection as to minimum hours, and so on.

I therefore suggest we should support the amendment as the only way in which we can effectively give protection to the people in the north in the same way as to people in the rest of the country. I hope the government will accept the amendment, or at least that the minister will indicate that any position he adopts should not be taken by members of the council as a direction that the council is to make sure that these provisions are not contained in any legislation it passes. When we consider the composition of these councils and the present need of this legislation as against the vague hope of action at some time in the future, I think we must conclude that it is the duty of this committee to act in such a way as to provide protection without delay.

Mr. Barnett: I suppose that up to a point the Minister of Labour has an excuse for not being fully cognizant of every detail relating to labour conditions or working conditions in the Northwest Territories. I think it is unfortunate that the minister of northern affairs is not able to be with us this afternoon to give the committee some authoritative statement as to the situation in the north and the steps which are intended.

The Minister of Labour has told us that this amendment must be related to the provisions of clause 51 of the bill which makes provision for deferring the application of the legislation for a period of one and a half years. This transitional period would be as applicable to the corner grocery store in the Northwest Territories to which the hon. gentleman referred as to any segment of an industrial operation which normally comes under federal jurisdiction in any other part of Canada. It seems to me that if the minister intends to recommend the provisions of clause 51 he is thereby subtracting from the validity of the argument he attempted to advance, particularly in view of the fact that he has informed the committee, first, that there is no protective legislation applicable at the present time in the territories and, second, that he understands the territorial council has some such legislation under consideration or study.

The proposal in clause 51 would nicely cover the transitional period. It would enable the provisions of the minimum standard wage to be applied immediately to people who live in the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon. It would, also, through the proper use of the proposed transitional period, provide an opportunity for the territorial councils to take action which would make the present provisions of the proposed Canadian minimum standards code applicable in the territories under their jurisdiction. I wonder whether the minister in the reply he gave earlier had fully taken into consideration the impact of clause 51 which does provide for this transitional period of a year and a half and which would enable him if he so desired to prevent the small grocery store somewhere in the Northwest Territories from going out of business during the adjustment period until such time as the territorial councils had made their enactments in this field.

Mr. Gray: I feel I should say a brief word about the remarks made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North. His assertion that I am in favour of some form of second class citizenship status for the people of the north is of course entirely incorrect. The purpose of my remarks a few moments earlier was simply to point out that we have a similar situation in the north to the one which would prevail in the southern provinces of Canada if this bill were passed, because the Yukon and the Northwest Territories have already gone a long way toward provincial status and are progressing further toward that end. It therefore seemed sensible to me to follow the same outlook that seemed sufficient to the hon. member for Brandon-Souris when he was minister, namely that of excluding strictly private and local undertakings, which would ordinarily be under provincial jurisdiction, from the immediate application of this legislation.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, my name has been mentioned on two occasions by the hon. member for Essex West, so I think I should say a few words on the amendment that has been proposed in connection with clause 3. I appreciate the kind words of the hon. member for Essex West, but I think as I

examine them they might be regarded as a somewhat left-handed compliment.

Mr. Gray: I am left-handed.

Mr. Dinsdale: I think the hon. member is ambidextrous, having listened to his second presentation on this particular item. It is quite true that the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory have been progressing with reasonable speed toward a greater degree of local autonomy, with the eventual objective in mind of provincial status. This was one of the avowed intentions of the previous administration. Unfortunately, as I have viewed these developments from the ranks of Her Majesty's official opposition during the past two years, it seems to me that the sense of urgency that had been generated under the leadership of the former administration has been to a great extent lost. It is for this reason that I am going to support the amendment proposed.

Another point that has been ignored by the hon. member for Essex West is this. There is a slight difference in the degree of local autonomy between the Yukon government and the government of the Northwest Territories. The Yukon government is an entirely elected body and in many spheres of operation is completely autonomous. Unhappily, the government of the Northwest Territories has not proceeded nearly so far in the direction of self-government as has the government of the Yukon. At the time the previous administration left office we had launched a program that was designed to accelerate the movement of the government of the Northwest Territories toward a greater degree of decentralization. I was the responsible minister for some three years, and it did not require a very long period of time to realize that the Northwest Territories, and to a lesser extent the Yukon Territory, would never come into its own until it had a greater degree of local responsibility and initiative.

We were carrying on negotiations with the labour organizations that are active in these territories with a view to encouraging the governments of the respective territories to establish a labour code of their own. According to this legislation before us it would seem that no further progress has been made in these conversations and discussions. I was quite disappointed in this, along with the hon. member for Northwest Territories, who above all members of this house knows whereof he speaks because he was a part of the administration of the Northwest Territories for a number of years and made an outstanding contribution in that regard before he became the elected representative of the people there.

I was surprised to see that the present government, when bringing this bill before the house, had decided it was going to continue the discriminatory approach to the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories which has existed far too long for the good of the general development—the political development as well as the economic development—of these territories. I think that if the amendment is accepted by the committee it will serve as a catalytic agent, particularly in the Yukon where the government, I am sure, is ready to deal with the matter of establishing a labour code of its own. It will certainly act as a catalytic agent in getting moving once again the efforts that were under way to give a greater degree of self-government to the Northwest Territories. There has been a complete stalemate in this development. We had the matter before the committee on mines, forests and waters for several weeks, but the committee died a premature death. I think that here is an excellent opportunity for this committee, by expressing its opinion on this amendment, to give a prod to the powers that be to get in motion once again this movement toward self-government and local autonomy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Chairman, when I first read the bill, I also was under the impression that the House of Commons should not agree to the exception provided for in clauses 2 and 3, concerning the Northwest and Yukon Territories.

However, after the explanations given by the minister, and particularly as a defender of the special interests of the provinces and the territories, I believe that I should object to this amendment for the following reason: I cannot see how the federal government could overstep the powers granted the council of the Northwest and Yukon Territories, and then allow it to pass the legislation it desires.

I know personally that in certain districts of the province of Quebec, should private enterprise be compelled to apply the minimum salaries mentioned in this bill, it would encounter major difficulties.

This small clause of the bill will specially protect private and local businesses.

In my opinion, the Yukon and Northwest Territories are already considerably handi-

capped by their geographical position and their lack of means of transportation.

Should all private and local industries be tied down to this act, this would bring a surcharge to bear on private industries of those territories and would place them in an unfavourable competitive position not only internationally, but also nationally from the economical standpoint.

That is why we are opposed to the proposed amendment, even if we suggest that the council which has the jurisriction over the Northwest Territories and Yukon, acts as soon as possible but taking into consideration local requirements and not those of the federal government, as we do according to this act.

[*Text*]

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether, before the question is put, the minister could state to the committee his position on a matter that relates precisely to this kind of problem. I have asked him on repeated occasions whether there is any possibility of the staff of his department looking into this and related kinds of labour problems within the northern territories, with a view to assessing the present situation. I am not prepared to accept the statement of hon. members that this would work a hardship on someone in the Northwest Territories. I do not know out of which part of the atmosphere they draw this conclusion, or on what advice. The minister has not told me who advised him that this would work a hardship. Was it the officials of the department of northern affairs who said it would, or is it just because of some feeling that the territorial council would do something along this line?

The point I am making which has application to the amendment before the committee is this. Not nearly enough research and examination has gone into this kind of exclusion. I for one am not prepared to admit that it is in the best interests of the northern territories to make this exclusion or that it will afford some sort of protection which the business community in the Canadian north needs. That is always the argument which is used whenever an effort of social reform is brought down—that it is not in the best interests of those it will affect to have this sort of help. The minister has a division which does this sort of thing and I asked him about this the last time his estimates came up. I do not want the officials of the department of northern affairs brought in because already they have too much to do in the Northwest Territories and have their fingers in too many pots in the Canadian north. But it is time this was curbed, and curbed smartly.

To get back to the purport of the clause, what guarantee has this committee that the minister and his officials will give the territorial council the sort of advice which is required? The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona pointed out that right now the council of the Northwest Territories is made up of nine people. Four of these people are elected from some part of the north and five are appointed. The five who are appointed live in southern Canada. They are appointed by the governor in council. In at least two cases they are also federal civil servants who give advice to the officials of the department of northern affairs. Here is the kind of inbred problem, if you will, that we face now.

I am not reassured when the minister says they have done nothing about this in all these years, but he thinks they are going to do something and because of that the government does not want to step on their toes. Surely the minister can say what studies were undertaken and on what basis he excluded the territories. It is not enough just to say that it seemed like a good idea at the time. I want to know who advised him in this regard; and second, can he tell the committee what sort of advice will be presented to the council? The minister said the council of the Northwest Territories will be considering a document which will offer advice about these matters and whether or not it will be hurtful to certain business enterprises in the territories to implement a standards code. I do not think we should have two labour standards codes in this country any more than I think we should have two flags. We are getting too many instances where there is one thing for one part of the country and another thing for another part of the country. I am still not convinced that northern workers need less protection than southern workers.

I am aware of the observations made by the hon. member for Essex West—and there was probably a moral in this, namely that people who live that far south should not advise people who live in the north, and vice versa. I have yet to make a speech on labour conditions in the city of Windsor, and I doubt that I will. None the less I wish the minister would give the committee some information as to the quality of the advice

that is going to be given to the federal authority prior to the next meeting of the Northwest Territories council. That would not be betraying any secrets. I for one am not prepared to tell our northerners not to worry, that the department of northern affairs officials love them and will look after their best interests, and that they need no guarantees of any kind. That sort of nonsense has pervaded too much of our legislation. Surely the minister can tell the committee what advice is being given the council of the Northwest Territories, and who it was advised his department to exclude the Northwest Territories and the Yukon from the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is very worth while. I am wondering whether the minister will give some consideration to a charge which has been made this afternoon, namely that the former minister of northern affairs found himself in the same position as the present minister has now been advised to take. Does this not flow from the fact that the same advisers who made this decision before are making the decision now?

I have several persons from the Northwest Territories who live in my constituency who have had occasion to write to me concerning compensation, vacation pay, and so on. In two cases I went from the council to the Department of Labour, and then to the department of northern affairs and the Department of Public Works. In each case we came across a decision which had been made by the director of industrial relations in the department, which I think was wrong. I also think this official was wrong in advising the former minister of northern affairs, the hon. member for Brandon-Souris, and is wrong today in advising the present minister.

Clause 3 (h) makes reference to any work which is before or after its execution declared by parliament to be to the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more of the provinces. This is a highly technical clause which has disallowed the benefits of labour relations legislation to persons working in the Northwest Territories and, I presume, the Yukon. If we are to write into this bill an exclusion of the Yukon and Northwest Territories we will not be meeting the requirements which the Minister of Labour has declared must be met. Because of the direction being given and the vast amount of legalistic confusion which exists through the actions of five or six agencies having relatively equal responsibilities in the territories, we are not well advised here, and the minister is not well advised to put himself in the position of making an exception of a very large segment of the country in regard to industries in those areas over which he has jurisdiction.

I think the minister should think again about this matter because he is recommending an exclusion which must indicate that he had knowledge that such a thing has worked to the disadvantage of workers in that area. I thought some time ago that this bill should apply mainly to the Northwest Territories and the Yukon because this is one place in which the federal government can give leadership, and I congratulate the minister for this. However, I do not think this exemption should be left in the bill in the form it is, although he may be perfectly right that there are segments of the labour field in Northwest Territories and the Yukon in which it would be difficult to implement the terms of this bill. This means there is no difference between the application of this exemption in one part of Canada compared with the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

I think the minister is being unfair to himself and is not giving the leadership he wants to give by exempting for one reason or another a small segment of the country to which this measure would bring a great deal of benefit. I am sure other hon. members have also brought before the minister cases which would be effected by clause 3 (h) to which I have referred. Normally even work done by the federal government is not classified as being in the interest of Canada or Canadians, as it reads in this bill, which means that there must be a special declaration to this effect. If we allow this exception we will be providing a loophole in respect of this problem which has developed over the years, and which has been discussed and argued with the officials of the department on numerous occasions; and it will continue to exist. If the minister is not prepared to support the amendment now before us, I think he might find it to his advantage to reconsider it, in terms of those works being done by the federal government in the Northwest Territories which are not specifically declared by the governor in council, or by the parliament of Canada as being to the general advantage of Canada. If the minister is not prepared to support this amendment I hope that he will indicate he is prepared to propose an amendment which is perhaps not as all-embracing as the one now before us.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Chairman, I only wish to say a few words, because according to the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Rhéaume) I might have suggested that the passage of this legislation with the amendment as proposed would result in an additional charge for the Northwest Territories.

If I said that, it is because in the province of Quebec, under orders and regulations, minimum wages are 64 cents per hour and in many parts of the province of Quebec, people are paid three or four times that amount. However, in certain depressed areas, where transportation costs are extremely high, some companies see fit to keep to this minimum wage of 64 cents per hour.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Marcoux: Yes, it is a shame. But if the federal government were to compel these municipalities, these localities or regional contractors to pay the minimum salary we propose, that is $1.25 per hour, this would certainly constitute an overload. Even if the hon. member for the Northwest Territories does not think so, I believe that this exists in our area.

However, I wish to point out to him that in the Northwest Territories there is but one member, and if that member were of the Liberal party he would be of the same opinion as the government, but as he is in the opposition, it is clear that he must oppose even if in his heart—

[*Text*]

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak to a question of privilege. I do not want the hon. member to say something he does not really mean, but the suggestion that my motives for voting may approximate his is surely an insult which I cannot accept.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Chairman, I see that the hon. member misunderstood me completely when I meant that there was not just one member from Quebec and that was why there could be some difference of opinion, whereas, as far as he is concerned, he is the only one and, in most cases, his opinion differs from that of the government.

The reason for my intervention, in a way, is that I am convinced that there will not be any more satisfaction in the Northwest Territories and all I did was to extrapolate in what I found to be the case back home, in many areas of my province.

[Mr. Peters.]

[*Text*]

Amendment (Mr. Orlikow) negatived: Yeas, 51; nays, 57.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. MacNaught: Mr. Chairman, before clause 2 carries I have an amendment to propose which affects the French version of the bill. For example, on page 2 of the French version at the top of the page, the words "du gouvernement fédéral" should be "relevant de la juridiction fédérale". This appears in various clauses throughout the bill and I propose to move an amendment which will cover those various clauses, as follows:

[*Translation*]

That the words "works, undertakings and businesses coming under federal jurisdiction" and "work, undertaking or business coming under federal jurisdiction" be substituted for the words "federal works, undertakings or businesses" or "federal work, undertaking or business' wherever these words appear in the French version of Bill No. C-126.

[*Text*]

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2 as amended agreed to.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

On clause 3—*Application of act.*

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, clause 3, for the main part, is a standard kind of clause which tells us the categories of work that come under federal jurisdiction, and for the most part it simply carries out the terms and spirit of the constitution of Canada. It does of course have in it a reference to the question of work in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. We would have had to move a consequential amendment to that, had we been able to carry the amendment that we moved in that respect to clause 2.

However, I should like to direct the minister's attention in particular to subclause (3) of clause 3 which reads as follows:

This act does not apply to or in respect of employees who are

(a) managers or superintendents or who exercise management functions, or

(b) members of such professions as may be designated by the regulations as professions to which this act does not apply?

We have had a good deal of experience with wording such as that set out in subclause (3), paragraph (a). However, I wish the minister would tell us what the government has in mind under 3(b), where the wording is a bit new. What are the kinds of professions that it is proposed to exempt from the provisions of this legislation?

While the minister is answering that, I wonder if he could tell us if the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation comes under the provisions of this bill? If so, will he relate in particular this question of professional work to the various kinds of work that are done by the employees of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It would seem to me that this is an entity in which there is room for argument as to which persons are professional and which persons are tradesmen or technicians. I wonder if the minister could deal with this general point at this time?

Mr. MacEachen: I understand why a member would raise this particular point with regard to clause 3, paragraph (b). If he will observe the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, he will note there is an explicit provision with regard to the exclusion of the professions. The act excludes members of the medical, dental, architectural and engineering professions from the provisions of this act when employed in that capacity. When we considered this particular paragraph, we considered including the words of the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act. Then, I considered it would be preferable to permit some flexibility in the way of including professions.

Now, there may be some professions to which, because of their method of operation and ethical practices, this act would not regularly apply. We would like first of all to have representations from employers or professional associations with regard to who were to be excluded from this act. What I really have in mind is the opportunity of including professions which would benefit from the application of this bill. Rather than apply the wording in the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, I thought it would be better to leave it flexible so we would be absolutely certain there would be no advantage to a profession before it was excluded from the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Knowles: I was quite aware of the wording in the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, and it was precisely because the wording in this bill differs from that wording that I put the question I did to the minister. I do not know whether my concern is relieved or not by the way in which the minister has put it. In the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, while members of the professions are excluded from the provisions of that act, at least we know what professions are excluded because they are spelled out in the legislation itself. In the case of this legislation, however, we do not know in advance because the decision is to be made by the government and implemented by regulations passed by order in council.

Now, it is good to have this word from the minister that it is his desire to have it this way, so that he can include as many professions as possible rather than excluding them; but I wonder if he could not give us examples of the kind of professions he has in mind, now classified as borderline cases but which he might be able to include.

Mr. MacEachen: For example, the Annual Vacations Act excludes members of the medical, dental, architectural and engineering professions. Unless there were strong reasons or evidence why benefits would be available to these persons, or why their inclusion should be maintained, we would consider excluding them. But there are others, for example those in the nursing profession, whom we would like to consider carefully before we excluded them from the benefits of this bill which would assist them in certain instances. The motive is very clear. It is to extend, where advantageous, the application of this bill, and we would like to have some consultations with and hear from members of professional associations before we would exclude them.

Mr. Knowles: May we take it as a commitment on the part of the minister that no additions will be made to the exclusions that are listed in the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act and in the Annual Vacations Act? Is it clear that the purpose of this is to include more, not to exclude more?

Mr. MacEachen: That is the purpose, because as a matter of fact the original draft which I had before me automatically excluded certain professions, and I thought it would be better to have a look at these on their individual merits before we excluded them automatically from the wording of the bill. Certainly I have no proposal in mind that would enlarge the range already mentioned in the I.R.D.I. Act.

Mr. Knowles: Could the minister answer my earlier question: Is the C.B.C. covered by this bill?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, I understand it is covered by this bill.

Mr. Knowles: Has the government run into any difficulty in interpreting other legislation with regard to this word "profession", because it seems to me that among those working for the C.B.C., particularly with the wide range of duties they perform, the employers might well decide that certain employees are technicians and certain others are professional people? Can we be assured that, apart from lawyers, doctors and dentists, there will not be the exclusion of these other kinds of technicians who work—

Mr. Douglas: For a living.

Mr. Knowles: —for the C.B.C.?

Mr. MacEachen: I accept the qualification of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. I certainly can give a commitment to the extent that we do not have in mind exclusion of any profession, except the traditional professions that have already been excluded in other statutes; and before we exclude any, we would have to be satisfied that it was justified on the basis of professional practice. For example, one point that was very much in our minds was the encroachment by this legislation upon hours of work that might be professionally accepted among members of the medical profession which would not be appreciated by them as in any sense normal for the job. We would not do anything of that kind, and this is why we ask for some flexibility in the bill.

Mr. Crouse: Clause 3(1) says:

> This act applies to and in respect of employees who are employed upon or in connection with the operation of any work, undertaking or business that is within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada.

And paragraph (a) says:

> Any work, undertaking or business operated or carried on for or in connection with navigation and shipping, whether inland or maritime, including the operation of ships and transportation by ship anywhere in Canada...

This is an interesting clause, and due to the fact that these references are included in clause 1(a) it is evident that the government attaches considerable importance to wages and salaries earned by seamen on Canadian ships. Since the bill is to apply to any undertaking or business operating "within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada" could the minister inform the committee if it applies in any way to the fishing industry?

The federal government is today more concerned and involved with the fishing industry than ever before. Our fishermen register for unemployment insurance with the Department of Labour. Our draggers and trawlers are licensed by the departments of transport and fisheries and must undergo regular steamship inspection; but in view of the nature of the fishing industry, in view of the fact that fish must be caught and processed when they are available regardless of statutory holidays, I doubt whether it is possible to apply standard hours of work and overtime regulations to that industry. I hope the minister will clarify this point, especially for the men involved in the deep sea fishery.

Mr. MacEachen: This listing of the federal works and undertakings covered is the traditional listing found in all federal statutes such as the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, the Annual Vacations Act and all other acts passed by parliament with respect to federal works and undertakings in the labour field.

It should be pointed out that, for example, fish plants are not covered by this bill because they are under provincial jurisdiction, but there is a nice question in my own mind as to whether trawlers operating out of a fish plant would be covered. However, work in connection with navigation and shipping, whether inland or maritime, would be covered.

Mr. Crouse: I listened carefully to the minister's explanation, and if I heard him correctly he said there was a question in his own mind as to whether coverage by this bill could be extended to deep sea fishing trawlers. As I explained in my previous remarks, in view of the nature of this work, the nature of the industry and the manner in which the fishermen must operate, this point should be clarified before we proceed further.

It is simply impossible to adopt regular hours of employment on a fishing dragger. The men may well fish from eight to six o'clock, but during that period there may not be any fish to be caught. If a dragger is operating at night and is successful in securing a large catch, it is sometimes necessary, as the expression goes on board ship, to break watches, to bring out all the crew at three o'clock in the morning to dress all the fish caught. The catch cannot simply be left lying

on deck, waiting until morning to be processed because it is very perishable. As a fellow Nova Scotian the minister is well aware of the many difficulties under which fishermen must operate, and I believe we should have a clear definition from him of the manner in which this bill is to apply to the fishing industry and the men in it.

Mr. Douglas: I wonder if I may ask the minister whether this legislation covers a group which greatly needs the benefits it will confer? I am referring to the commissionaires, of whom there are about 5,000 in Canada. As the minister knows, these are veterans who are enrolled in the corps of commissionaires for the purpose of acting as watchmen, doorkeepers and in other functions. On a number of occasions I have taken up their problems and found they were not covered by provincial labour legislation. My information is that they have no statutory holidays and very little protection as far as labour legislation is concerned. I have been asked whether or not they will be covered by this legislation. I have not been able to ascertain from reading the bill whether or not they are included.

Mr. MacEachen: The class of employees referred to is not covered directly by this bill. It is a question of determining their status. I stated on second reading that it is the intention of the government to apply the standards of this bill to government employees generally. If the commissionaires are government employees, then the standards would apply. If on the other hand they operate in connection with contracts issued by the federal government, then the Fair Wages and Hours of Labour Act would apply. As I have already stated, we propose to bring in amendments to this act to apply these standards, especially with respect to wages and hours of work. In order to be absolutely certain as to the coverage of this particular bill and as to the coverage extended to government employees under the Fair Wages and Hours of Labour Act I would have to know the precise employment status of commissionaires.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the minister whether he would look into this? I am told the Canadian corps of commissionaires often assigns people to work on airports and sometimes on government dock contracts—various jobs of that kind. One particular case which came to my attention was on Vancouver Island. It was ruled that they did not come under the provincial labour legislation. There was no federal legislation and these people were without any protection at all. I fear they may fall between two stools—that they do not come under the provincial legislation and that they will not be covered by the bill before us. Is it possible for the minister to look into this matter to see whether they can be included in any regulations made under this bill?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes. It is possible to say that commissionaires employed by any federal agency, such as a bank, would be covered. They would be covered if they were employed at a radio station, or presumably the Bank of Canada.

Mr. Douglas: Airports and docks?

Mr. MacEachen: Airports, yes. We expect they would be covered if they were working directly in a federal post or one under federal jurisdiction. Then we go on to consider the position of a commissionaire employed in connection with federal government contracts and we hope that ultimately these standards will apply when we have passed the necessary legislation. However, I would wish to look at this question further and see that this class is given the maximum protection possible.

Mr. Crouse: I wish to ask a question supplementary to one I asked a minute ago. Am I to understand from the minister's answer that the legislation does not apply in any way to the fishing industry and to the men involved in it? Is that correct?

Mr. MacEachen: I suppose, ultimately, it would be a matter for the courts to determine. It would be my opinion however that the trawlers to which the hon. member referred, operating as part of a fish plant located on the shore, would normally be under provincial jurisdiction and we would not cover them. I know one fishermen's union which has been certified under the provincial labour legislation. The fishermen's union in British Columbia has been certified under provincial legislation. This gives us an indication or a guide as to the possible coverage of this measure.

Mr. Rock: I should like to know whether the words "any aerodrome" mean "any airport". Do they apply to the land where any airport is situated? What I should really like to know is whether people working for concessionaires would be covered, for example

employees of Murray Hill taxis who are underpaid and who work 75 hours a week or more.

Mr. MacEachen: On the facts presented I am not absolutely sure whether these people would be covered in the bill or under the Fair Wages and Hours of Labour Act. But they would be covered under one or other of these measures.

Mr. Winkler: My question is in the same field. It refers, generally speaking, to the trucking industry. It seems to me that in clause 3 there is an area which is not entirely clear and which may lead to hardship in certain cases. I would ask the minister if the terms of this clause apply, generally speaking, or even specifically, to the trucking industry. Take as an example a firm working out of Toronto. If its operations are wholly within the province of Ontario would the terms of the act apply? Let us take another case. If the firm operated outside the boundaries of the province in which it was located, would the act then apply if it did not in the first instance?

Mr. MacEachen: The answer to the first question is, no. It would not apply to a trucking operation within a single province. But it would apply as I understand it to a trucking operation extending into another province.

Mr. Winkler: Does the minister not agree this will create an area of injustice because of the competition to which such a company would find itself exposed? Runs between one province and another must take place, and these affect the hours of work. I understand this is a most important factor in a company's operations. Would it involve the total operation of the company or would the minister divide the two questions with regard to its application to any one company so as to apply to just those operations outside the province concerned?

Mr. MacEachen: Perhaps I may answer the hon. member by saying there was a case in the Ontario high court of justice in 1960 dealing with this question, and as I understand the decision it was that if any single employee or any number of employees are covered by the federal authority then all the employees automatically are covered.

Mr. Rock: I would still like to know whether the word "aerodrome" would include "airport".

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. Rock.]

Mr. Herridge: I wish to refer again to the question which was raised by my hon. friend from Burnaby-Coquitlam in connection with the corps of commissionaires. I have been interested in their problems ever since I entered this house, particularly as a member of the veterans affairs committee, as have other members of that committee. Having discussed this question with officers and members of the corps in various places in Canada, may I say I do not think the minister's reply in this respect was altogether satisfactory. I know from experience you will find members of the corps employed for a few days on work which would come under this legislation, and then, perhaps two or three weeks later, they will be employed on something which is covered by the provincial legislation.

Would the minister look into this question very carefully and see what can be done, so that these persons who are members of the Canadian corps of commissionaires will know their rights and will know, when they are in a particular employment, whether they come under this bill or under provincial legislation. I think this should be clearly defined and the Canadian corps of commissionaires notified to this effect. Will the minister look into that question so these people will know their rights after this legislation is passed?

Mr. MacEachen: I think it would be helpful for the department to investigate this matter a little more carefully with regard to the employment conditions of the commissionaires, so we may determine the extent of the application of this bill. We will be glad to look into this matter and notify the commissionaires as to their rights under this legislation.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I raised on the orders of the day, the question of postmasters in local post offices. At this time I would like to ask the minister two questions in that connection. The first question is: Will this bill affect postmasters who are operating small, local post offices? If I could have the reply to that question, I will then ask the second one.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I stated on second reading that the standards established in this bill will apply to government employees. I stated, further, that the President of the Privy Council would make a statement later giving the details in this regard. This is the intention. For example, employees of the post office would come under the minimum wage provisions of the bill. We are certain these standards will be applied to employees

of the post office, for example, or casual employees of the post office at Christmastime. The exact date of the application would depend upon the bringing into effect of this bill and a statement to be made by the President of the Privy Council.

Mr. Aiken: Arising out of that answer I would like to point out what I consider to be an anomaly in the legislation. The postmasters in small offices earn anything from $500 a year upwards for operating their post offices, and this is sometimes not much more than $1.25 a day, let alone $1.25 an hour. The minister has just stated that the provisions of this legislation will apply to employees of the post office. I am thinking of clerks who are employed by a postmaster. Will they be eligible for the rate of $1.25 an hour?

It seems to me that a postmaster of a small post office will never be able to hire an assistant at $1.25 an hour if he is only getting $1.25 a day himself on a contract basis. Many of these smaller offices are operated in that fashion. In the average post office the postmaster has some other duties and receives a reasonable amount of income. There is for example a requirement that the office stay open a minimum of eight hours a day. This would result in the postmaster having to pay his helper up to $12 a day, when he himself was getting a good deal less than that on a contract basis.

Unless the bill operates to the benefit of the postmaster himself and permits him to draw this minimum wage so he can pay it without losing money, there is a very great anomaly in this bill. I have had the matter drawn to my attention by a number of postmasters who thought they were going to get $1.25 an hour as soon as this bill came into effect. However, it is quite obvious they are not, but their assistants are. How on earth they are going to manage, I do not know. If the minister can shed any light on this problem, I would like him to do so.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, the light I can shed is that the policy has been laid down and it will be up to the Postmaster General to grapple with the application of these principles with regard to employees of the post office. I think it is a very good thing that we have established as a matter of policy that the standards within this bill will be applicable to federal government employees. It will be up to the head of each department to work out the details.

Mr. Aiken: I assume from the minister's reply that I should go after the Postmaster General for an answer to this question, rather than himself. Does the minister agree with that?

Mr. MacEachen: Employees of the post office will naturally get the standard rate. There are certain persons working for the post office on a contract basis, and this would be an entirely different aspect because they are contractors. The status that would be occupied by revenue postmasters under the provisions of this bill is something that I think would have to be determined by the Postmaster General.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I would like to come back to the question of commissionaires. First of all, I wonder if the minister could spell out whether under the provisions of this bill the take home pay of commissionaires will be at the rate of $1.25 an hour. I realize that the provisions of this bill only apply to work which comes under federal jurisdiction. As I understand the set-up now, the corps of commissionaires bids for certain work; for example, if the government or some industry that comes under federal jurisdiction hires the corps of commissionaires, the corps then supplies personnel. Under the provisions of this bill will the corps be required to bid at such rates that after the deductions are made by the corps the people working will get $1.25 an hour?

As I understand it now, if the corps bids, let us say, for the sake of argument, $1.25 an hour and gets the contract, the corps then deduct their commission, or whatever they call it, for handling the contract, and then they deduct "X" cents an hour as payment for the uniform. Then of course there is also the question of whether the corps will be required to put aside a percentage of this money for holiday pay. I think these are important matters. It seems to me the government is involved, because very often a government department decides to hire the corps rather than hiring government employees directly, who would get the rate established by the government. Therefore the government very often hires the corps in order to save money.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, the illustration given by my hon. friend obviously refers to persons employed under a contract. A person contracts with the government to provide certain services and these services are provided by the corps of commissionaires; in this case the Fair Wages and Hours of

Labour Act would apply in so far as contracts with the federal government are concerned. In that case we set the minimum rates of pay, and to my knowledge there is no rate at the present time that we have set for the corps of commissionaires that is less than $1.25 an hour.

Mr. Orlikow: My information is—and I have taken it up with the appropriate person in the department—that these deductions are made, and for the person actually doing the work it really does not make any difference whether the government says, "We are paying $1.25 an hour", $1.50 an hour, or $2 an hour, because the deductions bring the rate of pay down below the $1.25.

I am trying to get the assurance that after the rates are set and the deductions have been made by the corps for handling, and so on, the person employed will receive the $1.25 an hour, and that with regard to work which comes under the jurisdiction of the federal government they will receive, for the days they work under a federal government contract, the equivalent of two weeks holidays with pay for a full year's work. That is what I am trying to get at, before it is too late.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand what deductions could be involved. If a federal contract comes, as it does, under the Fair Wages and Hours of Labour Act, then the employees must receive a certain wage set by the department under that act. I do not understand what deductions could possibly take place which would supersede the rate approved by the department, unless it were a deduction freely given by the employee himself to his association.

Mr. Orlikow: As I understand it, and I have discussed this with Mr. Wilson, it is a very simple matter. I have not got the file here but the corps charges, for getting the contract and handling it for a particular employee, 10 or 15 cents an hour for every hour the person works. In other words, if the corps get the contract at $1.25 an hour this person would get $1.25 less 10 or 15 cents service charge. The corps also charges for the uniform. I think the uniform costs $40 or $45, and when it is paid for deductions in that respect stop, but the 10 or 15 cents an hour continues the whole way through. What I am concerned with is that if the corps charges this kind of fee it might never get a government contract if the rate were not less than $1.40 an hour, giving the employee $1.25, plus a couple of cents holiday pay.

Mr. MacEachen: The situation is that the employee receives the rate, and whatever fee is owing to the corps of commissionaires is paid over and above that rate. Because of the dispute over facts here I would be glad to check into this matter further with my hon. friend, because I think this is a point on which we should be clear.

Mr. Orlikow: I will be glad to give the minister the facts. What I am concerned about is that no government department should accept a contract at less than an amount which would leave the commissionaire who is actually doing the job $1.25, plus whatever he is entitled to for holiday pay.

Mr. MacEachen: I would agree with that.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the minister whether the bill applies to hotel employees in hotels which form part of a railway system. I am not quite clear whether this bill would be broad enough to cover all employees employed in connection with the operation of a railway. There may have been some decisions of the courts on this matter and I am wondering whether large hotels like, for example, the Royal York, which are owned by railways or which simply offer a service in connection with the railways are covered by the bill.

Mr. MacEachen: Certainly the hotels of the Canadian National Railways are covered by this bill. As I understand it, the hotels of the Canadian Pacific are not; they are under provincial jurisdiction. I think the reason is that the C.N.R. hotels have been declared to be to the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I quite heard what the minister said. Did he say that hotels operated by the Canadian National Railways fall under this bill but that hotels operated by another railway, such as the Canadian Pacific, would not fall under the bill? If that is so—he said something about declaring them to be for the public benefit of Canada—would it not be reasonable that hotels under both systems should fall under the same administration and be subject to the same laws?

Mr. MacEachen: I had a meeting this morning with the vice presidents of the C.P.R. and the C.N.R. and this was a matter of discussion, that the bill was discriminatory in that it covered C.N.R. hotels and not C.P.R. hotels, presumably because the C.P.R. hotels

fall under provincial jurisdiction. The reason cited is the reason I have given, that these hotels were declared to be to the general advantage of Canada and therefore under federal jurisdiction. However, this is a legal point which, I must say, is rather baffling to me.

Mr. Brewin: I suggest to the minister that there is no doubt, if there is a legal problem here, that it can be resolved by the government's declaring these hotels to be to the public advantage of Canada. Certainly it seems to me that a person working in a hotel owned by the C.P.R. is working in connection with a railway, just as much as an employee working for a C.N.R. hotel. I should have thought the federal government could bring this matter within its jurisdiction. If there is any doubt, I suggest that it do so by explicit language or by declaring such hotels to be for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, I should like to follow up my previous point about a postmaster with an allied subject which I should think would cause just as much difficulty and which we should have out here and now, because if this principle is applied it will make quite a difference to highway mail services and rural routes operated for the carriage of mail.

Rural route contractors bid for contracts and receive so much money in accordance with their bid. Likewise the men who haul highway mail services from one point to another put in a bid for a given contract, which might perhaps be $1,000 or $1,100 or $1,200, and they are contractors. In the past the contract has stated that the contractor will pay the prevailing wage, and in some cases the prevailing wage for the driver of a truck operating on a rural route, who himself is not a contractor, has been put at a very low figure. In fact, since there was no real minimum wage no minimum was applied at all in most cases.

The position of these carriers is the same as that of a postmaster. They contract at a stated figure and are therefore contractors, and I presume they do not come under the provisions of clause 3. Yet their employees will be covered because they are engaged in carrying mail and are therefore federal employees. In this event a contractor who may be bound by his contract to carry mail for anything up to four years will suddenly find that he has to pay his drivers $1.25 an hour, with the average rural route run taking three or four hours. That is $6 or more per day. I think this is another instance where the bill in respect of a minimum wage cannot be applied, and I point this out for this reason. The general impression is being given that this will be an across-the-board minimum wage for all employees in government works. I do not know how on earth a contractor who is bound by a contract of $1,000 is going to be able to pay $2,000 to a man he has hired to drive the vehicle.

Exactly this same situation will exist in regard to a postmaster of a small post office who has a contract for perhaps $500 or $600 but has to pay a clerk $1.25 per hour. I think this is one of the most difficult areas in which to apply this principle.

If the principles embodied in this bill are not applied to federal government employees on an across-the-board basis, and particularly to individuals carrying the royal mail, I think we must consider that it will be ineffective. I do not know how the government intends to work out these problems.

The minister has said in respect of postmasters and their problems in this regard, that the Postmaster General will take responsibility and provide some solution. Is the Postmaster General going to allow these contractors, who employ other individuals, to adjust their contracts so they can pay at least the minimum wage and not be out of pocket as a result of previous contracts? I should like the minister to give us some explanation in this regard.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, there is an answer to that question. The regulation in respect of federal government contracts is covered under the Fair Wages and Hours of Labour Act. Only construction contracts are covered by the Fair Wages and Hours of Labour Act, and the rates have been established under that act for those contracts. There is nothing in this bill in respect of such federal contracts, and there was no intention that this bill should cover those contracts, because they are covered, as I have said, by that act. As I have outlined, we intend to cover federal government contracts generally by amendments to the Fair Wages and Hours of Labour Act. When these amendments are brought before the house we will all have an opportunity to discuss this important range of contracts entered into by the federal government.

Up until this time the Post Office Department has asked the Department of Labour to prescribe rates for persons employed by postal contractors on a voluntary basis. The

contractor himself is self-employed and does not come under this voluntary edict, so to speak. We are providing for employees of the contractor by way of rates prescribed by the Post Office Department.

Mr. Aiken: Just to clear up this point, do I understand that the class of people described as postal clerks, who are not civil servants, including drivers and others who are employed by postal contractors, are not included in the provisions of this bill?

Mr. MacEachen: That is right.

Mr. Aiken: Thank you.

Mr. Groos: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the minister one more question in an attempt to nail down the status of the members of the royal Canadian corps of commissionaires, and I am thinking particularly of those who are employed directly by the government in my area as Department of National Defence security guards. Will they be covered by the provisions of this bill?

Mr. MacEachen: They will not come under the terms of this bill because they are not employees of federal industries. However, we have stated that the standards set by this bill will apply to government employees, and the standards and wage rates will apply to commissionaires as employees of the government. As I have stated, the timing of this legislation will depend on a statement to be made by the president of that body.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, we seem to have touched upon a wide variety of subjects during the course of our discussion on this clause. I was interested in the point raised earlier by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg, and perhaps what I have to say should more properly be considered when we are dealing with clause 5. Perhaps for a moment, however, I may be permitted to go back to that question raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre at the beginning of our consideration of this clause. That hon. member made reference to clause 3, paragraph (3)(b) in respect of the application of this bill to members of the various professions. The question which arose in my mind as I read that part of this bill was whether it is worded so that it would be applied to all of the members of a profession, no matter what the circumstances of their employment, or whether it was worded so that it would apply to only certain members of a profession and not to others. What I have in mind is that in many professions certain persons are in private practice and in fact self-employed, whereas others who are members of the same profession may be salaried. As this clause is worded, does the minister feel that it will be applied to the whole membership of a profession, or does he think that under this part of the bill self-employed persons or persons in private practice will be excluded? Will some members of a profession be excluded from the provisions of this bill while other members of the same profession, who are employed directly on salary, will enjoy the protection provided, such as the non-deductions from salary for statutory holidays? Can the minister give us his understanding in this connection?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, naturally all members of a profession covered by this bill would be those employed in connection with a federal works or undertaking. That would limit the area of coverage. We did discuss this matter during our consideration of clause 3, paragraph (b). We have provided for a certain amount of flexibility in the application of this act to members of the professions employed upon or in connection with federal works. We have done this for the purpose of examining each profession, so to speak, on its own merits to see whether there might be advantages to the professions or to the public interest by including members of the professions. It might well be that some traditional professions should be excluded, such as the medical profession, the dental profession and perhaps the engineering profession. There are others, however, we should examine very carefully before we exclude them, and possibly we will include them so that they will benefit from the provisions of this act.

The one profession I have very much in mind is that of nursing. It may be advantageous to that profession, particularly in respect of hours of work, which would induce us to include it.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, just before we pass this clause I should like to return once again to a consideration of the point I raised earlier in connection with the trucking industry. I listened to the minister say that he wanted to be fair, that he wanted to see there was no discrimination as between areas. However, to get back to a specific item under which unfairness might arise, I should like to refer to a carrier who operates within the confines of a province. In each and every province, and certainly in the large provinces in the country, there could be a run that would take more than eight hours. I am

thinking of the answer the minister gave me before, in relation to an operation that is partly outside a province, and the fact that this bill will apply to the whole operation in the province.

I am sure the minister is well aware of the fact that carriers can operate out of the city of Toronto under provincial legislation and can have a tremendous advantage over a carrier who conducted a small part of his business outside of the province. He would come within the terms of this legislation. The point which I feel the minister should clarify is this: Is there any recourse for those operators or their associations, individually or collectively, at any time to correct an injustice this legislation might cause any one of these interprovincial operators? Can he give us any assurance that if the measure does operate to their disadvantage they will have an opportunity to change the application of the provisions of this bill which relates to their industry?

Mr. MacEachen: The hon. member has asked if there is any recourse to the application of the hours section. I agree that this is an important consideration, especially for the trucking industry. There is a transitional provision with regard to hours in clause 51. It may be that at that time it would be appropriate to discuss a little more fully the type of problem that is posed by the standard hours provision in relation to the trucking industry. I have some things to say about it, and I think they would best be said under clause 51 where the transitional provision is found.

Mr. Winkler: While we are dealing with this bill?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes.

Mr. Aiken: There is one further question I should like to raise and perhaps the minister will answer it readily. Earlier this afternoon we disposed of an amendment to clause 2 in connection with the exclusion of the Yukon and Northwest Territories. I do not intend to raise that question again now, but in this clause there is a suggestion that perhaps there is some discrimination involved in excluding those two territories. This brought me back to the bill of rights which was passed in 1960 which, under clause 3, paragraph 3, requires the Minister of Justice to examine every bill introduced in the House of Commons in order to ascertain whether any of the provisions thereof are inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of the bill of rights. I refer particularly to clause 1(b) which guarantees the right of the individual to equality before the law and to the protection fo the law. I should like to ask the minister if the Minister of Justice has examined this bill and has reported that it complies with the bill of rights?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, the obligation mentioned is an obligation imposed upon the Minister of Justice. I think the hon. member would have to direct his question to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Aiken: I believe there would be an obligation on the Minister of Labour to see that there had been compliance with the provisions of this act before the bill was introduced.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, it is certainly not in any sense discriminatory. The exclusion has been made for the reasons stated. It is precisely the same coverage that is extended in all parts of Canada, exactly the same coverage in the Northwest Territories. In fact, if we took the alternative course we could then describe it as discriminatory because it would be discriminating with regard to the territories. It is not discriminatory in any sense. I do not want to go into an argument which has been decided by the house.

Mr. Aiken: I had intended to ask this question of the minister earlier today when the Minister of Justice was sitting beside him and might have made it easier to answer. I still feel that, while the Minister of Labour has expressed the opinion the statutory obligation is on the Minister of Justice, he should be able to give the house the assurance that the provisions of the bill of rights have been complied with. I am raising the point because I have a feeling that this bill of rights was treated by the opposition of the day, and the government of this day, very lightly. These provisions are there. They were passed and are obligatory in connection with the legislation. While there are those who may say that this bill of rights was not as effective as it might have been because it did not include provincial legislation, nevertheless there is a requirement that the Minister of Justice examine each bill to ascertain whether any of the provisions are inconsistent with the purposes of the bill of rights. I should like to ask the minister if, before we pass the last clause, he will assure the house that this has been done.

Mr. MacEachen: I will try to get this message to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Knowles: Before we finish with clause 3, I should like to ask the minister another question or two. My questions relate in particular to the matter of contracting with other people or contracting out. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier-Lasalle, the member for Victoria, British Columbia, and the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam have touched upon examples of what I have in mind. I remind the minister also of the very useful and constructive statement made on this point the other day by the hon. gentleman who is now sitting at his left, the hon. member for Hamilton East, the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

When he was speaking on second reading of the bill, this hon. gentleman, as recorded on page 9045 of *Hansard* for October 14, did me the honour of reading the wording of one of the sections of my labour code bills that I have been bringing in for the past ten years. In particular he pointed out that the wording which I had in my various bills included very specifically contractors, representatives, managers and agents. The hon. member for Hamilton East expressed the hope that clause 3 of this bill would be wide enough to cover all such operations. I should like to ask the Minister of Labour if he has satisfied the hon. member for Hamilton East on this point?

May I bring up a particular case? The hon. member for Jacques Cartier-Lasalle raised the question in relation to the operations that take place at an airport. Is it possible for the Department of Transport, which is operating an airport, to contract out some of the work at that airport and for the contractor or subcontractor to say that the kind of work his employees are engaged in comes under provincial jurisdiction?

Similarly, may I ask a corresponding question with respect to the C.B.C. It is clear that the work of any radio broadcasting station is under federal jurisdiction, but could the C.B.C. contract out some of its camera work, or some of its technical work of one type or another, and could we then find ourselves in the position that the contractor or subcontractor could claim that the work he was doing was provincial in nature, and therefore that his employees were removed from the protection of this bill?

I am glad to have the interest not only of the minister but of the hon. member for

[Mr. Aiken.]

Hamilton East because the point he made the other day was a valid one. We should hear from the minister whether the bill is so worded that it does cover contractors and subcontractors who get work that is initially under federal jurisdiction? Are all the employees of such contractors and subcontractors covered by this bill?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, clause 3 says "This act applies to and in respect of employees who are employed upon...." and so on; and if my hon. friend will refer to line 27 he will see it says "to and in respect of the employers of such employees and to employment upon or in connection with the operation of any such work, undertaking or business." We are satisfied that the application of this part of the bill will include the instances mentioned by the hon. member for Hamilton East and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. We are satisfied of that, both upon the wording and upon a supreme court case in 1955, the stevedoring case, which supports the view that any contracting activity, even though it is contracted out, if it is an integral part of federal work comes under federal jurisdiction.

I am satisfied, so far as one can be satisfied. We have covered this category. I may say it is a matter about which we were very conscious, because we thought this might have been an escape route if it could be successfully employed. We do not think it can be.

Mr. McIntosh: I am interested in paragraph (h) which reads:

> —any work or undertaking that, although wholly situated within a province, is before or after its execution declared by the parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more of the provinces, and—

What is meant by the phrase "to be for the general advantage of Canada"?

Mr. MacEachen: This is also a standard paragraph or section in all our labour statutes. The parliament of Canada is free to declare a work to be to the general advantage, and if such a work is done it comes within federal jurisdiction. For instance, uranium mining has been declared to be to the general advantage of Canada and is under federal jurisdiction. The wheat elevators, flour and cereal mills have also been declared by parliament to be to the general advantage of Canada, and for that reason come under federal jurisdiction.

Mr. McIntosh: I would refer the minister to section 174 of the Canada Grain Act which says:

All elevators in Canada heretofore or hereafter constructed are hereby declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada.

I am wondering how this clause would apply to the managers of these elevators in the fall, when the farmers are taking their crops off and when they get into the elevators at all times of night. Clause 3(3) of this bill says:

This act does not apply to or in respect of employees who are
(a) managers or superintendents or who exercise management functions,

Would this apply to all elevator operators on the prairies in the fall months when the crops are coming off? They certainly could not work a 40 hour week and take in all the crops.

Mr. MacEachen: I appreciate the point being made by my hon. friend because we have given consideration to the problem that has been posed by the representatives of the country elevators with respect to time, or the standard hours of work. In the operations of the country elevators there are peak periods, and these peak periods go beyond the standard hours of work for a day or a week, and this might be regarded as an excessive burden on the elevators with respect to overtime.

The officials of my department have had discussions with representatives of the elevators, and we expect that the application of another clause in the bill, providing for the averaging of the standard hours beyond a period of two weeks, would take into account the problems raised by country elevators with respect to the application of hours.

Mr. McIntosh: To what other clause is the minister referring?

Mr. MacEachen: Clause 5(2).

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): In the case of the country elevators I wonder if this should not be spelled out in definite terms so that it would not come up as a point of argument at a later date. I do not know whether the minister understands it, but I know the elevator agents could work a great number of hours a day during peak periods, and I am wondering whether these employees should be included as managers and operators.

Mr. MacEachen: I think it would be unfortunate to exclude the country elevators specifically from the total operations of the bill, because we want to apply its principles to the employees of federal undertakings, including country elevators. We think it is reasonable to provide for an averaging over a period greater than two weeks and, if need be, this could be extended over a period of a year, which would provide an opportunity to level off the seasonal peaks with the seasonal valleys. This is one protection in the bill that I think will go a long way to meet the difficulties.

When we come to the transitional provisions I shall have something to say in connection with the opportunities available for a deferment, where the application of the hours might be prejudicial to the employees or to the operation of an undertaking under this bill. There are two protections here that will look after the situation without spelling it out specifically, because I think it would be unfortunate to exclude these people.

Mr. McIntosh: If this is not spelled out, is there not a conflict here between what the minister is trying to do and what it says in the Canada Grain Act, which provides that elevators will open and remain open for the convenience of the farmers? I think, in this case, if he would spell out, as the hon. member for Assiniboia suggested, an amendment substituting "elevator operator" for "manager" in the prairie wheat area some of the fears we have as to what could happen if this were carried in its present form might be eliminated.

Mr. MacEachen: First of all, there is a feeling, presumably that these are managers, though they have entered into a collective agreement as employees of the wheat board in a Saskatchewan trade union—

Mr. McIntosh: If I may interrupt; there are two definitions given in the Canada Grain Act. One applies to managers and the other to operators. I cannot remember what the definitions are, but there are two.

Mr. Douglas: I wish to support the minister by saying I certainly think all grain elevator operators should come under this legislation because they are in a group which is not covered by provincial labour legislation and they should have the benefit of this bill, particularly as far as statutory holidays, vacations with pay and so on are concerned—the minimum wage provision scarcely affects them because most of them are paid well in excess of it.

However, I am sure the minister is aware there are some problems. The key problem is

that there are times of the year when the quotas are open and when farmers must be able to deliver their grain. At such times the elevator operators must be there. On the other hand there are long periods in the winter, and when quotas are not open, when the job is merely a caretaking proposition with occasional cleaning of grain and so on. I think the minister could work this problem out under subclause 2 of clause 5 and under the regulations which provide for averaging. We encountered the same difficulty with respect to oil drillers under provincial legislation, but in the end agreement was reached between the employers and the employees under which for certain months in the year the employees worked on the basis of a 30 hour week while in another season of the year they worked on a 48 hour basis. It averaged out. If extra hours had to be worked, then of course overtime was paid.

I think a solution could be worked out in this case. I should like to ask the minister whether he is satisfied that he has the necessary powers under the regulatory provisions to enable him to deal with the situation in this way. I agree it is essential that the elevators should be kept open and that someone should be there whenever grain is delivered. This particularly applies during the fall when grain is wet and has to be delivered to the elevator and dried. This might mean working 12 to 16 hours a day. It would, of course, be unfortunate if we tried to impose an eight hour day at that time of the year and then stuck to an eight hour day in the winter when there is less work to be done. I hope the minister is satisfied he has the necessary powers, after consultation with the grain operators, because I believe that by making the necessary adjustments in the regulations he could solve this problem. The operators must be covered by the legislation, yet the legislation must at the same time provide sufficient flexibility to enable farmers to deliver their grain to the elevators at any reasonable time.

Mr. McIntosh: May I suggest that this clause stand until we have an opportunity to ascertain what subclause (5) means? It would give us an opportunity to look up the grain act and make sure that the western producers are protected.

Mr. MacEachen: I am content that it be allowed to stand and I am satisfied we can meet this problem.

Clause stands.

[Mr. Douglas.]

On clause 4—*Saving more favourable benefits.*

Mr. Herridge: I have one question to ask on this clause. It concerns subclause (2) which reads:

> Nothing in this act authorizes the doing of any work on Sunday that is prohibited by law.

I can understand those words, but I should like to know the reason for including them in this clause. Can the minister tell the committee how they apply in all the circumstances?

Mr. MacEachen: This subclause makes it clear that the bill is not to be taken as interfering with any law prohibiting work on Sunday. It is necessary because of the provisions of clause 7 which require one day's rest in seven, wherever practicable on a Sunday.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 5—*Standard hours of work.*

Mr. Orlikow: I think this is the proper place to ask the minister whether he can now give an explanation of the problems I raised when we were discussing this question last week in connection with groups of workers such as railway workers and others. The illustration I used last week was the case of sleeping car, dining car and parlour car employees who are now working substantially more than a 48 hour week. If they were included in the provisions of this measure and if the railway company reduced their hours of work to 48 while holding them to the hourly rate established by the contract, they would suffer a very severe reduction in pay.

Mr. MacEachen: I think the place to deal with this is under clause 51. Presumably we are already agreed on the principle of the eight hour day and the 40 hour week, and clause 51 gives us an opportunity, as it were, to time the application of this principle, taking into account considerations of the kind mentioned by the hon. member. I think if we could defer consideration of this matter and others like it—there are a number of them —until we come to clause 51 we would have a better discussion. Presumably we would do nothing at this point to upset the acceptance of the principle on second reading.

Mr. Orlikow: Except that as I understand clause 51 the transitional period only applies for a maximum of 18 months. I suppose that in 18 months the unions concerned could

negotiate a new contract, but those negotiations could conceivably lead to a substantial reduction in take home pay at the end of the month.

Mr. MacEachen: That is the problem we are attempting to deal with in the clause I have just mentioned. I think it would make for a better discussion if we were to postpone this issue unil we reach that particular clause. It would give us a chance, too, to deal with some other aspects. The case of the country elevators is really the same type of problem.

Mr. Knowles: I am sure that my hon. friend, along with the rest of us, will not mind having the discussion on clause 51 rather than on clause 5, provided we are not precluded from putting forward the proper amendment necessary to the appropriate clause. Things are going fairly well today so we thought this might be the proper time to move another amendment.

Clause 51 as we understand it merely provides for the 18 months transitional period. But we had some discussion the other night as to whether a time limit is the best way to deal with this, or whether it is necessary to have legislation saying that the total take home pay shall not be reduced because of the effect of this legislation.

The minister has not yet accepted the idea of writing such a provision into the legislation. But if he were to accept it as the result of discussion in this chamber, to which clause would these words be added; would they be added to clause 5, or to clause 51?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I would not raise a point of order if my hon. friend proposed an amendment to clause 51 to cover that point.

Mr. Knowles: All I can say to the minister is, many thanks for the invitation. We do not need it, but we will accept it.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister at this point a question regarding the matter raised by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek and the hon. member for Assiniboia. Looking at clause 5 (2), the last few words are:

> —in such manner and in such circumstances as may be prescribed by the regulations, as an average for a period of two or more weeks.

If that is the case, I am wondering whether this gives the minister sufficient flexibility to deal with the problem raised by hon. members regarding grain elevators on the prairies.

Mr. MacEachen: This would permit us to arrive at an average for a period of two or more weeks. We would have the authority to average over a full year, if that were necessary. Presumably the premium paid would apply only beyond 2,000 hours, because on a yearly average the total hours permissible within the 40 hour week would be 2,000 and beyond that overtime would apply. Presumably this would meet the seasonal character and would also preserve the principle of the 40 hour week. This certainly goes a long way in levelling off, I would think.

Mr. Douglas: Then the minister is satisfied that this is flexible enough to meet the problem outlined?

Mr. MacEachen: I am satisfied that it is sufficiently flexible, based on the conversations we have had. But it may be that clause 51 is another place where this situation could also be helped.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister is correct with regard to clause 5(2), but one of the points that I think could be raised as an eventual argument is that the elevator operator might possibly go to the elevator at eight o'clock in the morning and be there until six o'clock at night. So far as he is concerned, he can say he is on duty full time, and I do not think the two weeks would be enough extra time to cover the extra hours he would be there for that period of time. This is the part I am concerned about. Possibly the elevator operator is not buying grain for a good deal of the time; he may even be over in the town drinking coffee. This is a possibility. But at the same time he is on the job working for the elevator company that has hired him and most farmers would know where to find him. He is going to say that he was on duty for eight or nine hours a day.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the minister would allow me to read section 109 of the Canada Grain Act. I think this is why there is a conflict here. It is not spelled out by the minister, and if he will spell it out we will accept what he says. Section 109 says:

> Except as provided in section 108, the operator or manager—

It uses both terms:

> —of every licensed public country elevator shall, at all reasonable hours on each day upon which the elevator is open, receive all grain offered thereat for storage without discrimination and in the order in which it is offered, provided that there

is in the elevator available storage accommodation for grain of the variety and grade of such grain and of the character desired by the person by whom the grain is offered.

I think if this is spelled out, we would have no further argument.

Mr. MacEachen: It seems to me that there is no necessary contradiction between "reasonable hours" and the system provided in this clause, because presumably the grain act obligates the operator and manager to be available for reasonable hours. If the reasonable hours at a peak period are 12, we would make provision to take that into account in the average for the year. Surely in a slack period he is not obligated to be there for 12 hours; perhaps he is obligated to be there for eight hours, or perhaps only three hours. So you could average this out, and we believe it is a reasonable provision. We certainly would not think this would contradict the "reasonable hours" mentioned in the grain act. I think we are safe enough here.

Mr. McIntosh: I know that in the past elevator agents have been on duty in their elevators for 18 hours a day during certain periods, and others may not have to be there more than one or two hours on other days, but you cannot average it for a period of two or more weeks.

Mr. MacEachen: We can average up to 50 weeks in a year, if we need to. We can prescribe an average for two or more weeks in a year so that we have it—

Mr. Douglas: So that you have it for the whole year?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, so that we have it for the whole year, if need be.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): In coming to an average would you expect the elevator operator to be there from, say, eight o'clock in the morning until noon and to be away for the rest of the afternoon? Is this what the minister means by averaging, that he can close up the elevator for half a day periodically to offset the hours he has worked for a longer period?

Mr. MacEachen: Presumably it is up to the management to decide the hours men shall work. From the facts the hon. member has mentioned, working four hours or three hours a day, we would average those days of few hours with the days having 10 or 12 hours of work over a period as long as is required to meet the needs of the particular operation. If the facts are as we have had them discussed, this looks after the situation.

Mr. McIntosh: This situation is going to be further agitated when rail line abandonment takes place—and I believe it is going to take place in certain areas—and farmers come in from many miles away with their grain and find the elevator closed. This is a situation against which we as legislators must guard, and protect our constituents. Although we are dealing with clause 5(2) here, it refers to clause 3(3), and I think before we conclude this matter we must have a definite statement from the minister that elevator operators or managers are not included. If my colleague is satisfied that it will be averaged over the year and he thinks this will look after the situation, or other members representing farm areas are satisfied this will be taken in the way the minister means it, and when the regulations come out they will not change the minister's meaning—which I have seen happen in other cases, where the regulations have been more powerful than the act itself—this would be sufficient; but I believe the minister should spell it out right now.

Mr. MacEachen: I have spelled it out as far as I can. I gather my explanation met with the approval of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam and the hon. member for Assiniboia; I thought they agreed with what I said in regard to the facts as we know them concerning variable hours. We certainly will utilize the provision to the limit, to meet the problem of the country elevators. I believe in this way we are going very far in that direction, and I do not believe hon. members would want us to go to the extent where the principles of the bill would be overcome.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, I merely want to get it completely clear in my mind. Supposing a farmer delivers a load of grain to the elevator and the elevator operator has been working really long hours for two or three weeks? A period of adjustment is provided to cut down the hours; if I understood the minister correctly he mentioned a figure of 2,000 hours. The elevator operator goes to his elevator at about eight o'clock in the morning—some go before that—and stays until six. In that case he will say he was on duty, and because of the fact he has worked there long hours he will say he is going to work just in the mornings for

two or three weeks and will close in the afternoons. That is not going to satisfy the farmer who comes in with a load of grain at four in the afternoon, only to find the elevator operator away, and rightly so because he has been averaging out his hours. I think this has to be spelled out in black and white so that everyone can understand it in no uncertain terms.

Mr. MacEachen: This legislation does not provide any authority for an employee to advance that argument. This is a matter he has to work out with his employer.

Mr. Barnett: I do not want to get mixed up in the problems of country elevators but I would say that in the part of the country I come from, if that situation arose and an operation was required to be open 18 hours a day over a period of time, they would put on a second shift. That is one method of settling that kind of problem, it seems to me.

I rose, Mr. Chairman, because I am a little puzzled about what appears to me to be some conflict between clause 5, which is now under consideration, and clause 6. I want to know which one of these clauses is to be the operative clause as far as the bill is concerned when it becomes law. Clause 5 refers to standard hours of work and clause 6 refers to maximum hours of work. Clause 5 says that the hours of work shall not be longer than eight hours per day or 40 hours per week. In clause 6 it turns right around and says that an employer can require an employee to work 48 hours per week. Why is clause 6 there at all, particularly if one considers it in relation to the provisions of clause 9 which we will be coming to a little later on. The thing which concerns me is that some of the people who read this act when it becomes law are likely to decide that the present clause 6 is really the operative clause, and it may very well tend to become the standard provision rather than the exception. I think we should have some information on why clause 6 is there at all before we pass clause 5.

Mr. MacEachen: Clause 5, of course, establishes the standard day of eight hours and the standard week of 40 hours. The clause now mentioned allows for the working of 48 hours in a week, but the additional eight hours beyond the standard 40 must be at premium pay; in other words, at time and a half. That is set out in clause 8.

The hon. member referred to clauses 9 and 10 which provide for two instances where an employee may be required to work beyond 48 hours per week on the issuance of a permit by the minister. Second, there is a possibility that in the event of emergency conditions—for example, the breakdown of machinery or an accident occurring—work beyond the 48 hours may be required, in which case a report is subsequently made to the minister. So that actually a 40 hour work week is prescribed. Then there is the possibility of a 48 hour week at premium pay, and then work beyond a 48 hour week as a result of emergency conditions with a report made to the minister. That is the sequence.

Mr. Barnett: If I might pursue the particular questioning I had in mind, the other matter which puzzles me is the relationship between subclause (2) of clause 5 and clause 7. As I understand it, clause 7 imposes a limitation on the operation of subclause (2) of clause 5. I am not certain I am opposed to clause 7, but I am wondering how this averaging out principle will work under certain circumstances if it is limited by clause 7.

I have particularly in mind the kind of situation referred to earlier by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg in respect of employees in marine transportation and that sort of thing who may be out working for a period of time extending beyond seven days. I know there are some procedures which allow for people to be on duty for longer than seven days, with compensation provided under some union agreements for extra days off. I have in mind here ships returning to shore. But I am wondering whether the minister could explain what he understands to be the implications of clause 5(2) and its relationship to the operation of clause 7.

Mr. MacEachen: May I draw the hon. member's attention to the phrase "wherever practicable" in clause 7. Where it is impracticable of course to have a full day of rest on a Sunday, provision is made for one day of rest in the week. But it is to be on a Sunday wherever practicable. If work had to be done on a Sunday, presumably averaging would apply on that day as on any other.

Mr. Barnett: Then may I ask the minister who decides when it is practicable? There are some areas in the bill where such matters may be defined by the regulations, but I have not noticed anywhere where this particular matter is set out in such a manner as to give the minister or the governor in council authority to make regulations defining what constitutes what is practicable or

impracticable regarding Sunday as a normal day of rest.

Mr. MacEachen: I cannot tell my hon. friend at the moment who decides when it is practicable, but there is now an established law providing for this day of rest. Or, at least, it has a persuasive character and it is carried forward in this bill that Sunday shall be the normal day of rest in the week wherever practicable. If it is not practicable, then presumably another day of the week will be provided. The sanctions of the bill will presumably apply to this clause as to all others.

Mr. Barnett: I think this is rather an important question because, if I may say so, sometimes this develops into a situation where the employer decides what is practicable. I can quote an example of this, which I admit falls outside the minister's jurisdiction.

Apparently the management of the British Columbia ferry authority has decided that their employees are going to work ten days on, straight through, and then so many days off. This has become quite a bone of contention and up until this time the employer, the B.C. ferry authority, has decided that the ten day period is to be worked by the employees. I would hate to see that kind of situation remain in respect of the operation of our national minimum standards, so that a group of employees is entirely at the mercy of an employer as far as the decision as to what is practicable is concerned. That is why I wonder whether the subject matter of clause 9 could more effectively be covered in some way by incorporating it in the provisions of subclause (2) of clause 5.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I think it is agreed that there shall be provided one day a week off on a mandatory basis as a day of rest. That is an obligatory provision of this bill. Sunday is the normally accepted day of rest. There is no absolute assurance or sanction that Sunday will be the day off, but wherever practicable it shall be. It is presumably suggested that whenever Sunday is impracticable as the day of rest, clause 5 (2) shall apply. Certainly one could argue that this involves an irregular distribution of the man's hours of work when it is impracticable to have Sunday off.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Chairman, just before we pass clause 5, I should like to state that I have listened with interest to the discussion carried on by the hon. members for Swift Current and Assiniboia in relation to grain elevators employees. It may be true that the hours worked by those employees can be averaged out for a period longer than two weeks, but I still envisage some complications in this regard.

In the event that an elevator operator operates his elevator on the prairies on an average of 12 hours a day in the fall for several months, then he would have to declare a similar period of months during the summer as a short work period—perhaps four hours per day—in order to strike an average. If I understand the wording of this bill correctly, this could greatly injure the grain handling trade, and I am thinking particularly of a year like last year when the grain handling companies did a tremendous job in respect of moving a large quantity of wheat for export.

I think the minister should make this averaging out principle a little more clear, because clause 3, as I read it, definitely includes the grain handling trade—the wheat board and grain elevator companies. The provision contained in clause 5 (2), embodying the averaging out technique for more than a two week period, does not really solve the problem to which I have referred. I think the provisions of this clause would eventually have the effect of increasing the cost of grain handling and make much more uneconomical the operation of some country elevators. Perhaps these provisions would bring about the abandonment of some country elevators, as well as some railway branch line abandonments. These abandonments would greatly contribute to the cost of grain handling, and I am sure no one in this house desires to see that happen in any of the grain producing areas of western Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I think this aspect of this bill should be given some further consideration. If the grain trade falls within the provisions of this act, there should be some further provision made, clearly setting out this averaging clause, so that an elevator may remain open only half a day during the wintertime in order to average out the working hours. It may be that that practice could only be followed by a certain portion of the total grain trading area, and I think a great deal of difficulty will be created by this provision for the Alberta wheat pool, the united grain growers and many other grain handling companies in western Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I should also like to draw the minister's attention to the fact that in many cases the farmers find themselves only able to deliver their quotas of grain to the

grain elevators in the last weeks of July, as a result of which further difficulty will be created in respect of the averaging out technique. I think there is a great deal of room for improvement in this portion of the bill. Perhaps the Minister of Trade and Commerce would give some consideration to this part of the bill, and perhaps between the two ministers a clear explanation can be worked out which would answer some of the questions asked in relation to the obvious complications which appear to exist. I should like the Minister of Labour to again clarify what is involved in this bill in relation to the grain trade.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, of course the principle of this bill is to provide for a 40 hour week. That principle was accepted on second reading. All employees under federal jurisdiction are to come within this provision. It has been argued and suggested that in the case of grain elevator companies, they would be obliged to pay an excessive amount of overtime during peak periods because of the nature of their operations. Clause 5(2) will permit these companies to average out the hours worked, even to the extent of a period of a full year, so that if an employee works on the average of 2,000 hours for 50 weeks, the employer would not be obliged to pay overtime until that employee had worked more than 2,000 hours. At that time, of course, he would be obliged to pay overtime, and that is the purpose of this bill. I think the provisions of this bill do clear up any difficulty which arises as a result of a seasonal operation. It may be that the elevator companies will occasionally have to pay overtime, and I am sure they do so now. It may well be that they will reorganize their operation, putting on an extra shift, or something of that nature. There are alternative ways of dealing with this seasonal type of operation. We think that in this bill we have met, to the maximum, any difficulty that arises from the seasonal nature of an operation.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Chairman, may I call it ten o'clock.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: I should like to ask about the business for tomorrow and Wednesday, if we could have it.

Mr. MacNaught: Tomorrow we will resume the committee stage of the electoral boundaries commission act. This will be followed by the committee stage of the Canada labour standards code. Then, we will take up second reading of an act to provide for the establishment of harbour commissioners.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

AIR TRANSPORT—INQUIRY AS TO NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN AIR CANADA AND C.P.A.

Mr. Gene Rhéaume (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, the question I raised the other day and that I want to raise again tonight relates to the urgent need for the government to make some kind of statement on the negotiations that are going on between Air Canada and Canadian Pacific Airlines, particularly inasmuch as until some sort of conclusion has been reached the minister has told us he will not be in a position to even consider regional air carrier policy.

This question is not a new one. It is not even new to this session. If you look at the record of the first session of the twenty sixth parliament, you will see numerous occasions upon which members directed questions to the then minister of transport. From press reports we were led to believe that the former minister of transport, who is now the President of the Privy Council, was just on the verge of exploding with some kind of policy statement, when internal difficulties about regional carrier problems within the cabinet forced a change of duties. Consequently this matter was not raised again until February 26 of this year. The question is to be found on page 256 of *Hansard,* when the hon. member for Three Rivers asked the Minister of Transport when we could expect a statement. The last sentence of the minister's reply reads as follows:

> I hope this will be before too long.

We all remember what happened on April 30, the night the minister attempted to make a policy statement over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and the resulting furore in the house. I do not intend to rehash that debacle. I should like to quote from the minister's statement the following day, which is found on page 2808 of *Hansard*:

> I considered very carefully last Friday morning whether the very tentative decision which was taken by the government to carry on another stage in the formulation of air policy, which has not yet been formulated—

These are the pertinent words.

—and which I am sure will not be formulated for at least another month—

When the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines was examining the officials of Air Canada on June 22, the minister told us then, those of us who were on that committee, that he expected to make a statement around September 1. He asked us to forbear asking any further questions because this would only complicate negotiations that were then proceeding between Air Canada and Canadian Pacific Airlines. Well if you look at the record of this session, you will find members did refrain from asking any questions. Indeed the next time a question was asked on this subject was on September 3, two days after the time the minister thought he would be in a position to make a statement, at which time I asked a question. The minister's reply can be found on page 7613 of *Hansard,* as follows:

I can report that very active discussions have been going on between the two air lines since discussions commenced some months ago. I get progress reports from time to time, but I doubt that a statement at this stage would add very much to the prospects of success in these negotiations.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we were told not to ask questions because it could hamper prospects for success. Six weeks later, on October 13, I raised the question once more, and it was at that point Your Honour ruled the question was not one of urgency.

If you read the press you will have noticed that last Saturday the Ottawa *Citizen* carried a feature by Norman Campbell headed, "Parliament", in which he stated:

Meanwhile, parliament awaits the promised statement of government policy on Canadian air lines and the international routes...

More than six months ago, transport minister Pickersgill told the Commons the whole question of future air policy was under "very active consideration." He hoped it would not be too long until conclusions were reached and could be announced to the house.

Many Canadians see in this kind of hedging, this referral of a government decision basically to two air lines, Air Canada and C.P.A., a calculated manoeuvre not to get on with the problem of announcing a regional air carrier policy for the country. If he cannot make any statement tonight, may I appeal to the acting minister to try another television performance so that we may find out something about what is happening.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, following the meeting which the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) held with the presidents of the major railways and the presidents of Air Canada and Canadian Pacific Airlines to outline the basic principles which should apply in the development of Canadian aviation policy, a number of meetings have been held between working teams of the two air lines and between the two presidents of the air lines to discuss possible avenues of co-operation.

These discussions have not yet been completed and it would therefore be premature at this stage to attempt to make any detailed statement on the various items on which progress has been made. However, I am very happy to be able to state that the two air lines have jointly requested the following information to be made public, and I quote:

Air Canada and Canadian Pacific Air lines have agreed to co-operate in presenting a united Canadian effort in the highly competitive world of international air transportation.

The agreement follows a government request for greater co-operation between the two Canadian carriers.

Both carriers have agreed to "sell Canada first" by ensuring each adopts the other's service as first alternate to its own, consistent with customer requirements.

That is, if one carrier cannot accommodate a customer due to inconvenient routing or lack of space, it will book him on the other Canadian carrier before any foreign operator, providing it is not to the passenger's disadvantage.

Air Canada has also agreed to appoint C.P.A. as its general sales agent in many areas of the Orient, the South Pacific and South America, while C.P.A. will name Air Canada as its general sales agent in Bermuda, the Bahamas and the islands of the Caribbean.

Additional general sales agency appointments are under review.

The new policy is expected to improve service to passengers and shippers by providing greater Canadian representation in the areas concerned, while aiding both carriers in obtaining additional revenues on international services.

TRANSPORTATION—PROPOSED REDUCTION IN C.P.R. SERVICE IN WESTERN CANADA

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, last Friday I raised the question of further curtailments in passenger train service between Calgary and Lethbridge, and between Lethbridge and Medicine Hat. Effective October 26 C.P.R. trains 307 and 308, now operating daily between Medicine Hat and Lethbridge, will be reduced to Monday, Wednesday and Friday from Lethbridge to Medicine Hat, and Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday from Medicine Hat to Lethbridge.

Trains 309 and 310 now operating Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday between Calgary and Lethbridge via Macleod subdivision will operate only on Wednesdays and Satur-

days. Trains 311 and 312 now operating Monday, Wednesday, Friday and Sunday between Calgary and Lethbridge via Aldersyde subdivision will operate only on Thursdays and Sundays.

The Railway Act does not require that a railway make application to the board of transport commissioners for authority to reduce passenger service. Such prior authorization by the board is required only where a passenger service is being completely discontinued. Accordingly, none of these reductions I have mentioned requires the board's approval. Under the Railway Act, however, the railways are obliged to maintain adequate service and facilities, and the board has full authority to require that reductions in passenger service, for example, be not proceeded with if in the board's opinion the reductions would reduce the service below what the board would consider adequate in the public interest. Furthermore, after the reduction has gone into effect, the board can order the restoration of the service for the same reasons.

The only notice given with respect to this reduction in rail service has been that posted in all the small railway stations between the points mentioned that service would be reduced within 30 days. Representations have been made to the Department of Transport, and I believe to the board of transport commissioners, that the service which would be left would not be adequate to meet the needs of the area I have mentioned. I think that in all fairness to the city of Lethbridge and the city of Medicine Hat, to the chambers of commerce in those cities and to other interested parties, there ought to be a longer period between the date when notice is given and the date when the reduction takes effect. My appeal to the minister tonight is that he request the board of transport commissioners to see that this period is extended by 60 days at least in order that the interested parties may have an opportunity to appear before the board and present their case. Then, if in the opinion of the commissioners the reduction is not likely to inflict an undue inconvenience on the communities concerned, the railways could proceed with the reduction in service which is contemplated. But up to the present time there has not been sufficient opportunity given.

I should like to say also that in my opinion during the last two months there has been a terrific upswing in demand for rail passenger service. I should like to quote from an editorial which appeared in the Medicine Hat *News* of September 26. It says this:

> The entire railway situation is under review at the present. This would be a good time for the government, its board of transport commissioners and others concerned to probe the passenger service provided by the railways in this country.
>
> Is the C.P.R., for example, deliberately attempting to discourage the public from travelling by rail?
>
> Is the C.P.R., through this "policy" trying to steer would be train passengers to its air line?
>
> The public has a right to know the answers to these and other questions inasmuch as public money subsidizes the railways.
>
> Lastly, the politicians should ponder well the fact that there is a demand for rail service. Is it not to be met?

This involves much larger considerations than the local services I am talking about now, but I ask the minister tonight to take this into consideration, to get in touch with the board of transport commissioners and at least give the people concerned the opportunity to make representations.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): I should like first of all to express my appreciation to the hon. member for the accuracy of his statement of the facts involved in his question, and for the accuracy of his statement of the law applicable. I might also add that he did me the courtesy of making his request in a wholly objective way.

The situation is that the board of transport commissioners has received complaints with respect to these changes and they are at present being considered. Since the changes in both of these services do not involve discontinuance of specific trains, but a reduction in the frequency of their operations, the board has taken no action to intervene on the strength of the representations which have been received from parties objecting to the changes.

In view of the volume of complaints received by the board, however, it has directed the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to file its submissions with respect to the specific points raised, and also to furnish the board with the particulars of the patronage of the existing services. It will be seen from what I have said that this matter is receiving the careful attention of the board.

AGRICULTURE—EGGS—REQUEST FOR CHANGE IN DEFICIENCY PAYMENT METHOD

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): I welcome this opportunity to debate a matter pertaining to the 2 cents deficiency payment to egg producers.

As the house knows, these deficiency payments are based on the national weighted average price which farmers receive during a 12 months period. In my opinion this should have been on a regional, cumulative price basis. To justify my argument I should like to give hon. members this information. During the month of May on the prairies the price received for grade A large eggs was 17 cents. This included the cities of Edmonton, Calgary, Saskatoon, Swift Current, Regina, Melville, Brandon and Winnipeg. The price range was from 17 cents to 19 cents, while at the same time other places in the east received 35 cents. Victoria 32 cents, Vancouver and Kelowna 31 cents, Fort William, Toronto and other cities received 32 cents to 35 cents.

When the stabilization board establish the average price they take the low that the prairies received, normally 17 cents, and the high received by the egg producers in the east and on that basis they calculate what should be made as a deficiency payment. This year it is 2 cents. My argument is this. Instead of taking the national weighted average it should be done on the regional basis. The difference in price ranges from 17 cents to 35 cents. We on the prairies just help to get a higher price for these people who receive 35 cents and 37 cents; we lower the average. They will again receive 2 cents per dozen, while our fellows on the prairies who received 17 cents will also only receive 2 cents per dozen. My argument is that the price should be established on the regional basis instead of on the national basis.

Last year I had a resolution on the order paper to provide deficiency payments for eggs—and the same applies to hogs—on a cumulative regional price basis, rather than on a national weighted basis. Until this is done the egg producers in the west will never receive justice.

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for his question and for the opportunity of commenting on it briefly. I think the hon. member would agree that the purpose of deficiency payments under the price stabilization board is first of all to provide stability to the egg market, and second to provide a measure of guarantee to the small producer who may receive a deficiency payment on the first 4,000 dozen eggs that he produces.

I think the hon. member would also recognize that in view of the fact that this is a matter which might normally be regarded as government policy, he could not expect me to elaborate in too great detail. I do, however, wish to avail myself of the opportunity to comment briefly on this matter and say that the ideal situation of course would be where the production is nearly equal to the demand. Because production is difficult to regulate precisely, so may we expect price fluctuations. These fluctuations in production usually follow a pattern affected by the seasons of the year. To make deficiency payments on a quarterly basis, or even on a regional basis, would be to aggravate the situation and would tend to defeat the principle of price stabilization on a year round basis.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.21 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, October 20, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Sixth report of standing committee on public accounts—Mr. Baldwin.

Eighth report of standing committee on banking and commerce—Mr. Pennell.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

CONSIDERATION OF GILL REPORT—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this stage to ask leave, in accordance with standing order 26, to move the adjournment of the house to discuss an urgent matter of national importance with regard to the report which was submitted almost two years ago by the royal commission on the administration and application of the Unemployment Insurance Act.

We have asked a number of questions on the subject and tried to get some information, but without too much success.

The government is studying the report, but we have not been informed of the results of that study. At present every member must face problems dealing with unemployment insurance and the operation of the unemployment insurance commission in his own riding.

The unemployed are affected and are victimized, that is, half a million persons out of work are affected by the functioning of that agency. Furthermore, the officials find themselves in an impasse, since they must apply the act as it exists, and sometimes it is unjust and very poorly drafted.

The government has been studying this report for several months, but the house was not informed of the results of the study; we do not know the opinion of the government or what it intends to do. If such an inquiry proved to be very useful and necessary two years ago, it is even more so today, especially if we take into account the unemployment situation.

I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), the adjournment of the house under standing order 26 for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely the immediate need on the part of the house to take the immediate action necessary for the duty in committee of the Gill report and to carry out as soon as possible the recommendations of the said committee in order to correct numerous anomalies in the operation of the unemployment insurance commission.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other hon. members who wish to say anything on this request to adjourn the house under standing order 26 in order to give more attention to the Gill report? If not I am prepared to render a decision.

Standing order 26, of course, envisages something which is a sudden emergency. Citation 100 (8) of Beauchesne's fourth edition says, in the middle of the paragraph:

> What I think was contemplated was an occurrence of some sudden emergency, either in home or in foreign affairs.

I think all hon. members would agree that this matter has been raised several times during the question period. It is not exactly a new matter and to my way of thinking it is not a new, sudden emergency. In my opinion it does not conform to the dictates of standing order 26; therefore I must decide that the proceedings of the house should not be set aside at this time to proceed with the matter set forth in the motion submitted to me.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

EFFECT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON TRUCKING AND FISHING INDUSTRIES

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 Labour regarding the labour standards code. I should like to ask him whether he would be prepared to meet representatives from the trucking interests, whose claim it is that adopted in its present form this bill would have a detrimental, if not disastrous, effect on that industry.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to hear further representations from the trucking industry. Yesterday I did meet with a group of truckers and I had an opportunity to appreciate the difficulties that face this industry. During discussion on a particular clause of the bill I might be able to indicate a way which would meet the problems which are posed by the truckers.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for those encouraging words. I know they will be appreciated.

Mr. W. H. Jorgenson (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could I ask the minister whether he would be prepared to delay the reintroduction of this bill in the house until the trucking industry has had an opportunity to present its case.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I believe the views of the trucking industry and the problems which are involved have been pretty well put forward by the industry. When we come to a discussion in committee of the transitional provisions of the bill I believe I will be able to indicate a way to meet, I trust, the problems which are posed.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I commented on the effect of Bill No. C-126 on the fishing industry. That industry has made representations to me to ascertain whether the minister will further clarify the situation as it relates to the fishing industry. I say this because the whaling industry on both coasts is affected in that they have permanent employees; on the west coast the seiners and packers have permanent employees who would therefore be affected by the bill according to the hours they worked. I think the minister might further clarify the position of the fishing industry before this bill is passed, and I ask him whether he would do this.

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker; and I hope it would meet the convenience of my hon. friend if I did that when we return to the committee stage of the bill.

LOUISBURG, N.S.—STRIKE OF WORKERS AT HISTORIC SITE

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 Labour, asking him whether he is now in a position to report to the house about the strike of the workers at the Louisburg restoration project.

Hon. Roger Teillet (Acting Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, as acting minister I was given a report by the department a few minutes ago to the effect that a meeting held today broke up about 2.30 this afternoon in a very hopeful mood, and with the full expectation that the men will be returning to work tomorrow.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. After the lay-off of 55 men at the restoration project, can the Minister of Labour indicate what his winter works program will mean by way of further work for the men in that area? Does it mean that the 55 men laid off will be assured of employment in addition to the several hundred more who are looking for work in that area?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, this question really is for the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, but my understanding is that the men who were temporarily laid off will be rehired under the winter works program.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, my question was directed to the Minister of Labour, since he made the announcement in conjunction with the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. My question is, will the men laid off be assured of employment when the winter works project starts, and can the minister indicate to the house just how many men will be involved in the winter works project?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is yes, and I will attempt to get specific figures to answer the second part.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

REPORTED STATEMENT RESPECTING ABILITY TO AFFORD NEW SOCIAL MEASURES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question regarding the speech which was made in Toronto yesterday by the premier of Saskatchewan, in which Mr. Thatcher is reported as having indicated that Canadians could not afford new social measures such as the national pension plan and a national comprehensive medical insurance

plan. I want to ask the Prime Minister whether this statement expresses the views of the Liberal party and explains the apparent delay in the government proceeding with these two programs.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity of reading the report of this speech by the provincial premier to which my hon. friend has referred, but the views of the Liberal party in respect of this matter are well known and have often been expressed in this house.

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister a supplementary question. I wonder whether the Prime Minister can tell the house, in regard to the pension legislation, whether we can expect that it will be introduced into the house before the conclusion of the present session.

Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have already answered that question a good many times. The last question was whether the resolution would be put on the order paper before the end of this month. I believe that will be the case.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a further supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Will there be any necessity to hold any further consultations with the provinces before a resolution in respect of the Canada pension plan can be placed on the order paper?

Mr. Pearson: I do not think so, Mr. Speaker. The legislation is drafted and the resolution will be on the order paper in a few days.

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. In regard to this report that appeared in a Toronto newspaper, would the minister tell the house whether he received these representations in verbal or written form; and I refer particularly to the reference the premier of Saskatchewan made to the advice he gave the Minister of Finance regarding a reduction in taxes before the next budget is brought in.

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that I am able to make any comment which would throw any light on this very difficult and complex question.

TRADE

VISIT TO CANADA OF U.K. HOME BUILDERS MISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce. It is related to a subject of importance to those who are interested in increasing Canadian sales of forest products overseas, namely the visit of the 26-member home builders mission from Great Britain to Canada.

In view of the importance of the Kootenays as a forest producing area, and in view of the topographical pulchritude of this district, would the minister give consideration to arranging a visit of the home builders mission from Great Britain to the Kootenays on its way from Vancouver to Calgary? They are very interested in this area.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Important as the question is, I wonder whether the hon. member would put it on the order paper.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Speaker, I should like to give notice of my intention to debate this at ten o'clock.

COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TO INCREASE TRADE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister and arises out of an answer he gave yesterday to a question asked in relation to commonwealth trade. In view of Prime Minister Wilson's views on commonwealth trade, has the Canadian government any specific proposals to make, or does it intend to take any specific initiative in this regard in the near future?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the views of the government in respect of this matter are well known. We are anxious to do everything we can to increase trade within the commonwealth, and we will be very anxious to discuss ways and means of doing this with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom as soon as we are able to meet with him.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

PROPOSED CHANGES IN RUN-THROUGHS IN MOUNTAIN REGION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting

Minister of Transport. Has the minister received representations from the brotherhood of trainmen respecting certain changes in run-throughs on the part of train crews in the mountain region? If so, what has been done in this regard? Is any consideration being given by the minister to asking Canadian National Railways to defer the pending changes while the implications and ramifications of the contemplated moves are ironed out with the men in question?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, representations have been made by the brotherhood concerning run-throughs in two areas. I presume the area the hon. member is asking about is the Wainwright area. Those representations were made last week and have been communicated to the management of the railway. I do not know that I can say anything useful beyond that at the moment.

Mr. Lambert: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister exert some influence on his colleague the Minister of Labour in order to have him meet the delegation which has been here since Friday afternoon?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I met the delegation with the Minister of Labour and there was a further meeting late Friday afternoon; but because of certain things that had to be done in the house at five o'clock I had to leave the meeting and come here at that hour. On that occasion we were not together when we met the representative, as we had been the day before.

Mr. Lambert: He still has not seen the Minister of Labour.

REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR FROM NOVA SCOTIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Rober Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I wish to address a question to the Acting Minister of Transport. In view of the information contained in a recent press release from the office of the Minister of Transport indicating that no one from the province of Nova Scotia has been appointed to the board of directors of Canadian National Railways, can the acting minister advise the house and the country when this serious error will be corrected, more particularly in view of the fact that the press release stated that one director had yet to be appointed?

[Mr. Lambert.]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): I do not wish to become involved in an admission or denial as to whether the omission of the name of a director from Nova Scotia is a serious error, because other provinces have laid the same kind of claim for that one position. In any event, I will take notice of the question and bring it to the attention of the Minister of Transport on his return which, I am glad to say, will be within a few days.

IMMIGRATION

DAISY MAUD HENRY—CONSIDERATION OF DEPORTATION ORDER

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 Citizenship and Immigration. Last week he promised to take into consideration the exercise of his discretionary powers to reverse the decision of his department respecting Miss Daisy Maud Henry of Toronto, who had been ordered deported to England. Has the minister reached any decision regarding this case?

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not as yet received the file from the court of appeal on immigration matters. As soon as it reaches my office I shall give it serious consideration to see to what extent I could use my discretionary powers to allow Miss Henry to remain in Canada.

[*Text*]

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister how soon he expects to make this decision?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Within a few days, I hope, Mr. Speaker, because that is about the time needed by the department to examine the file and send it to me.

[*Text*]

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): As a supplementary question, has the minister had an opportunity to look into very serious charges, both in the newspapers and on television last Sunday night, against an immigration official in Toronto, charges that he expressed a very discriminatory viewpoint with regard to race and colour?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I did not have the privilege Sunday night of seeing on the English network the televised broadcast dealing with certain immigration cases in Toronto. As I already pointed out in this house a few days ago, I carried out an investigation following Miss Henry's case, which was brought to light by a newspaper. After this investigation, although it was not proved that discrimination had occurred against Miss Henry or Mr. Hyde, who was also mentioned none the less, the department realized that an official in its Toronto office during an examination, made a statement contrary to the policy applied by the department, and disciplinary action was taken by the department against this employee.

[*Text*]

AIRPORTS

TORONTO—PROVISION OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICE TO NORTHEASTERN SECTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. Moreau (York-Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport, but in his absence I wonder whether the acting minister has any further information concerning a matter I raised some time ago, namely the question of transportation service to and from Toronto international airport and the northeast sector of Toronto.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport has been advised by the president of Air Terminal Transport Limited that on Monday, October 26, the company is inaugurating on a three month trial basis a regular hourly service from 6 a.m. until 12 midnight, five days a week, across the north end of Toronto. Stops will be made at the Toronto transit commission terminal on north Yonge street and at the Canadiana hotel at Kennedy road and highway 401. This route has been approved by the Ontario highway transport board and the air lines.

Mr. Moreau: Would the acting minister undertake to contact the company to make sure this service is well publicized; because it is on a trial basis and, if not given a chance, could soon fail.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I shall draw the hon. member's question to the attention of the company.

PUBLIC WORKS

WELLINGTON, ONT.—REQUEST FOR CHANNEL DREDGING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works of which I have given him notice. Due to low water levels in lake Ontario and a local silting condition, Wellington harbour, facing on lake Ontario, is now closed to navigation. This has crippled the commercial fishing industry and has adversely affected the whitefish catch. In this emergency can the minister give his immediate attention to dredging the channel leading to the federal wharf in Wellington harbour?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, this matter has already been reported to the local office. We are looking into it, but unfortunately I have not yet received a preliminary report. As soon as it reaches my office I shall inform the hon. member.

CONSTRUCTION OF POST OFFICES, MÉGANTIC COUNTY, QUE.

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. Has he reached a decision following the two resolutions which have been sent to him by two municipal councils respecting the building of post offices at Notre Dame de la Guadeloupe and Coleraine, in Mégantic county? If so, can he tell the house—

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: This is a question for the order paper.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this question be debated tonight after ten o'clock.

[*Text*]

CANADA COUNCIL

REQUEST FOR INCREASE IN FEDERAL GRANT

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the hon. Secretary of State.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Could he tell us if the government has reached a decision with regard to the request made by the Canada Council that the moneys allotted to it for the coming years be increased?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): No decision has been reached, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question. Could the minister tell us whether the government is studying the matter and whether a decision will be reached in the near future?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, we are now studying this request most seriously, as well as other solutions to the problem, but I am unable to say exactly when a decision will be made.

[*Text*]

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

STUDY OF ECONOMIC INTERDEPENDENCE OF PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Several months ago he indicated that the commission on the economic interdependence of the provinces would be reporting toward the end of September. Has the commission finished its report, and when may we expect to get it?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker. As I have already stated, this is an inquiry undertaken by officials of the government. Their work has not yet been completed, and will not be for several weeks.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON REORGANIZATION OF MILITIA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Since several days have transcended the "next few days" the minister spoke of, is he yet in a position to announce a decision with regard to the militia, in conformity with part 2 of the Suttie report?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): It will be soon, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

PROVISION OF NUCLEAR MISSILES FOR R.C.A.F. IN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Are press reports, the only source of information from the department, accurate, to the effect that nuclear missiles have now been provided for the R.C.A.F. Voodoo planes in Canada, a year and a half after the minister assumed office?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Notwithstanding the form of the question, Mr. Speaker, I may say that if there were press reports to that effect they were not correct.

FINANCE

QUEBEC—TAX CONCESSIONS RESPECTING CONSTRUCTION OF STEEL COMPLEX

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Has the General Investment Corporation of Quebec, in respect of its plans to build a huge steel complex in that province, been granted or made any request for any tax concessions?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton West.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): That was the question I intended to ask, Mr. Speaker.

UNION CARBIDE SHARE ISSUE—INVESTMENT OF PROCEEDS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Can he tell the house whether any arrangements were made with, or any undertaking obtained from, Union Carbide to invest in this country the proceeds from the sale of $60 million of their shares in Canada?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am sure my hon. friend knows that under our laws these matters are within the jurisdiction of the company's officers. I expect this is the way most of us would like things to continue.

Mr. Lambert: Knowing the minister's preoccupation on other occasions with foreign

exchange problems, as a supplementary question may I ask whether there was also some indication that the funds which arose from this sale would be withdrawn, shall we say gradually, from Canada?

Mr. Gordon: I am a little confused by the question, Mr. Speaker, but if my hon. friend is worrying about the condition of Canada's foreign exchange reserves I can reassure him there is nothing to worry about.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND—U.S. BORROWING TO PERMIT REPAYMENT OF CANADIAN ACCOUNT

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): In view of that last statement, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister whether it is a fact that the United States borrowed moneys from the international monetary fund within the last few days in order to lend Canada funds needed to repay the Canadian account with that fund?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition would mind repeating that question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The question I asked was whether within recent days the United States government had borrowed a large amount of money from the international monetary fund, part of which was to be loaned to Canada to enable Canada to have funds to repay the Canadian account with that fund.

Mr. Gordon: I am glad I asked for a repetition of that question. Last month Canada repaid part of its previous borrowings from the fund. Under the arrangement Canada put up U.S. dollars, but part of the money had to be repaid in other currencies, and I think the rather complicated matter to which my right hon. friend has referred had to do with those various transactions. If he would like a more detailed report I will be glad to get the specific amounts in the specific currencies and make a report tomorrow.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is fine. Possibly we will get the facts tomorrow.

REPORTED INTENTION TO APPLY TIGHT MONEY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Minister of Finance if there was going to be a tight money policy in the country and he said he did not know. Does he know today whether a tight money policy will be in effect?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): In the first place, I did not say I did not know. There has been no tight money policy, and there is no prospect of there being one.

BANK OF CANADA COMMITMENT UNDER AGREEMENT WITH U.K. GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question?

I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance whether, following the drop of the pound sterling, the Bank of Canada granted loans to the Bank of England and, if so, at what rate of interest?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: It does seem to me that this is a question asking for considerable detail and that the minister can hardly be expected to answer on the spur of the moment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I admit this is an embarrassing question, but I do not ask the exact amount, I only ask whether the Bank of Canada granted cash advances to the Bank of England and, if so, at what rate of interest?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: I suggest this is a question for the order paper.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will discuss this matter at ten o'clock tonight.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Speaker, may I put my question, worded differently, to the Minister of Finance, and ask him without going into details, simply this. Has the Bank of Canada, since the new government came into power in England, granted loans to Great Britain?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Once again there is in my opinion no pressing necessity for an immediate answer to that question this afternoon. May I suggest it is a question for the order paper.

[*Translation*]

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

Mr. Lambert: It is no question of privilege at all.

Mr. Grégoire: It will be interesting to see, by reading *Hansard* tomorrow, what very urgent questions have been asked this afternoon. This problem has been discussed before in the house and the minister was ready to answer my question which only requires a yes or no answer.

It is extremely important to know whether the Bank of Canada lends our money to foreign countries when they are subjected to credit restrictions.

I wonder why the Minister of Finance is not allowed to answer this question of general interest, when I am not asking for any details and, moreover, the minister is willing to reply.

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: I wonder whether the hon. gentleman would be willing to withdraw his proposal to ask me his question at ten o'clock. I would then be in a position to make a full statement tomorrow which I think would give him the information he is seeking.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

MARITIME FREIGHT RATES

STATEMENT ON INQUIRY AS TO PROVISION FOR STUDY

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yesterday the hon. member for Saint John-Albert inquired about discussions I had held with the premiers of the Atlantic provinces regarding the proposed railway legislation. At the time of those discussions last week I explained that because of the complexities of the problems of transportation in the Atlantic provinces a decision had been taken when the new legislation was first under consideration by the previous administration —and this decision was confirmed by the present administration—that the questions relating to the Maritime Freight Rates Act which had been brought forward by the royal commission on transportation should be the subject of a separate examination. The current railway legislation does not deal with these particular recommendations, although it maintains the protection accorded to the Atlantic provinces under the Maritime Freight Rates Act as extended by the government of the day early in 1957.

I am sure hon. members will be glad to hear that the Minister of Transport will be back at his desk within a few days. At that time we intend to give prompt consideration to the establishment of a special examination into the problems relating to maritime transportation and the Maritime Freight Rates Act which were raised by the royal commission.

The provincial representatives at the discussion to which I am referring also raised the question whether the proposed railway legislation would lead to a further deterioration with regard to rate problems in the Atlantic provinces. I indicated that the intent of the legislation was to retain all the existing advantages and statutory protection accorded by the Maritime Freight Rates Act. Given this situation, the new legislation might be expected to be more advantageous on an overall basis than the situation which has applied heretofore, in which rate increases took place on a broad horizontal basis. Nevertheless, the points raised by the provincial premiers in this regard are being further reviewed on our part.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): May I thank the Prime Minister for answering this question in detail. We are all pleased to know that the Minister of Transport will be available later to take part in our discussion of this important railway legislation. I hope the government will continue to consider this matter sympathetically in view of the fear in the maritimes that there will be a further deterioration as a result of the new legislation, in spite of the fact that there are supposed to be exemptions in the area of the Maritime Freight Rates Act.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

INQUIRY AS TO LEGISLATION TO BE CONSIDERED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister and ask him whether he has any revised list of priorities respecting public business to place before the house before the Christmas recess or prorogation, whichever may come earlier.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Well, we have two important pieces of legislation before us now; we are shortly to have

before us again the redistribution bill and the labour standards bill. In addition we have a great many estimates to deal with, so I think we have quite enough ahead of us to keep us occupied for some days, apart from important reports from special committees which we are expecting shortly. And there is, of course, the pension plan.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Can the Prime Minister assure the house that it is the intention to deal with and pass the Canada pension plan legislation prior to any Christmas recess?

Mr. Pearson: I have already stated our intentions with regard to the pension legislation, but I am informed we have only managed to get through seven departments out of 23 as far as estimates are concerned, and this is certainly priority business.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Would it not be possible for the Prime Minister to set out at an early date the legislation which he and his government expect to have passed before the prorogation of this parliament, in addition, of course, to the estimates?

Mr. Pearson: I have already mentioned certain pieces of legislation, but legislation has to be considered at the present time in the context of the progress made with the estimates. We have already spent 66 days on estimates this year.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): On the contrary. May I ask a supplementary question of the Prime Minister. Is it not a fact that we have spent on the main estimates this year only 27 days, whereas in the session of 1960-61 some 54 days were devoted to the main estimates?

Mr. Pearson: I corrected myself by saying "supply".

Mr. Diefenbaker: No.

Mr. Pearson: I think if the facts are ascertained it will be found that I was conservative in my statement. We spent more than 66 days on supply.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Having regard to the widespread interest in priorities and the course which the government intends to take, I should like to ask the Prime Minister, particularly as press references are coming out of the committee on the flag, whether when that committee reports it is the intention of the government to resume debate on the resolution before the house and the amendment and subamendment thereto.

Mr. Pearson: When the committee reports on this matter it will be the report of that committee on this subject which will be first considered by the house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: At the moment I am not accepting the right of the government to do that which the Prime Minister has suggested, but is it the intention of the government to resume thereafter the debate on the resolution and the amendment or the subamendment?

Mr. Pearson: The intentions of the government with regard to this matter will be made known in due course.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am very glad to have the Prime Minister's answer, and when he asks for co-operation in the days ahead we shall remember the answer he gives us when we ask for information.

REDISTRIBUTION

PROVISION FOR BOUNDARIES COMMISSIONS AND READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION

The house resumed, from Monday, September 14, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-72, to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions to report upon the readjustment of the representation of the provinces in the House of Commons and to provide for the readjustment of such representation in accordance therewith—Mr. Pickersgill (for Mr. Pearson)—Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

The Chairman: Order. When the committee rose on September 14 last, with regard to clause 6 there was an amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and clauses 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13 had also been allowed to stand. Shall clause 14 carry?

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I was just waiting to get clarification from Your Honour as to precisely what clauses were going to be considered this afternoon, following the 20 minutes, shall we say of unforeseen debate of some three weeks ago just before the adjournment hour. I was wondering whether it had been agreed among the party leaders that we should revert to clause 6, because the Minister of Transport who was then piloting the bill through the house indicated that because of the short notice it would perhaps be better if the committee went on to some non-controversial ground. As a result of this

suggestion I believe clause 10 was passed, though I am subject to correction in this regard.

With regard to clauses 13 and 14 I have some observations to make. I should like to have a chance to bring out my material, Mr. Chairman, so perhaps the Minister of Labour, who I understand is now deputizing for his colleague, could indicate to the committee the manner in which the government would like to proceed on this bill.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I am sure we all regret the circumstances which necessitate my being in this position today. The Minister of Transport is at home, indisposed, and for that reason I have been asked to act for him in this particular matter. I have attempted to master this bill as well as I can, but I expect a good deal of forbearance and assistance from the committee as we go through the various clauses. As the hon. member for Edmonton West has stated, at its last sitting on September 14 the committee stood clauses 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13, so this afternoon the committee presumably would be dealing with clause 14.

Perhaps I might indicate what I have in mind for the consideration of the committee. I suggest that the committee proceed with the clauses of this bill, beginning with clause 14, and work to the end of the bill; then return to clause 6 which is, as we all know, a clause of considerable importance and contention. I had hoped yesterday and today to have more consultation than I have been able to have with members of other parties with respect to clause 6 and other contentious clauses. I commenced these negotiations, but because of my being in the house all day yesterday I did not complete them.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would be the wish of the committee to begin with clause 14 today and complete the remaining clauses, including clause 31; then having done that, if the day is not completed we could move to the labour code and return to these other clauses at a later date. In the meantime we would hope to continue these consultations with members of the other parties. I put this suggestion before the committee and hope hon. members will find it agreeable.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, my first words must be to refer to the illness of the minister who was piloting this legislation through the house, and to express the gratification of us all at the statement made by the Prime Minister today that the hon. gentleman will soon be back in his place.

[Mr. Lambert.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: After all, parliament would not be the same place without him. Now with respect to the suggestion of the minister, I recognize the difficulties of a minister who is propelled into dealing with a bill with the complications of this one, particularly with regard to two of its clauses. I certainly would want to do everything I could to co-operate with him. We are trying to assure in this bill non-partisanship in redistribution, and we want to have the best bill possible.

As far as the opposition are concerned, we are prepared to go ahead with the clauses of the bill, beginning with clause 14, and leave these two controversial clauses, the one dealing with appointments to the several provincial commissions and the other as to the percentage of tolerance that should be allowed with regard to populations of various constituencies, to a later date.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I rise merely for the purpose of saying that the proposal made by the Minister of Labour, and amended slightly by the Leader of the Opposition, is suitable to us as well. When I suggest that the proposal has been amended slightly I have in mind the fact that the Minister of Labour seemed to suggest that we would leave over until another time clauses 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13, but I think on reflection he will agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the only two we really need to leave over are clauses 6 and 13, unless of course we run into difficulty on one of the others. At any rate, the general proposal that we start with clause 14 and go through to the end of the bill, passing any others that we can, and then adjourn the discussion on this piece of legislation, if we get that far this day, meets with our approval.

On clause 14—*Powers of commission.*

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I would raise this question as a preliminary point, and I think it will assist the thinking of hon. members with regard to some of the provisions of the bill. This point is not germane to clause 14, but I think the minister can give us the assurance that the committee would like to have. In regard to the negotiations that took place at, shall we say, Canada's so-called super parliament, the dominion-provincial conference, there was a communiqué issued on October 14 with respect to the drafting of the amendment of our constitution, and clause 2 thereof reads:

No law made under the authority of this part affecting any provision of this act or section 51A of the British North America Act, 1867, or affecting any provision of the constitution of Canada relating to—

Then it lists four points, and says:

—shall come into force unless it is concurred in by the legislatures of all the provinces.

That in itself is quite clear. Section 51A is the amendment of 1916 whereby the representation in this house of any province is limited to a floor of not less than the senatorial representation from such province. However, what concerned me was a report in the press—and I must say there were conflicting reports in the press—that in the field of representation in parliament discussions had been held between the premiers and the representatives of the federal government which suggested that before any change was made in the representation of any province it should be the subject of agreement with the provincial government concerned. I must confess I cannot read that interpretation into paragraph 2 of the communiqué, but there have been sufficient noises on the fringes to indicate that this may have been part of the negotiations and the agreements reached at this dominion-provincial conference.

I should like the minister on behalf of the government to assure this committee that other than the floor established by section 51A of the British North America Act, there has been no undertaking given and no understanding reached that any provincial legislature shall have any say whatsoever in the determination of the composition of the membership from that province in this house. Otherwise it is a one way street.

With all due respect to those people who speak about co-operative federalism and who say that the provinces should have a say in what is done by the federal government, are those self same provinces prepared to say that the representation in their own houses shall be subject to the consent of the federal house? Of course they are not. Therefore the counter argument is equally untenable.

However, I should like to have the assurance from the minister that there is no question that any provincial government will have a say in the representation in this house by the body of members who come from that province. If such were the case the whole consideration of this representation measure becomes academic. After all, what is the point in setting up norms, representation commissioners and rules and regulations regarding the composition of this house within a certain province if the matter is going to be subject to a veto or to some other consideration by a provincial government?

The Chairman: I wonder whether the minister proposes to reply to the remarks made by the hon. member for Edmonton West. I realize these remarks were perhaps introductory to the discussion this afternoon, but as the hon. member himself remarked these comments went somewhat beyond the terms of clause 14. I suggest that from now on, subject to the reply of the minister, we restrict our comments to the terms of clause 14 of the bill presently before the committee.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Chairman, before we get to clause 14, in considering the procedure outlined by the minister may I take a moment of the committee's time to remind the house of the urgency of the constitutional responsibilities which parliament has in this matter.

The Chairman: I do not think the committee should get involved in discussions of that kind at this time. We have agreed to start with clause 14. I recognize that the hon. member for Edmonton West was granted quite a bit of latitude in making his introductory remarks, but I think hon. members in general would agree with the Chair that from now on we should try to respect the rule of relevancy and limit ourselves to the specific matter before the committee, namely clause 14.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I would be rather rash, I think, to attempt to deal with this important constitutional question, but I think it may suit the hon. member if the Minister of Justice dealt with this later when we are on another clause of the bill. I will draw it to his attention and ask him to deal with it later.

The Chairman: Shall clause 14 carry?

Mr. Lambert: Just one question on clause 14. Is it envisaged that there is to be a duplication of staffs, in regard to the staff which is permitted to be hired by the representation commissions and the staff which is now at work on behalf of the commissioner who was appointed by legislation last year? How is there to be a transfer of staff from one office to another? We do know that people have been drawing maps and travelling about the country preparing material. For whom are they going to work, the representation commissions or the representation commissioner?

Mr. MacEachen: My understanding is that the representation commissioner presently has a staff, but when this legislation is passed his staff will have to be enlarged in order to do the work involved. The commissions, of course, will require a staff as set forth in this clause.

Mr. Lambert: The authority to employ staff is given in subclause 2 of this clause, which says:

> A commission may employ such technical advisers and other staff, including a person to act as secretary to the commission, as it deems necessary—

—and so on. What I am concerned about is this. Is this technical staff going to repeat the work which has been done by the staff of the representation commissioner, and what will be the status of these people if they are transferred? The representation commissioner, who after all will have to oversee this work, will deem it in his wisdom to assign people to various representation commissions. What will be their status with regard to their conditions of public employment? After all, we know under which regulations the commissioner's staff are employed, but as far as these other people are concerned will they come under another set of rules?

Mr. MacEachen: I understand that the commissions will require a staff. They will be empowered under this section to employ such staff subject, of course, to treasury board approval. That is not a unique situation, certainly as far as I understand employment of persons in categories of this kind. This staff would be of a temporary nature and used by each commission to assist in the work of the commission. As I understand it, it is not intended that the representation commissioner's staff will be transferred to the commissions.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 15 agreed to.

On clause 16—*Rules of procedure.*

Mr. Diefenbaker: On clause 16, Mr. Chairman, may I ask what is the meaning of this clause, which says:

> A commission may make rules for regulating its proceedings and for the conduct of its business, and may provide therein for the conduct of any inquiry or hearing by one or more of its members.

Would the minister outline something of the procedure which a commission would follow in determining the course for the province for which it is appointed? Would the commission move around throughout the province? What evidence would it hear? May representations be made verbally or in writing; and generally, would the minister give the committee an outline in this regard within the limitations necessarily imposed upon him by reason of his entry into the discussion of this bill at this time? Naturally I am trying to find out how these commissions are going to operate, and if the minister could give a general outline, so that the house and the country will understand their *modus operandi,* it would be beneficial.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I certainly cannot give a generalized description of the functions of the commissions, because I understand that the tasks of the commissions would vary from province to province, as would the extent of the task each commission has to undertake. Different kinds of procedures might be involved in provinces such as Ontario and Quebec from those involved in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, for example.

The next and subsequent clauses include provision for sittings to be held so that representations can be made to the commissions. Clause 17 prescribes the sittings of the commissions, and paragraph 4 of that clause prescribes how the sittings may be held. I regret that I cannot give further detail about the operation of the commissions, except to say that I would conclude that clause 16 gives the commissions the authority to make the rules which govern their sittings, and provides for the conduct of any inquiry or hearing by a commission or by one or more of the members of a commission.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, the minister has pointed out the complete uncertainty as to the manner in which these various commissions will operate, and has stated that, as is provided by clause 16, there may be a variety of regulation. However, I do feel that there should be mandatory sittings. I think an opportunity should be available for evidence to be given, to the end that the commissions will have the fullest possible information. At present the representation commissioner, with his staff, has made an assortment of diagrams covering the various provinces and outlining the territorial limits of the various constituencies. As I understand it, these have been based on various percentages of tolerance. It seems to me that no commission could possibly fully understand local conditions and considerations unless there was provision for the taking of evidence. Clause 17, paragraph 1 states:

A commission may, in the performance of its duties under this act, sit at such times and places in the province for which it is established as it deems necessary, and before completing its report may, if it sees fit, hold one or more sittings in that province for the hearing of representations by interested persons.

The use of the expression "may" when applied to the crown is always meant to be "shall", but not in so far as it applies to a creation of the crown in the form of a commission. To give a reasonable degree of unanimity to the discharge of the responsibilities of the several commissions, I suggest there should be a change in line 1 where the word "may" appears so that it would read "a commission shall, in the performance of its duties—". Line 4, which reads "—before completing its report may, if it sees fit—" should read "—before completing its report shall", and the words "if it sees fit" should be left out.

It is very material that representations should be made, but if we pass the legislation as it is now a commission may simply say it is going to sit in province A but not in province B.

The hon. member for Scarborough was about to speak, but circumstances and rules prevented him from doing so. I am sure he was going to make some representations, but he was denied the opportunity of doing so under the rules. He certainly should not be denied the opportunity of placing his views, or the views of others, before a commission set up in his province and, indeed, others should have the same opportunity. I ask the minister whether he will consider an amendment along the lines I have suggested, in order to assure a degree of unanimity among the commissions so they will not interpret what they should do in one province, in so far as public hearings are concerned, differently from what they should do in other provinces.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition has made a very valid point. This point has been raised in earlier sittings of the committee, as hon. members know. I have a suggested revision to clause 17 which I should like hon. members to look at and consider, and if it meets the point made, as I think it does, I will be glad to move it as an amendment to clause 17.

If I might be allowed to elaborate on the first point made by the Leader of the Opposition in respect of at least one mandatory sitting, this suggested amendment provides that the commission may, in the performance of its duties, sit at such times and places in the province for which it is established as it deems necessary, except that before completing its report it shall hold at least one sitting in that province for the hearing of representations by interested persons.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What is meant by "one sitting"? Is that one day? If it does mean one day that is not sufficient, because if a commission sat from ten o'clock in the morning until noon and then adjourned for tea, that would not be long enough to hear all the representations which can be expected.

Mr. MacEachen: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that "one sitting" in this sense is similar to a court sitting, which may be as long as required.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, in this regard I came with my music prepared. I should like to go slightly further than the minister has suggested in his proposed amendment. In my view the commission should sit for longer than one sitting. I suggest that we should strike out the whole of paragraph 1 and substitute the following. "A commission shall in the performance of its duties under this act, and before completing its report, hold one or more sittings in the province for the hearing of representations by interested bodies or persons." After all, in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec it would not be possible to hold only one sitting in each and receive all the representations expected. I am sure that in respect of a province as large as Ontario at least four sittings would be required; therefore I suggest it should be mandatory.

I think the Minister of Transport previously agreed with the contention advanced at an earlier stage of the debate that public sittings must be mandatory, and I would think the language should constitute a directive rather than as proposed, because it seems that it is exceptional. The language of the amendment put forward by the minister is "except that before completing its report it shall hold". I suggest it would be better and simpler to say, "it shall hold one or more sittings" and let it go at that.

Mr. Douglas: Shall hold one or shall hold more? It cannot be both.

Mr. Lambert: Oh, yes.

Mr. Knowles: Maybe it is a matter of semantics, but "shall" is mandatory. If it is "one or more" you introduce the element of choice. Is not the phrase "at least one" better in the sense that it does require one?

Mr. Lambert: I am not going to dispute it. I think we are in agreement.

Mr. MacEachen: I gather that this amendment is acceptable.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, there is one other aspect of the minister's proposal upon which I should like to touch before he assumes it is completely acceptable to all members of the committee. In my view the proposal the minister has placed before us in draft form is an improvement over the original drafting of clause 17, apart from the question of whether the holding of sittings should be optional or mandatory as far as the provincial commissions are concerned.

One point with regard to the original draft which caused me a good deal of concern was the provision with respect to the giving of notice of hearings. I think the proposal advanced by the minister in the substitute draft is an improvement in this respect over the original proposal, which as I understand it provided for the giving of notice only in the Canada Gazette. If the original draft had been accepted it would have created the possibility of people having only five days' notice of a hearing prior to the time within which they had to give notice of their intention to make representations and to file their written representations with the secretary of the commission.

The proposal the minister has put forward suggests that notice must be given at least 30 days before the commencement of the sittings, and that notice in writing to the secretary by interested persons must be filed within 20 days from the date of publication in the Canada Gazette of the advertisement referred to in subsection 1. This certainly provides more opportunity for those desiring to file notice of their intention to make representations, but I suggest to the minister that even with that provision there are places in my constituency where it would take more than that time for the Canada Gazette to reach people and for a reply to reach the hands of the secretary of the commission through the mail services provided by the government.

I think the minister will agree that it is not only those people who live in large urban centres where daily mail service prevails who should have the right to make representations to the commission. The Canada Gazette is not very widely read, of course, by people generally throughout Canada, and I suggest that in addition to publication therein provision should be made to require the commission to give notice, to use a phrase that is certainly in some election acts if not in the Canada Elections Act, in at least one newspaper circulating in the district or districts affected. I think this would be a distinct improvement and would give the commissions a clearer directive that it was the desire of parliament that they should provide every opportunity to people in all parts of the province affected by the hearings of a commission to make representations if they so desired.

[Mr. Knowles.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) spoke about the period of time at the disposal of those who wish to appear before a commission, because I believe that a period of five days between the date when the meeting of the commission is announced and the time witnesses must notify the commission before which they wish to appear, is insufficient.

I believe that it would be advisable to extend further the period of time at the disposal of those who wish to make submissions, because even a time limit of ten days is rather short.

I would also point out that paragraph 5 should be added to those presently included in this bill.

I wonder whether under this subclause 5, it would not be possible for the commission, which is required by subclause 1 to sit at least one day, not to sit at all, since it is free to state that the evidence to be given is not to be heard at the sitting, so that if that commission felt that no evidence was worthy of being heard at that sitting, it could simply decide not to sit.

I wonder if subclause 5 is not at variance with subclause 1 of section 17, because I feel the commission could easily give the following interpretation to subclause 5: since there is no evidence likely to be of interest to the commission, the commission will not be required to sit at the place scheduled for that date.

I therefore ask the minister to clear up this point and also suggest that he might extend even to 30 days the period of time allowed to people anxious to submit representations to the commissions.

[*Text*]

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether we are going to discuss the whole of clause 17 at one time or do so by subclauses. The discussion started on 17 (1), then

jumped to 17 (2) and has now come back to 17 (1). I would prefer to limit myself to 17 (1) and then go on to 17 (2), because it raises an entirely different sort of suggestion that we would wish to make to the minister. So far as 17 (1) is concerned, I had one wording but I am quite prepared to accept the minister's wording.

Mr. MacEachen: Would it be desirable that I should move the amendment to clause 17, subclause 1, now and dispose of 17 (1)?

Mr. Lambert: Yes.

Mr. MacEachen: I move:

That subsection 1 of clause 17 be deleted and that the following subsection be substituted therefor—

Mr. Lambert: I think one of your colleagues has to do this.

Mr. MacEachen: I am advised that because the motion is in the name of the Prime Minister I am free to do so.

—17. (1) A commission may, in the performance of its duties under this act, sit at such times and places in the province for which it is established as it deems necessary, except that before completing its report it shall hold at least one sitting in that province for the hearing of representations by interested persons.

The Chairman: The committee has heard the proposed amendment. Is it carried?

Amendment agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now deal with subclause 2.

Mr. Lambert: I agree with the general principles enunciated by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni but I think it would be preferable to expand the advertisement beyond the Canada Gazette. Who receives the Canada Gazette? Lawyers and official bodies receive it by mail. It takes two or three days to deliver and has not a general circulation. As a matter of fact a lot of lawyers put it into their libraries when they receive it, and in some cases into their wastepaper baskets, and whether opened or unopened is always a good question.

Representation is such an important matter that I suggest the advertisement not only be published in the Canada Gazette, in order to make it official, but also in at least two appropriate daily newspapers published in a province. When I use the words "appropriate daily newspapers" I am thinking of a province such as Quebec where it should be published in both the French and English language papers, and the same would apply in New Brunswick.

Alberta has two definite regions, and so the advertisement could be published in a Calgary paper and an Edmonton paper, and for the province of Saskatchewan in Regina and Saskatoon papers. In B.C. it could be published in one of the daily newspapers on Vancouver island and in another on the mainland. Further, there should be at least 30 days notice given before the commencement of sittings.

Mr. Moreau: The hon. member's purposes are good, but does he not think that since this matter comes up only once in ten years and is of considerable public importance, the newspapers would carry information about the sittings in any case?

Mr. Lambert: They might, but possibly not concerning the exact hour and date of sittings. There are consequential provisions concerning the submission of representations, and that such representations be received prior to a certain time. One organization may say, "We will have our submission in the mail by the 10th of the month," but the commission may have indicated it wants all submissions received by 12 noon or 3 p.m. on that date.

Calls for tenders and other types of official notices on behalf of the government are advertised in daily newspapers, and surely the changes which may be made in constituency boundaries deserve as much consideration as calls for tenders. With the greatest respect to the government, if there is one way of making sure something will not be seen by the general public it is for the government to put it in the Canada Gazette.

I have an amendment which I am prepared to move, but if the minister accepted this suggestion I think it would be better if it were moved by the government.

Mr. Barnett: I am pleased to have the support of the hon. member for Edmonton West with respect to notice other than in the Canada Gazette. I thought he was doing quite well when he outlined his proposal for advertisements in two newspapers—

Mr. Lambert: In at least two.

Mr. Barnett: That makes it better. I thought he was doing quite well when he discussed some provinces, but he boggled a bit when he got to B.C. When I suggested earlier that the advertisement be published in a newspaper circulating in the area concerned I had in mind the situation in my own province of B.C. where I do not think two newspapers could be said to cover the province.

If the area most affected were in the coastal region, say the Prince Rupert area, a Vancouver city or Vancouver island newspaper would not be suitable, nor do I think would the people of the Kootenays agree that a Vancouver newspaper would be suitable for their purposes. For that reason I would not like to see a commission confined to publishing the advertisement in two newspapers within a province.

Mr. Thomas: I would like to support the contentions of the previous two speakers, and in addition to newspaper advertisements I suggest the best way to disseminate this information would be to contact the people most concerned, the candidates in the preceding general election and the candidates in any intervening by-election. They would then disseminate the information to their political parties.

Mr. Patterson: I wish to support the views expressed by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni. We all recognize the fact that very few people who receive the Canada Gazette read it, but I do not believe the suggestion made by the hon. member for Edmonton West is adequate, because it is almost impossible to pick out two papers in a province—

Mr. Lambert: At least two.

Mr. Patterson: He says at least two, but I think you would have to go much beyond that to give the coverage required. We believe the fullest information possible should be disseminated in this connection. I think the government is aware of other means by which this could be done. I do not see why we could not use our own broadcasting corporation to place this information before the public. It is there, and it is providing a public service. I think all these media should be used to acquaint people of what is going on relative to this important matter.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I approve the view expressed by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). This bill must be given great publicity as it is certainly a most important piece of legislation since it deals with the preparation of the future electoral map of Canada.

However, I wonder if my hon. friend has read subsection 3 of clause 17. According to the principle he has laid down will it be necessary, in newspaper advertisements to insert the drawing referred to in subsection (3)?

Are you in favour?

[Mr. Barnett.]

Mr. Lambert: Oh, yes.

[*Text*]

Mr. Bell: I should like to suggest to the minister, if he does not look too kindly on the proposal to publish this information in newspapers, that he might consider the methods used by such bodies as the board of broadcast governors and the board of transport commissioners with regard to their hearings on the subject of new radio stations, the discontinuance of railway lines, and so on. I think it is most important that every opportunity with regard to time should be given to all those who are interested and that facilities for publication should be made available. After all, hearings of this type are only held every ten years.

Mr. MacEachen: I appreciate that the Canada Gazette is not widely read in the constituency of the hon. member for Edmonton West, or, for that matter, I hasten to add, in any other constituency in the country. I appreciate the hon. member's interest in this point. I gather that when notice is published in the Canada Gazette that the commission proposes to hold hearings it is a matter of general interest which would be picked up by the news media and widely publicized. This of course would give appropriate publicity to such hearings. However, I am prepared to make an attempt, at least, to meet the views expressed by the hon. member. I readily accept the point made by the hon. member for Edmonton West that the number of days might be increased from 15 to 30 and I will also accept, at least in part, the proposal with respect to newspaper publication. Would it not meet the situation if we provided that notice of the time and place fixed by the commission for any sittings to be held for the hearing of representations from interested persons shall be given by public advertisement in the Canada Gazette and in at least one daily newspaper of general circulation in the province concerned? This is going to be an expensive business—

(Translation)

Mr. Lambert: And in the province of Quebec, it would be in an English language newspaper?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: Probably we should say that the information should be made public in at least one daily newspaper. The commissions will themselves be able to decide on the basis of their appreciation of the need for publicity whether to utilize more than

one. But let us say "at least one". If this meets with the wishes of the committee, I would move:

That subclause 2 of clause 17 be struck out and that the following be substituted—

Mr. Thomas: Before that amendment is read, I wonder if I might press this idea that all candidates at the preceding general election should be notified at the same time as publication is made in the Canada Gazette. After all, the representatives of our organized political parties in Canada are the people who operate our elections and our election machinery. Were it not for the organized political parties and the people who have taken an interest in this work over the years, our elections would be nothing but confusion. You can reach these people most readily through the candidates who contested the previous general election and I would certainly urge that notification be sent to the candidates.

Mr. MacEachen: I appreciate the importance of organized political parties and the desirability of candidates being informed. But it seems to me these constitute the group of persons most capable of getting this information, particularly if they are interested in running again. I would think this group would automatically follow these matters and need no special notification.

Mr. Knowles: They might even read the Canada Gazette.

Mr. MacEachen: It might be required reading for all candidates.

Mr. Barnett: Before the minister proceeds I should like to raise one point. If I heard him correctly, he intends to use the phrase "in at least one daily newspaper". I cannot see it is necessary to include that word "daily".

Mr. Lambert: Oh yes.

Mr. Barnett: Why? In certain areas of this country the commission might well consider it most desirable to publish in a newspaper which appeared less frequently than daily. If the word "daily" is used the commission will be prevented from exercising its discretion in this way. The minister may not have realized it but there are large areas of British Columbia where the residents just do not get daily newspapers within a reasonable time after their publication. But there may be a perfectly adequate weekly paper covering the area and I should like to see the legislation left open on this point so that the commission would not be bound in all cases to use daily newspapers, though I have no doubt that in most parts of Canada daily newspapers would be selected.

Mr. Francis: I cannot support the suggestion of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni. In the first place we are meeting the request which was made with regard to time; the minister has indicated that 30 days will be allowed instead of 15. This deals with part of the problem. There is one other matter to which I would draw attention. In most of the metropolitan areas there are local papers which come out weekly or biweekly. I have noticed that in some cases the requirement of the Canada Elections Act for publication of the expenditures of candidates is met by publication in a weekly newspaper in a relatively obscure section of the riding. The technical requirement of publication is still met but I would not like to see a loophole of this kind left in the present measure and I do not believe that upon reflection the hon. member for Comox-Alberni would like it left in either.

Mr. Barnett: The minister suggested that publication would have to be made in a newspaper in general circulation and I think this would cover the point raised by the hon. member for Carleton. I can understand the consideration he has in mind in regard to urban areas, but I still maintain my right to suggest that people who live in scattered rural areas, where there may be no daily newspaper circulating, should be entitled to the same rights with regard to notice as people who live in populous places such as Carleton, which the hon. member represents in this house.

Mr. MacEachen: I will certainly take out the word "daily", Mr. Chairman. I do not think it will hurt the matter. Therefore may I continue with the motion. I move:

That subsection 2 be struck out and that the following be substituted:

"Notice of the time and place fixed by the commission for any sitting to be held by it for the hearing of representations from interested persons shall be given by advertisement published in the Canada Gazette and in at least one newspaper of general circulation in the province at least 30 days before the commencement of such sitting".

Amendment agreed to.

Subclause as amended agreed to.

The Chairman: We are now on subclause 4, notice of representation to be given before sittings.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, is not the minister going to move an amendment to subclause 4?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, I have an amendment here to subclause 4, but before moving it, if hon. members would like to speak to the subclause it might be better.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of subclause 4 is to maintain the ten days notice to the commission. Under the bill as originally proposed, with the 15 days and then ten days before the commencement of the sittings, it allowed only five days for the public to become aware of a sitting, after publication of the notice, and to make up their minds after studying the advertisement whether they wished to make representations. Then they had to prepare a synopsis of their representations and get it into the hands of the secretary to the commission. Frankly that was impossible. That is why there has been the insistence on the 30 days notice. Now that the minister has brought forward the 30 days amendment, notice must be given within 20 days after the date of publication. This means that the commission will get ten clear days notice. I think that is basically the same requirement in subclause 4 as it now stands as it is in the proposed amendment. I would have thought that was not necessary. I would have thought it would be adequate to give five days notice.

My notes in the original instance on examination of this bill indicate that five days notice would be sufficient, and therefore we could take the proposed amendment of the minister by saying "within 25 days of the date of hearing". I think the purpose of the notice is to give the public the chance to study the proposals and make their representations. It must be remembered that you will be dealing in many instances with really untrained persons, in so far as making representations before public bodies is concerned. They are not going to go running to high priced counsel to make these representations. Therefore every latitude should be given to the public in this regard.

It may be a little bit of tough luck on the commission, but in any event the subject is somewhat limited. I do not know how many representations will be received, say in the province of Alberta, with regard to 17 seats as the matter now stands. Ontario, regionally might be somewhat greater. But I do feel, and suggest to the minister, that at this time we should bear in mind that publication in the Canada Gazette at the first of the month will perhaps not get to the people until the third of the month, and if it is a newspaper circulated in a province, by the time it gets to the rural areas three or four days may have been eaten up. Let us give the public the benefit of any latitude that can be given. Therefore instead of saying "20 days from the date of publication", why not say 25 days, giving the commissions five days before the sittings? I think this would be quite adequate. I put my point forward on that basis, Mr. Chairman. There is a proposal for a subclause 5 and I am going to have something to say about that, but I am dealing with subclause 4 at the present time.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I am advised, and I think there is considerable validity in this view, that the commissions will require more than five days between the moment a representation is received and the time a hearing is held. This is regarded as the irreducible minimum in order to give the commissions an opportunity to sift out the representations. There may be many representations received by a commission and it may not be possible for them to get ready for a hearing and hold it in five days. We think ten days is the minimum they ought to have. I put that forward as a reason why the provision which is contained in the amended subclause 4 ought to be maintained.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, the minister will readily understand that in certain areas of the country time will be taken up by what might be called the portal to portal requirements in connection with notice reaching interested people. Then they have to prepare their representations and get them into the hands of the secretary. Anywhere from seven to ten days may elapse as a result. Therefore what I am concerned about is the time allotted to the public to study the proposals, make up their minds and then prepare their representations. I am concerned that this time is being squeezed. After all, there will be a deadline imposed by the secretary to the commission, and if they say representations will be received until five o'clock on a certain day, and that is ten days before the sittings, difficulties might arise for the public. In this regard I would ask the minister, just how complicated can these representations be? The commissioners may have to bend over a little more, I will admit; but my concern is primarily for the public, unless the intention is to insist that they go to high priced counsel to prepare these briefs and get them in. I think we would be erring on

the side of restriction rather than on being generous with the public.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words in support of the views expressed by the hon. member for Edmonton West with respect to increasing the number of days to 25. Let us consider the situation. The commissions will be well versed in the electoral boundaries of the ridings with which they are concerned, because they will have studied them and set those boundaries. They will know the conditions that exist in the constituencies with which they are concerned. On the other hand, when a notice appears to the general public it will not be the individual who will be making the representation as much as groups of people interested in the political affairs of that particular constituency. No one person in that organization is going to make the necessary decision as to whether or not representations should be made. Meetings will have to be called; they will have to prepare themselves and look at the situation, all of which will take a longer time than it would take the commission to acquaint themselves with the representations they have already carefully studied in the setting out of the electoral boundaries. Therefore I think if we are to decide which way it should go the benefit should be given to those people who are not acquainted with what is going on but who are anxious, after careful consideration resulting from a number of meetings, to decide whether or not they should make a representation, and also to decide what form the representation should take.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might say a few words on this question. I certainly agree with the two hon. members who have just spoken with regard to the need for adequate time. We have already dealt with the clause which requires at least 30 days notice to be given. I am wondering whether the minister, in view of his earlier remarks, could give us any indication, arising out of any experience, knowledge or advice he has on the question, just what emphasis will be put on the 30 days and what interpretation will be given to the words "at least". In other words, if we could have some reasonable assurance that the normal practice would be that more than 30 days notice would be given and that only in unusual circumstances would just 30 days notice be given, then I think there might be a better case for the minister's idea that the commissions will require at least 10 days notice. It would appear to me that in using the phrase "at least 30 days" we are indicating the general desire of this house in putting through this measure that the normal practice should be that wherever feasible more than 30 days notice should be given. Has the minister any advice or information in this particular connection which he is able to give the committee on this very important aspect of the matter?

Mr. Bell: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister whether he has any information on the Australian act in this regard? I understand a lot of the thinking behind the bill has originated from the Australian position and it is quite important that we do give adequate time. Perhaps we should have considered subclause 2 in relation to subclause 4. I am all in favour of all the time in the world. The minister, coming from Nova Scotia, is familiar with a case conducted before the transport board regarding the discontinuance of a railway line of which very little notice was given the public and considerable annoyance resulted. Surely we know what is the experience in Australia.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Chairman, in our meetings with the electoral officer who studied the Australian act—some members of the house took advantage of this—Mr. Castonguay, in reporting on the Australian experience, did indicate to the members interested—I do not know whether the hon. member who just spoke was at the meeting—that it was the experience of the commission in Australia that the largest number of public hearings were rather beneficial, and I think probably that would be the attitude of our commissions.

With regard to the point made by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, let me say that 30 days is a minimum time for advertisement, and I certainly hope the commissions in Canada will give more time than that. I think we must keep in mind that this is the minimum time. In my opinion we should not attempt to hamstring the commission too much. We must remember that five days might just straddle a week end, which may give them very little time. We are dealing with people who, to some extent at least, are engaged in other occupations as well. I hope the members of the committee will accept the amendment proposed, bearing in mind that we are indicating to the commissions that 30 days is a minimum period.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member for Saint John-Albert said, if we had looked a little more carefully at subclause

2 we might have provided 40 days so as to give 30 days to the public and then 10 days to the commission. The point of view expressed by the hon. member for York-Scarborough and also by the minister with regard to the commission is certainly a very arguable one and I agree that there is some merit in it. But in balancing the two as between the public interest and the interest of the board within a limitation of 30 days, my view is that we should err on the side of the public.

If one looks back to clause 13 certain factors are indicated at which the commission may look in deciding to go outside the normal population quotient, such as the special geographic conditions, sparsity or density of population, historical boundaries, historical counties and such other matters. Those people will have to mobilize their information, and so forth, because it is not going to be the city ridings where there will be trouble. One street compared to another is not going to make as much difference as, say, a traditional boundary or county. In the older parts of Canada these traditional boundaries are certainly very important and I think must fully be taken into account. That is why I tend to plump on the side of the public interest rather than what I might call the administrative convenience of the commission.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I should like to support the argument which has been raised for a greater length of time, and I should like to quote an example to the minister from northern Ontario, where I imagine at the first redistribution there will be the most difficulty. You will have a situation where there would be five ridings to which probably some adjustments will be made. They cover a distance of roughly 700 miles from east to west and 600 miles from north to south, with communities scattered all along the way. I would point here to Kenora-Rainy River, where some communities involving several thousand voters could be on the margins of boundaries with as much as 300 or 400 miles between them.

Another point is that there is no single newspaper which reaches this region. There is no radio station or television station in this region. The watersheds of influence and information are tremendously varied and the changes which will be necessary as a result of any commission hearings and subsequent redistribution will be substantial. If I may give one example, it is quite possible that the constituency of Port Arthur, which is going to be cut considerably, is likely to have some relationship with Kapuskasing and even Timmins; yet there is no normal centre for any communication between these two places at all. For that reason I think the time mentioned is really minimal; it is very narrow.

I think the minister is aware that during elections there is an extra time allowance for certain of the northern ridings because of their area, and it is a rather substantial time allowance in relationship to the total electoral period. It seems to me that very same argument applies in this case. Therefore I should like to support the arguments which have been put forward by the hon. member for Edmonton West regarding the time factor. I like the improvement to this clause suggested by the minister but I think he can be even more generous.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, the minister has been very kind in accepting certain suggestions, but perhaps the way out of this dilemma would be to leave the ten day period and make the notice 40 days. As the hon. member for Port Arthur has pointed out, objections will be raised in remote sections of the country where communities may be shifted from one riding to another, and it is under those circumstances that the people will require additional time. It is relatively simple to effect a redistribution and notify everyone in a city riding where the large population changes will be made. However, the controversial changes are going to be those where townships and towns are changed. Perhaps the minister would accept the 40 days notice and the ten day period, because in fairness to everyone five days is a short period of time for the commission to prepare for representations.

Mr. MacEachen: I am conscious of the argument that has been made in respect of giving the public sufficient time, but a few moments ago we decided that the 30 days would be ample. We must reconcile the interest of the public with the efficient conduct of the commission's work.

What we could do is give the commission a week, or seven days, and within the 30 day period give the public 23 days, providing additional time within that 30 day period. In most provinces I do not think the commissions will need the 30 days, but in large provinces they will perhaps need more.

Mr. Smith: In the first instance they will require more time.

Mr. MacEachen: We must bear in mind that the commissions, in the exercise of their duties, can take more time if necessary, be-

cause this suggested 30 day period is a minimum. The commission could take 40 or 50 days if they require that much time. We are only suggesting that the time must be at least 30 days.

Perhaps I may be allowed to move an amendment making this seven days and 23 days.

Mr. Chairman, I move:

That subclause 4 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"No representation shall be heard by a commission at any sittings held by it for the hearing of representations from interested persons unless notice in writing is given to the secretary to the commission within 23 days from the date of publication in the Canada Gazette of the advertisements referred to in subsection (2), stating the name and address of the person by whom the representation is sought to be made and indicating concisely the nature of the representation and of the interest of such person.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, since this was prepared on the basis of the Canada Gazette, and the minister then amended subsection 2 to include the words "and in at least one newspaper of general circulation in the province", would it not be proper to have this subclause read "within 23 days from the date of publication of the advertisements referred to in subsection 2"?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could make that change by consent.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, would that not spoil the effect of this amendment? If a commission decided it should have 40, 50 or 60 days, the effect of this subclause, fixing the time from the date of that publication, would prevent the commission from providing more time. I think it would be much safer, if we want seven days, to simply change the ten to seven.

The Chairman: The committee has heard the amendment as proposed by the minister and further amended by the suggestion of the hon. member for Edmonton West, which now is as follows:

No representation shall be heard by a commission at any sittings held by it for the hearing of representations from interested persons unless notice in writing is given to the secretary to the commission within 23 days from the date of publication of the advertisements referred to in subsection (2), stating the name and address of the person by whom the representation is sought to be made and indicating concisely the nature of the representation and of the interest of such person.

Is the subclause carried as amended?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Thomas: On division.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to subclause 5.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting that a subclause 5 be added to clause 17 as follows:

A commission may, in the case of any representation of which notice has been given under subsection (4), dispense with the hearing of such representation at any sittings held by it where, in its opinion, the nature of the representation as indicated in the notice is such that no such hearing is necessary.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised that the minister has come forward with this proposed amendment, because it represents a judgment without a hearing. I could not for a moment accept it. It may be that in a case where there are no representations the commission would not be required to sit, although it has given notice of a hearing, but we could not possibly accept this amendment in its present form. It states "the nature of the representation as indicated in the notice is such that no such hearing is necessary." We are giving carte blanche to the commission to reject, in theory, any representation, yet the machinery of the act does not provide for any appeal from the commission's decision in this regard. Again I think public interest demands that any representations made must be heard. After all, the requirement is only on the basis of a concise representation as referred to in subclause 4. Therefore, representations could be dismissed out of hand on the basis of a précis or synthesis of a representation to be made, and there is no appeal whatsoever from a commission's decision.

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member permit a question? Perhaps I misunderstood him, but is he suggesting that the commission should be bound to accept representations made by anyone?

Mr. Lambert: I am suggesting that representations must be heard, and that is all. If at the hearing it is apparent that the representation is frivolous, the commission should hear the people and tell them that their representation will not be considered. I do not think the commission should be permitted to reply by letter to the effect that it has received a representation but cannot understand or accept it, and therefore there is not going to be a hearing. This problem is theoretical, but is in respect of theoretical problems that trouble occurs. With the greatest respect to the minister, we on this side cannot accept his amendment.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, before the hon. member for Edmonton West takes a firm position, may I ask him in respect of those representations having to do with minor patent errors in the description of boundaries which representations they propose to accept. Every redistribution committee I have been on has experienced several cases involving obvious omissions in descriptions, and that sort of thing. How would the hon. member handle that situation?

Mr. Lambert: The same way as would be done in a court of appeal. An appeal is launched and the court may not hear counsel prior to granting the appeal. In any event, it makes a public declaration that it is accepting the appeal, or if it is not accepting the appeal without argument it then hears argument. No court will say: We have judged these cases and no sittings will be held. This is what this subamendment is suggesting is possible, that the commission will say they have read the representations and they reject them out of hand. If they accept them that may be all right, but what about the rejections?

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member was taking a firm position in absolute terms with regard to the proposed amendment and I was trying to suggest to him that in the case of both the redistribution committees on which I have served there were several situations where there were minor inaccuracies in the description of boundaries. They were petty things and I do not want to take time to recount them in detail. Surely there should be provision somewhere to permit the commission to deal with that type of case. Possibly this clause does not do it.

Mr. Lambert: The minister will agree with me that the proposition I have put forward is quite tenable and that under the wording of the proposed subamendment representations could be rejected entirely out of hand. That would be possible under this wording.

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, but I was trying to intimate to the hon. member that having put forward that point he then went much further and excluded the authority to deal with another situation where there may be a necessity for such authority.

Mr. Lambert: Again I would much prefer to err in the other direction than in the direction indicated by the subamendment.

[Mr. Lambert.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the fact of giving the commission the power to reserve its opinion on the representations to be made is something new.

There is the board of broadcast governors which decides in advance whether a brief can be accepted or not. We have also here in this house the decision of the Speaker who decides whether the remarks made are pertinent or not, so that before a matter is completely detailed, he can call the member to order.

However, as I mentioned to the minister a while ago, I wonder if subparagraph 5 does not say the very opposite of subparagraph 1 of clause 17.

As I explained, if the commission feels that no useful information is likely to result from the representations, it might merely decide not to hold a hearing. In my opinion, the discretionary powers given to it by subparagraph 5 are too wide, since under that clause the commission may decide not to sit at all unless there is another way to explain the same thing in that clause.

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of getting this point clear I wonder whether we could have an answer to what the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency has just said. As I understood it, he said that the commission could in its own judgment dispense with the sittings. I do not read it that way. As I read it, the commission could dispense with a representation but it would have to do so at one of the sittings. In other words, if a representation is made that is frivolous or that is not necessary because the matter has been taken care of, the commission could say so but would have to say it publicly at the sitting: We are dispensing with the representation, not with the sitting. Is that not what it says?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Knowles: The proposed subclause 5 reads:

> A commission may, in the case of any representation of which notice has been given under subsection 4, dispense with the hearing of such representation—

May I emphasize these words.

> —at any sittings held by it—

It seems to me it cannot do so in camera or under the table or secretly. It has to do it at the sittings that still have to be held. I wonder whether the minister would com-

ment on the remarks made by the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency and my own remarks so we may get the point clear.

Mr. MacEachen: That is my understanding of the section, that a commission certainly could not dispense with a sitting or a hearing. It could dispense with the hearing of a representation. I should like to indicate to those members who have spoken on this point the reason for making this proposal. It is to avoid placing an obligation on the commission to hear, for example, repetitious representations. And, although it may be an unlikely eventuality, possibly this is the most important point: Suppose a group of individuals or an individual attempted systematically to hold up and delay the work of redistribution by a series of successive representations. This is a possibility that may be unlikely but it may occur. This provision would give the commission the opportunity to dispense with such representations. It certainly is not intended to remove the possibility of hearing valid representations.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, could you not achieve the same result by taking due advantage of clause 16 without the necessity of having subclause 5 of clause 17? I assume that clause 16 was adopted in its present form. Clause 16 gives the commission the power to make rules and surely by making rules, as any appellate court with competent jurisdiction may do, they could prevent the kind of repetition which the minister now appears to be afraid might take place. All that would be required to avoid that result would be the making and promulgation of rules under clause 16.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, these hearings are going to take place only once every 10 years and I think it is just as important that the commission give the appearance of a full hearing for everyone as it is to provide for such hearings. While the minister's explanation is reasonable on the face of it, I should like to draw attention particularly to the last words of the proposed amendment, "that no such hearing is necessary". How would a commission really know whether or not a hearing was necessary until they had heard the representations? I think that the intention of the amendment is perhaps good but the wording is unfortunate and can only suggest that the commission might want to be secretive or might want to have less than a full airing of views. I know that is not the intention but we have there the words "as indicated in the notice is such that no such hearing is necessary".

We are changing the boundaries of the ridings only every 10 years and it is a very final thing. Therefore I think it is most important that no words be left in there that will give the slightest hint of anything less than a full hearing. The President of the Privy Council has suggested that one case might be where the commission is prepared to accept the suggestion of a group. This happens every day with the Ontario municipal board. A group of citizens come before the board and are told at the beginning of the hearing that the board is very happy to see them but it has accepted their proposition. I think that is the way it should be done in this instance. If there is any validity in this amendment then certainly happier and better words could be used.

Mr. Churchill: I take it that the minister did not formally move this subamendment.

Mr. MacEachen: I did not think I had moved it.

Mr. Lambert: So this has been technically all out of order.

Mr. MacEachen: If the hon. member will forgive me for taking the floor, I wish to say my purpose was to put the thought before the committee in the form of an amendment, but I did not move it.

Mr. Churchill: That is my point. It was a bit of kite flying, and we have shot the kite down. Perhaps we could now go on to some other clause of the bill, otherwise we shall have to spend a lot of time discussing a proposal to which we on this side are opposed. The arguments against adopting the amendment have already been presented. I do not want to be guilty of repetition but I think it has been made clear to the minister that, although whoever devised this and put it in front of him may have had a good idea at the time, on examination it does not seem satisfactory.

It is unnecessarily adding something to the bill, and one of the difficulties with attempting to do that with a bill, as has been illustrated this afternoon, is that it immediately strikes members of the committee as being unnecessary. We do not want the commissions to give an appearance of preventing the public being heard. We are charting a new course, and let us not put restrictions on it at the start. If, following experience of commission hearings, it may be advisable in the distant future to make a change, it can be made at that time. I suggest that the minister drop this point now.

Mr. MacEachen: May I suggest that we have another look at it and maybe we could produce a proposal in a form that would be agreeable to members of the committee. I would be willing to pass on, with the understanding that I could come back to this and in the meantime try to work out something that would get general consent.

Mr. Barnett: And may I suggest that in his reconsideration the minister take into account the rather interesting points raised by the hon. member for Peace River in relation to the implications of clause 16, with which we have already dealt. I am wondering whether some slight modification of the wording in clause 16 might not more appropriately cover the problem which I know the minister has in the back of his mind.

Mr. Baldwin: May I tell the minister that the rules of court which are promulgated by supreme court judges are wide enough to cover from time to time the kind of thing the minister has in mind, not to the extent of preventing a litigant from having his remedy before court, but providing the rules under which he gets there. I think clause 16 is ample to cover the sort of thing the minister has in mind.

Mr. MacEachen: I would be glad to have the proposal made by the hon. member for Peace River reviewed, and with further consideration and consultation I reserve the right to come back to this if we can work out something acceptable. On the other hand, if it is established that the point made by the hon. member for Peace River covers the situation, we will not have to come back to this at all.

Clause 17 stands.

On clause 18—*Time within which report to be completed.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, before we consider clause 18, I should like just to say a word on clause 17, in its entirety, since this word is accepted. It is related to the advertising to be done: about the publication of notices in newspapers, according to paragraph 2.

There is one thing I would have liked to see and that is bilingual advertising, whatever the province in which it appears, because in the long run if the notice is published let us say, for instance, in a newspaper of Quebec city—where 5 per cent of the people are English speaking, why should we accept bilingual advertising in Quebec city and not in Prince Edward Island where, according to official data, 8.8 per cent of the people are French speaking?

I respectfully submit, therefore, that all publicity from the federal government should be bilingual, no matter what part of the country it is meant for. That would help us a great deal to fight against those many subversive ideas which are spreading and make the French-Canadian element look upon the federal government as an institution not to be trusted, because it is said that the federal government is not interested in the least in promoting French culture and the French language. That is why I find this suggestion most timely and that the government should see to it that all publicity be bilingual, for the federal government, besides being the government of 12 million English speaking people, is also that of six million French speaking Canadians. It would seem to me, then, to be perfectly logical and reasonable that this matter be given serious consideration and that all publicity from the federal government be bilingual across the country.

[*Text*]

Clause 18 agreed to.

On clause 19—*Report to be laid before house.*

Mr. Lambert: With respect to subclause 2 I think the same considerations would apply to the dissemination of the report of the commission as were required for the purposes of the notices of sittings. Therefore I would suggest that the subclause be amended by adding to it the words "and in at least one newspaper of general circulation in each of the provinces".

Mr. Thomas: Why could we not have the candidates in the last preceding general election notified? Speaking on a previous clause the minister said this would not be desirable and I would like him to enlarge on his reasons.

Mr. MacEachen: My thoughts are simple on this point. I do not see why candidates, important as we regard ourselves, should be singled out for special attention. Second, I think those who are candidates have an inbuilt incentive to inform themselves about these matters.

Mr. Barnett: What about the point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West?

Mr. MacEachen: The report of any commission in a province is bound to get publicity. Surely it will be big news and will appear in every paper. Further, such reports are likely to be voluminous, and may possibly contain electoral maps. I ask, do members of the committee think it necessary to publish the whole of such a report as an advertisement in the newspapers, since the report itself is bound to get publicity? I should like to meet the point made by the hon. member for Edmonton West but I do believe that here is a case where the news is of such importance that it is bound to get out—

Mr. Lambert: But there is one point which I would bring to the minister's attention with regard to the time element involved. Clause 20 reads:

> If within a period of 30 days from the day the copy of the report of any commission for a province is laid before the House of Commons or published pursuant to section 19—

There is a time limit and I do not think we can rely on the fact that communications media will pick up the report. There is an official step to be taken. There is a requirement. And if we require somebody to do something within a certain period there must be a starting date and there must be publication of that date. Certainly the news media will carry the story. But we do not know in what form they will use it. After all, a daily newspaper is not likely to take page after page spelling out reams of descriptions of changes in constituencies on the fringe of its circulation area. How much news space can a metropolitan newspaper devote to a report of this kind? In certain towns and cities there is only one newspaper, and one aspect of this is a smattering of editorial content between the advertisements. This constitutes the newspaper on certain big shopping days. Why not guarantee the widest distribution by the publication of this report? It may take a whole page. What is the difference? Is it not worth it? You are paying $800 or $900—

Mr. Moreau: But we may be dealing here with a voluminous report and surely the hon. member is not suggesting that the whole report be published. I should like to bring to the hon. gentleman's attention a recent experience when some changes were made in metropolitan boundaries. They received considerable publicity throughout the province of Ontario; new maps were printed, and so on. I suggest to the hon. member that his concept of making this information available by public advertisement could be applied to almost any piece of legislation. Surely he is not suggesting we should insert paid advertisements in newspapers throughout the country to acquaint the public with everything parliament has done? There is a role here for the news media. It strikes me this would be a news story of paramount importance. One paper would be trying to "scoop" another and I cannot see any need for the publication of the whole report.

Mr. Lambert: Is the hon. member suggesting, then, that a deadline be fixed on the basis of the publication of a news story? We are involved here in a legal requirement, because 31 days after the happening of an event it will be too late to do something. I say therefore that the legislation has to provide for a legal pattern. There must be a starting point which is generally known, not merely a date of publication in the Canada Gazette which is unknown to the public generally.

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member not agree that there is a role here for the member of parliament? He will have access to the report when it is tabled in the house, and if there are any features in it which appear to him to be objectionable he will be in a position to deal with them. It would seem to me that when we take into account the Canada Gazette, the news media and the members of parliament who will receive copies of the report we find ourselves with ample means of getting out this information.

Mr. Lambert: On the other hand, as far as members of this house are concerned they receive the Canada Gazette at their offices, and we are talking about a period between sessions. It is all very well for the hon. member opposite who comes from Toronto, close to Ottawa, to talk in this way but I am thinking of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, for instance, who could be entirely cut off from a notice in the Canada Gazette, completely to his detriment. I admit there will be wide publicity, but a news story does not start the clock ticking for a legal pattern.

Mr. Churchill: I take it that clauses 19 and 20 refer to procedures to to be followed by members of the House of Commons. If we could add something at the end of subclause 2 of clause 19 whereby members would be notified individually of the report, it would meet the objection raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West. The general public are not concerned with the wording of the clause we are considering, but the members of this

house are. I do not have the wording in mind at the moment but I would think that if a few words could be added at the end of subclause 2 providing for direct notification being given to members of parliament, this might satisfy us.

Mr. Barnett: I was on the point of rising to make a suggestion along the lines of the one just made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. It seems to me his proposal would meet the situation. If, in addition to publication in the Canada Gazette, the Speaker were required to notify members of the house individually when the house was not in session, an opportunity would be given for action to be taken within the time limit as suggested in clause 20.

Mr. Thomas: Again, I come back to my suggestion that all the candidates in the general election preceding redistribution should be entitled to this information, not just the sitting members.

Mr. Lambert: This affects the sitting members only.

Mr. Bell: While the minister is thinking about this matter for a few moments, I return to the point I raised a short while ago. It is true we are dealing with new legislation here but I think some of the patterns which have been established by other boards and commissions could well be followed at the present time. For example, we have been talking about notification of interested parties. I suggested we might follow some of the practices used by such bodies as the board of broadcast governors and the board of transport commissioners. The post office has a system which provides for notification after hearings have been held. When the board of broadcast governors has held a hearing, those concerned are notified by mail, afterwards, of the results. Would it not be possible to follow a system of this kind? I think it should be the responsibility of the commission not only to notify interested parties so that they may make their representations but also to make the results available afterwards. I urge that some standard procedure be followed throughout this whole business of notification and publication.

Mr. MacEachen: The proposal put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre is satisfactory. I would be prepared to include a provision that a copy of the relevant Canada Gazette—the copy which contains the report—

[Mr. Churchill.]

Mr. Knowles: It had better be a marked copy.

Mr. MacEachen: —be sent to each member of parliament; that it be mailed to each member of parliament. This is a matter, as the hon. member for Edmonton West pointed out, that relates to an action that must be taken by members of parliament and it is logical that some special effort should be made to see that the reports get into the hands of members. I do not think that effort will really be required, but it might be desirable in the future, when members may not be so concerned about the boundaries of their ridings.

The Chairman: Is the minister proposing an amendment to clause 19?

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, could we leave this clause open until after the dinner hour? There are other amendments that will be brought in at that time for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. MacEachen: Certainly.

The Chairman: Clause 19 stands.

On clause 20—*Procedure where objection filed with Speaker.*

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, with regard to clause 20, I think earlier in the debate on second reading hon. members had drawn out attention to line 29 which says:

> —signed by not less than one third of the members of the House of Commons representing electoral districts in that province—

With the distribution of seats by parties, this prohibits any objection by certain provinces. I think this is something the committee must now consider, namely how objections can be put forward by parties which are not represented in the house.

Mr. MacEachen: We have considered the points that have been raised in this regard and I have circulated a proposed amendment, Mr. Chairman. I hope all interested hon. members have a copy. This represents a rather important change to clause 20. As I read the changes proposed, the one third is reduced to one fourth of the members of the House of Commons representing electoral districts in that province. This meets, of course, a point that was made in the debate by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka, who argued, as an illustration of the necessity for a change, that the present membership of his party in the province of Ontario is less than one third and therefore the group from that province would not be in a position to take the action that is contemplated.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It would be the same in Quebec.

Mr. MacEachen: I am sure that may occur in other provinces. So we have met that point and are suggesting that one fourth of the members of the House of Commons representing electoral districts in that province sign such an objection and file it with the Speaker. Of course, the Solicitor General, for example, and the hon. member for Queens (Mr. MacLean) would be in a different position; one member from the province of Prince Edward Island would be able to raise an objection. That might be fine.

Mr. Knowles: With regard to this new rule, Mr. Chairman, supposing my hon. friend the minister and his friends do not like the map that is submitted for Saskatchewan; what would they do about it?

Mr. Lambert: Lump it.

Mr. MacEachen: That is the point that was raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. I suppose we could not do anything about it, unless we could get the co-operation of hon. members on the other side to present a proposal.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a serious point here, even though there has been some amusement about it. After all, while the members of a province do have a particular interest in the ridings of that province, under this clause the matter is being brought before parliament; it is parliament as a whole that looks at it. I am wondering whether there is not some way whereby a certain number of members of parliament could do it, rather than its being limited to those from the particular province concerned.

Mr. Smith: That is co-operative federalism at its worst.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, this is a rather harsh rule. I can think of a number of provinces in which there could be no objection, no matter what was done. In the province of Saskatchewan, of course, no objection could be raised by anyone. With regard to the province of Alberta, the Liberal party would be in the same position. With regard to the province of Quebec, on this basis we would simply have to accept what was determined for us.

I am wondering whether there should not be a provision made, as a member of parliament represents all of Canada, that one fourth of the members of the House of Commons should be concerned with such an objection. That would give a general power of objection. It could never hope to cover the various third parties, but it would cover the position of the two major parties. Certainly the system that is provided in the amendment would not protect third parties at all; but if there were a provision whereby one quarter of the membership of the house would be able to object, I think it would be fair. On the present basis it is certainly anything but fair. Again I repeat that, as a member of parliament represents not only his own constituency but his country, if provision were made for one fourth of the members of the house to object to what had taken place in Quebec, Ontario or any other province, I think the general cause of objection in this regard would be removed.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Leader of the Opposition would clarify a point for me. I think members of the committee would realize the danger in having 25 per cent of the members of the House of Commons considering the whole report. I think this might be acceptable province by province; but it seems to me that members of parliament are never so impartial as when they are considering ridings other than their own. In view of the far reaching effects of this redistribution, I do not think it is likely that any of us will be completely happy with the final report. It would seem to me there would be a very serious danger if the report were considered in its entirety, and perhaps it should be considered province by province.

I believe this is why the initial proposal was made. The final decision by the House of Commons would be by the majority of members and not necessarily by those members who come from that province. This report will have to be accepted by parliament, as I understand it.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, there is a much more fundamental change in the amendment than the one to which reference has been made; that is, that in the original draft of clause 20 the members who register an objection with the Speaker have the right to debate the matter, and if the house passes a resolution to this effect, the report is sent back to the commissioner for reconsideration by the commission. The draft now before us provides:

—the Speaker shall, within the first five days next after the expiration of that period that the House of Commons is sitting, cause a copy of the objection to be laid before the House of Commons

and published in the *Votes and Proceedings* of the said house, and the report shall thereupon be referred back to the representation commissioner by the Speaker, together with a copy of the objection, for reconsideration by the commission having regard to the objection.

I take it this means there will be no debate and no resolution agreed to by the house. If that is correct, I would object very strongly either to the provision that it would require one quarter of the members from a particular province to register an objection or to the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that one quarter of the members of the house be required to register an objection. If these objections are not going to be debated it seems to me that any ten members should be allowed to file an objection. Since all that is going to be done with these objections is to have them appear in *Votes and Proceedings* and then be referred back to the commission for reconsideration, I do not think we need restrict the number very severely. I can understand that when an objection was going to be debatable and the house had to take up a good deal of time naturally we would not want 20 or 30 objections registered.

Mr. Knowles: Or 265.

Mr. Douglas: Yes. Well, you could provide that ten members could make an objection and have some provision that those members' names should not appear on any other objection. But if all that is going to happen is that these objections are filed and printed in *Votes and Proceedings* and then forwarded to the commission, we can afford to have this clause wide open so that any ten members can raise an objection to some part of the report, and then have this objection considered by the commission.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I had not read this suggested amendment but it would simply destroy the power of parliament. This goes much too far. We must have the opportunity of determining in parliament whether substantial wrong has been done. We should at least be able to debate the question. This proposed amendment would simply emasculate parliament. All that would happen is that an objection would appear on *Votes and Proceedings*; it would go back to the commission and the commission would say that they had already determined the matter once and for all and were not going to do anything more about it.

I should like to hear an explanation of this. This is an administrative short cut which puts an end to parliament. I had not appreciated its significance until I heard the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam speak. I would oppose this suggested amendment to the limit. It would remove from parliament the power to debate a wrong when it occurs in the opinion of a substantial number of members of parliament.

[Mr. Douglas.]

Mr. Lambert: If I may, Mr. Chairman, in order to establish on the record what we are discussing perhaps I may be permitted to read this suggestion. Nowhere does it appear on the record at the present time, and I do not think it would be fair to ask the minister to put it on because it would become a formal amendment. Perhaps it would be better if I just read the suggestion:

If within a period of 30 days from the day a copy of the report of any commission for a province is laid before the House of Commons or published pursuant to section 19, an objection in writing signed by not less than one fourth of the members of the House of Commons representing electoral districts in that province is filed with the Speaker specifying the provisions of the report objected to and the reasons for the objection, the Speaker shall, within the first five days next after the expiration of that period that the House of Commons is sitting, cause a copy of the objection to be laid before the House of Commons and published in the *Votes and Proceedings* of the said house, and the report shall thereupon be referred back to the representation commissioner by the Speaker, together with a copy of the objection, for reconsideration by the commission having regard to the objection.

As has been suggested to me, this is a suggestion on the part of the minister, and I would put it no higher than a suggestion. It may require a little more consideration than we can give it now, we having just received it, so perhaps after we have heard a few speakers we could stand clause 20 so that we could consider the matter over the dinner hour.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, may I just explain the purpose of the suggested changes which have been circulated in the form of a draft for the consideration of the members of the committee.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Who drafted the last one?

Mr. MacEachen: The first change is a reduction from one third to one quarter and was intended to meet the point made by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. It would also help the situation generally.

The second proposal certainly removes the opportunity for the house as a whole to debate objections proposed by members of parliament. However, if, for example, the hon. member for Queens, Prince Edward Island, following the report of the commission for

that province, had serious objection to that report, under the original proposal this objection would have to be debated and a resolution passed by the house before it could be considered by the commission. In other words, any objecting group would have to secure a majority in the house before they could have their objections considered by the commission. This alternative makes it possible for the objecting members to have their objections heard by the commission without in the process enlisting majority support for their objections. This is obviously a protection for minorities in the house to enable members to have their objections heard by the representation commissioner. As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, it does remove that stage which is provided in the earlier draft, namely that parliament debates the matter and then by resolution sends the objection back.

As I understand it these are the purposes of the suggested draft which has been put forward for consideration, but I did want to explain, as I understand them, the reasons for the proposed changes so that hon. members might consider them.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, the suggestions—perhaps I might refer to them as the draft suggested amendments—have not yet been placed before Your Honour, although they are being considered by the committee. I must say they have no appeal to me whatever. This is the kind of thing which would actually deny parliament any control whatever. Certainly we would have to have a majority of the house in order to secure reconsideration by the commission if the original clause in the bill were carried.

However, difficult as it would be to get a majority of the house, on the basis of my experience going over many years, and as an interested party in two or three redistributions, public opinion does have its effect. If we accepted this projected, anticipated or casually advanced suggested amendment, we would deny the public the opportunity of hearing the facts, and I for one would be very opposed to anything of that kind.

Mr. MacEachen: Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition would develop his argument along this line—and I do not relate this thought to the present parliament. Is it not possible that during some future parliament party advantage might be taken, in that the objecting members would be prevented by a majority of another party from having their objections heard? In other words, if an element of partisanship entered into this it could have this effect. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition would consider that point.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Let us try to analyse the situation, human nature being what it is. Let us consider, for example, commission A. That commission hears representations and draws a map. All of the possible objections will have been raised at its hearings. If parliament simply goes through a perfunctory operation, and not one based at all on consideration, because one quarter of the members from the province in question, over which commission A has authority object, the matter goes back to the commission. Anyone who has ever reargued a case in a court which has originally come to a conclusion, yet for some reason a reargument is considered necessary, knows what the difficulties are. The difficulties in a court under those circumstances would be much less than the difficulties of bringing these objections again before the same commission that had decided earlier, on the basis of what it had heard and the evidence placed before it, as to the course to be followed. The commission would simply meet and say, "Under the law 25 per cent of the members from the province have objected. We dealt with this matter and it has come back to us purely as a mechanical result of the statute as it exists, but that is the end of it".

I have a great deal of regard for public opinion, and if a wrong is done, or a mistake is made, and 25 per cent of the members from any one province object, then in a debate the searchlight of scrutiny and examination will be brought to bear on what has taken place, and where there has been unfairness public opinion often steps in. If it does not step in at the time, it steps in later on whenever there is an opportunity for the people to vote.

I am not going into particulars in this regard, but I know something about this because I had an experience which was spoken of at the time. I do not think any member of this house ever went through two gerrymanderings, but I did go through two of them. This is what we are trying to get away from. As a matter of fact, as I said to the minister in the course of a private conversation recently, if it had not been for the gerrymander of 1949 I would never have sought re-election to parliament. However, that operation took place without anaesthetic and the results were most favourable to me in the long run.

That was public opinion operating in consequence of what was believed to be an injustice. This has happened to members in all parts of the house. None of us has been guiltless in connection with arranging constituencies of political opponents in such a way that their hopes of return were considerably diminished, and that has been so throughout the years.

We are now doing away with that sort of thing, but in doing away with it we must preserve the authority of parliament. Parliament must have the final say and the opportunity to speak. We cannot, as parliamentarians, abdicate the rights of parliament to a commission. Otherwise the first responsibility of parliament, the assurance of fair representation, is completely denied—whether in fact or in theory, none the less actually, under statute.

Members of this house as a whole, I am sure, would agree that we dare not pass an amendment which simply provides for a perfunctory return to the commission of an objection, because it has been raised by one quarter of the members of a province, without debate in this chamber. To do otherwise would be to make the commission in effect the absolute authority.

Mr. MacEachen: Would the Leader of the Opposition think that if a debate were provided for in the house in respect of the bill of objections, without the necessity of a resolution which would require a majority of members endorsing the objections, that this would satisfy the requirements?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, it is always difficult to answer a categorical question of that kind when one has not given it the fullest consideration, but on the face of it, that appears to be a most reasonable suggestion, and it would protect minorities as well.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering what has happened to this bill. Someone has been nibbling at it during the time it has been in the pigeon holes of the offices of the government. We studied this bill in March and April and I thought we had reached the agreement that two of the most contentious clauses would stand until we made our way through the rest of the bill. However, every other minute now we are being presented with some new idea. Some of these ideas may be very useful, but I do not think we are going to make much progress if further suggestions, such as the one just presented, are to be placed before us. Alternatively I suggest that if there are any more, they be placed before us now so that we may consider them over the supper hour, rather than having them presented in this nebulous fashion.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, may I tell my hon. friend that I have no more proposals to make.

Mr. Churchill: I am glad we have that situation cleared up, and perhaps if we can throw out this one we will be in a better position.

This last suggestion raises a fundamental issue, as the right hon. Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, in respect of airing grievances in parliament. The purpose of clause 20 is to permit people, who think something has not gone right, or who have a grievance, to bring the matter before parliament. Provision is made for members to advance their case in parliament and to have it discussed, and then you have the play of public opinion with regard to what has been said. But if the proposed amendment is accepted, that debate is not permitted and public opinion has no effect whatsoever, nor has the opinion of the house itself.

We are all quite familiar with the fact that at times issues are raised in the house with which we are not very familiar, but as the debate develops people discover they have an interest in the subject being debated and they then make a contribution. Therefore I hope the minister will reconsider this matter. I started off in discussing clause 20 by drawing attention to the fact that when this bill was before the house on other occasions earlier people had considered that one third was an unsatisfactory figure and the minister then suggested one quarter. But he did not disclose his hand at that moment. He had a great, long amendment which in some mysterious fashion—

Mr. MacEachen: I did not disclose my hand because when I was about to move to the next point the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre got up and took the floor and I did not get a chance. I was not trying to conceal anything.

Mr. Knowles: The hon. member sometimes has trouble with me, too.

Mr. Churchill: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre constantly and consistently intervenes. However I suggest that the minister let clause 20 stand so that we may consider his proposed amendment over the supper hour and that he rewrite it to make it acceptable.

Mr. MacEachen: Yes.

Mr. Churchill: Perhaps we might then proceed with the rest of the bill.

Mr. MacEachen: I will make an effort to meet the point that has been raised. As I understand it, the Leader of the Opposition accepted the view that, provided an opportunity for debating a report was available and was provided, a resolution might not be necessary and that if we provided that the matter could be aired in the house so that members could express their views a formal majority vote would not be necessary.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And the matter would then be returned to the commission.

Mr. MacEachen: And then it would go to the commission.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that we all look at this over the supper hour and I am sure we all agree this is a good idea. I should like to suggest that when we are looking at it we look at the record of the debate at an earlier stage. As I recall, some members of the house, I believe in the official opposition, objected to clause 20 in its original form on two counts. First of all, it was objected that the requirement of one third was too high in some provinces and, second, if my memory serves me correctly there was an objection that the requirement of a majority vote in the house before the objection could be referred to the commission was unfair.

It seems to me what the government is trying to do in bringing in this draft amendment is to meet both of these objections. I quite agree with the point made by the Leader of the Opposition that it is not really doing it in a parliamentary way just to have it in *Votes and Proceedings* and have no discussion on the floor of the house. I suggest that what has evolved between the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Labour might perhaps meet the point in that some discussion of these grievances would be a good idea. But I think that the official opposition might well consider the merit of the suggestion that if there is objection from a reasonable number of people it should not be necessary for that reasonable number of people to get a majority vote in the house before the matter can be referred back to the commission. Otherwise we are keeping this thing on a partisan basis.

While I concur in the suggestion that we look at this matter over the supper hour I should like to say while I am on my feet that I support the position taken by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, that to require a quarter of the membership of the house certainly is unfair to a number of groups in the house. If one looks, for example, at the position of my colleagues from the province of British Columbia he sees that they happen to be fairly numerous. Yet under the requirement of 25 per cent of the membership of the house they would not be able to register any objection. I should like to suggest that a further look be taken at my leader's proposal that it be any 10 members of the house. Then we might go along with the suggestion that there be a debate and without the requirement of a majority vote perhaps all of these things put together might result in the drafting of an amendment to this clause that would be satisfactory to all.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, I think I probably started all of the trouble in the original debate. My objection was that reading clauses 20 and 21 together as they now stand we might have the result of the House of Commons debating and passing a resolution respecting a change in the electoral boundaries of a particular province, sending it back to the commission and then finding that under clause 21 the commission could either accept or reject parliament's vote. My objection at that time was that this is wrong. If the House of Commons has taken a vote and made a decision that decision should be respected. But clause 21 says that the commission can take our recommendation or vote and either accept it or reject it. I felt that was wrong and that is the reason I raised the point in the first place.

I think the discussion that has taken place between the minister and the Leader of the Opposition has provided an answer. If there is a provision for debate without a formal resolution, then my objection will be overcome, but I do think we have to consider clauses 20 and 21 together. I think a solution has perhaps been reached and that if such an amendment is proposed it will meet the situation.

The Chairman: Shall the clause stand?

Some hon. Members: Stand.

Mr. Churchill: Six o'clock.

The Chairman: I have to advise hon. members that pursuant to provisional standing order 39A the following question is to be raised this evening:

The hon. member for Kootenay West, trade, visit to Canada of United Kingdom home builders mission.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, before we rose at six o'clock we were discussing clause 20, and I had circulated a draft amendment to members of the committee, with the purpose of gaining their views on it. I thought we had a very useful discussion and during the recess we have worked on an amendment that might meet the various points raised by the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, among others. Therefore I am going to break my pledge that I would not produce any more amendments.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the minister mind reading it?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, I shall read it, though I am not moving it as yet. It reads:

That clause 20 of Bill C-72 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

20. If within a period of thirty days from the day the copy of the report of any commission for a province is laid before the House of Commons or published pursuant to section 19, an objection in writing, in the form of a motion for consideration by the House of Commons of the matter of the objection, signed by not less than ten members of the House of Commons is filed with the Speaker specifying the provisions of the report objected to and the reasons for the objection, the House of Commons shall, within the first fifteen days next after the expiration of that period that the House of Commons is sitting, take up the motion and consider the matter of the objection, and thereafter the report shall be referred back to the Representation Commissioner by the Speaker, together with a copy of the objection and of the *House of Commons Debates* with respect thereto, for reconsideration by the commission having regard to the objection.

This seems to fit the various points that were made by members of the committee. It overcomes the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition in that debate is provided for where objections may be ventilated. It protects the rights of minority groups which might not be able to get a majority in support of their objections. It also enables ten members of the House of Commons to raise objections, with the result that the point so kindly raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West with respect to the Liberal party in Saskatchewan will also be met. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I now move this admendment.

The Chairman: Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt this amendment?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment has been skilfully drawn following careful consideration, and I believe it will be generally accepted. I thank the minister for utilizing the interim between the adjournment at six and our return at eight for doing such effective work.

Mr. Knowles: I should like to join in the remarks just made by saying the amendment has been skilfully drawn and seems to take into account all the points that were raised during the discussion just prior to six o'clock. I believe it should receive the endorsation of the committee but, having said that, there is one question that readily presents itself. What happens if quite a number of these objections are filed and they do not all get a chance to be considered within the first 15 days? I expect the minister will say he and I should discuss this in our subcommittee on procedure, but does it not raise the question of how much time is to be allocated for consideration of each individual objection?

This problem is posed by the wording of the amendment which says it shall be done "within the first fifteen days next—". Suppose there are 20 of these objections and the first ten occupy the first 15 days; what happens to the rest of them?

Mr. MacEachen: This is a point that occurred to me because I envisaged ten reports descending on the house at the same time, but it is quite unlikely this will happen. For example, the commission for Prince Edward Island might complete its report in three or four months. It could be laid on the table and the 15 days would apply there. If they come in the way we expect, this objection would not be too great, bearing in mind also that the house will be asked to deal with this problem only at ten year intervals.

Mr. Knowles: Let us take a chance on it, then.

Mr. Douglas: One point which concerns me a little is the phrase—

—the House of Commons shall, within the first 15 days next after the expiration of that period that the House of Commons is sitting, take up the motion and consider the matter of the objection—

What is covered by those words "take up the motion and consider the matter of the

objection". How does the house determine when it has finished taking up a motion and has given proper consideration to the objection? I presume this is something to be worked out by the house itself.

Mr. MacEachen: That is what I thought. It might be difficult to put into this measure the procedure to be followed. This is something which might be considered in the committee on procedure. One thing that worried me somewhat was this: Unless there is a time limit—and there is one here of 15 days—the house could delay dealing with a report indefinitely and thereby hold up redistribution. This is something which might be worked out by the committee on procedure as the hon. member has suggested. But the bill does deal with this problem.

Mr. Baldwin: May I suggest to the minister that once the matter has been taken up within 15 days it need not necessarily be completed within that time. Consider this in the light of an appeal. Once an appeal has been taken up there is nothing in the amendment, as I understood, to indicate the procedure has to be completed within that time. So if it should happen that all ten reports come back at the same time and there are ten objections and they are all entered or taken up within the 15 days, I do not think we will be obliged to complete our discussion on them within that period.

The words used are "in the form of a motion for consideration" and I would point out that this might presuppose an actual motion before the house, a motion which could only be determined, like all motions, upon a vote. I think the committee on procedure should have in mind that this is a type of motion which would not be determined by a vote. I have no desire to raise too legalistic a point but I believe the hon. gentleman or his successor might find himself in grave difficulty in not taking this procedure to the stage where there would have to be a vote; great care would need to be exercised as to the wording. Apart from these considerations, I think the proposal put forward is one which well meets the situation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Chairman, we should be grateful to the minister for having tried to substitute for clause 20, the present clause which takes into account all the objections raised this afternoon in connection with Bill No. C-72.

With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), if and when the house should face a rather difficult problem, it would surely be possible to obtain the unanimous consent of the members to allow discussion to extend beyond the time provided by this clause.

I feel that, unless luck is decidedly against us, the reports from the various commissions should not reach the house all at the same time, so there should be no problem. Still, should it arise, I am quite sure that the members of parliament, in view of the fact that they are all concerned, would give unanimous consent so that the debate could extend beyond the period stipulated in the clause.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, for our part, we also accept this amendment which will certainly be more satisfactory to the members of the house, all the more so because, by allowing ten members to put forward their objections, all the important parties in the house will have a chance to be heard with regard to electoral representations in each province.

[*Text*]

Mr. Churchill: I have a word to say with regard to the suggestion made by the minister and followed up by my hon. friend from Peace River. I am not at all sure we should saddle the committee on rules and procedure with the work of determining how this particular section of the act when passed will be applied in the House of Commons. I think that when we are dealing with new legislation and experimental procedures we should try them out first. Then if something is wrong with the procedure we can get a special committee to work on it. But the committee on procedure has other things to do and I would not saddle it with this particular job at the present time.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 20 as amended agreed to.

On clause 17—*Sittings of commission; hearing of representations.*

Mr. MacEachen: We stood clause 17, I understand, because I had proposed a subclause 5 which fell like a lead balloon on members of the committee. So I withdraw completely from that position and hope the committee will now pass the clause.

The Chairman: It is understood that the last part of the proposition, discussed but not

formally moved by the minister, referred to as subclause 5 of clause 17 is not one of the amendments agreed to.

Shall clause 17 as amended carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Churchill: Wait a minute; no.

The Chairman: Shall clause 17 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Clause 17 agreed to.

Clause 19—*Report to be laid before house.*

Mr. MacEachen: Clause 19 also stood and subclause 2 was under discussion as a result of proposals made by the hon. member for Edmonton West, followed up by a concrete suggestion on the part of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. It seemed to be generally agreed that the point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West would be met if it were ensured that a copy of the Canada Gazette were sent by mail to each of the members of the House of Commons representing an electoral district in a province.

I therefore propose to move:

That subclause 2 of clause 19 of Bill C-72 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(2) where the copy referred to in subsection (1) of the report of any commission for a province is received by the Speaker during an interval between two sessions of parliament, the Speaker, shall forthwith cause the same to be published in the Canada Gazette and a copy of the Canada Gazette, to be sent by mail to each of the members of the House of Commons representing electoral districts in that province.

Mr. Knowles: I do not want to be as fussy as some people think I am—

An hon. Member: That would not be possible.

Mr. Knowles: —but as I read that amendment, any copy of the Canada Gazette, for instance, one which was 15 years old, could be sent and it would still meet the conditions. Should it not read "a copy of the Canada Gazette containing the report"?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Weichel: To the last known address?

Mr. Knowles: I realize there is a fair amount of humour being exercised at my expense but I submit it is altogether ambiguous to say "the same to be published in the Canada Gazette and a copy of the Canada Gazette—

[The Chairman.]

An hon. Member: The said copy.

Mr. Knowles: It does not say that. It says the Canada Gazette, for all time.

An hon. Member: You are really splitting hairs.

Mr. Churchill: No, he is very sound in this.

Mr. Knowles: We are not just putting speeches on the record; we are passing legislation and we should be precise as to what is intended.

Mr. MacEachen: What about "to be published in the Canada Gazette and a copy thereof to be sent by mail—" and so on.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: I should like to point out to the Minister of Labour, who is sending us those amendments, that they are coming to us in English only.

Naturally, it takes more time to grasp their full meaning.

I am wondering whether it would be possible, if other amendments are forthcoming, to have French versions made available to us, so that we could thoroughly understand every word contained therein.

[*Text*]

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister has got himself into a position where he is going to have to send a copy of the report to hon. members, because the amendment says:

Where the copy referred to in subsection (1) of the report of any commission for a province is received by the Speaker during an interval between two sessions of parliament, the Speaker shall forthwith cause the same to be published in the Canada Gazette and a copy of the Canada Gazette to be sent—

The article is used twice there. Why could we not say "and a copy of such Canada Gazette"?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles: That is what I suggested in the first place.

The Chairman: Order. Perhaps the Chair should read the amendment as it now reads:

Where the copy referred to in subsection (1) of the report of any commission for a province is received by the Speaker during an interval between two sessions of parliament, the Speaker shall forthwith cause the same to be published in the Canada Gazette and a copy of such Canada Gazette to be sent by mail to each of the members of the House of Commons representing electoral districts in that province.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 19 as amended agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall clause 21 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Clause 21 agreed to.

On clause 22—*Preparation of draft representation order.*

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the minister must have a consequential amendment with respect to clause 22 (1)(a) because of the procedure that has now been adopted with regard to the report dealt with by the house.

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the consequential amendment is in connection with clause 22 (1) (a). I move:

That the following be substituted for the first three lines of clause 22 (1) (a):

"it is ascertained by the representation commissioner that no objection has been filed with the Speaker in the manner and within the time prescribed therefor in clause 20—

Then it continues:

—or that an objection has been filed—

And so on. I move that consequential amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lambert: Does the minister still feel that the latter portion of that subclause is still applicable, because there is no direction under clause 20 any more? There is no direction by the house at all; it is automatically referred back to the commissioner after objection has been filed. I would think it should stop immediately after "20".

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is perfectly correct. I move this substitution for the new subclause (a):

"it is ascertained by the representation commissioner that no objection has been filed with the Speaker in the manner and within the time prescribed therefor in section 20—

And then, comma. I thank the hon. member for his help.

Mr. Lambert: Does (b) apply?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Chairman, (b) applies. It would be comma "or (b) after the report was referred back to the representation commissioner by the Speaker".

The Chairman: The Minister of Labour moves:

That clause 22 (1) (a) be amended as follows: "(a) it is ascertained by the representation commissioner that no objection has been filed with the Speaker in the manner and within the time prescribed therefor in section 20, or—

Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Amendment agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall the clause as amended carry?

Mr. Lambert: No, Mr. Chairman, with respect to subclause 2(a) I posed a question this afternoon that had some constitutional implications. They are immediately pertinent at this point, because if there is any signed agreement or any question of the provincial governments participating in the determination of the members of parliament returned from each province, of course 2(a) becomes somewhat academic.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, did you rule that subclause 1(a) was deleted?

The Chairman: Is the hon. member referring to clause 22(1)(b)?

Mr. Thomas: No, Mr. Chairman. Was subclause 1(a) deleted?

The Chairman: No. Clause 22(1)(a) now reads as follows—

Mr. Thomas: What is in (a) thereafter is deleted?

The Chairman: The Chair understands that the first three lines are deleted and replaced by the following amendment:

(a) it is ascertained by the representation commission that no objection has been filed with the Speaker in the manner and within the time prescribed therefor in section 20, or—

Mr. Thomas: Then all the rest of that paragraph in the draft bill would be deleted?

Mr. MacEachen: That is right.

Mr. Thomas: And you go from the word "or" on to paragraph (b)?

The Chairman: That is correct.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to deal briefly with the point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West. Section 51(1) of the British North America Act, as my hon. friend well knows, provides for the adjustment of representation in the Commons, as follows:

—the number of members of the House of Commons shall be 263 and the representation of the provinces therein shall forthwith upon the coming into force of this section and thereafter on the completion of each decennial census be readjusted by such authority, in such manner, and from such time as the parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules:

Then the rules are set forth. The first one, for example, is:

> There shall be assigned to each of the provinces a number of members computed by dividing the total population of the provinces by 261—

And so on and so forth.

As I understand it, if these rules as set forth here are changed the changes will involve the invocation of the amending formula agreed to at the recent conference. I would much prefer my hon. friend to have an opportunity of raising this question later with the Minister of Justice, but that is the explanation.

Mr. Lambert: I think the minister sees the difficulty. I raised it as a preliminary point this afternoon because it becomes very pertinent when we are considering clause 12. Clause 22 (2) flows from a decision which is taken under clause 12 and therefore I feel we must decide the principle, or have some clarification of the principle, upon which clause 12 is based before we can approve clause 22 (2).

Mr. Moreau: Could I ask the hon. member for Edmonton West a question. Does he envisage clause 12 in any way affecting the rules under section 51 of the B.N.A. Act? I do not feel that this bill affects the apportionment of members of parliament from the various provinces in any way. Does he see a difficulty there?

Mr. Lambert: Yes, I do. If I may be permitted at this time to intrude this concept into the discussion, section 51 of the B.N.A. Act provides rules and regulations for the determination of the members. The point I raised this afternoon was that the communiqué issued following the dominion-provincial conference made reference in paragraph 2 to section 51A. Section 51A is not section 51. Section 51A merely deals with the senatorial floor for any and all provinces.

There have been conflicting reports in the press that it was agreed at the time of the last dominion-provincial conference that the representation from the provinces in the House of Commons could not be changed by this house without the consent of the provincial governments. I think *Hansard* will show that this afternoon I indicated there were conflicting reports about this and I wanted the minister once and for all to tell us whether there was or was not an agreement that the provinces had any say at all in the determination of the number of members to come from any province. The senatorial floor is definitely provided for in paragraph 2 of the draft amendment; that is one of the matters specifically referred to.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, the principle which has been preserved in the draft amending formula under section 6(g) of the formula which has been tabled and distributed is the principle of proportionality. The number is immaterial. If one reads the text this is quite clear; it refers to the principles of proportionate representation of the provinces in the House of Commons prescribed by the constitution of Canada.

Section 51 of the B.N.A. Act, as has been very aptly noted by the hon. member for Edmonton West, states what are the rules of proportionality. Section 52, which also deals with the membership in the House of Commons states:

> The number of members of the House of Commons may be from time to time increased by the parliament of Canada, provided the proportionate representation of the provinces prescribed by this act is not thereby disturbed.

So that what we have tried to do in the formula is rendered subject to the general amending rule which requires the consent of at least two thirds of the provinces having among themselves 50 per cent of the population, in conformity with the principle of proportionality prescribed by section 51.

The question of the number of members which might result from the application of the principle of proportionality was not considered as sacred because I remember, and I suppose this will appear in the report, that there were many references to the principle of section 52 of the B.N.A. Act. It is also agreed—I speak for no one other than myself but I personally satisfied myself about this before discussing the new amending formula —that if this proposal were adopted, or if it had been adopted in the past, it would not have prevented the present law relating to the redistribution of electoral seats from being passed by parliament, because it is completely within the constitutional framework of the B.N.A. Act as it presently stands.

Mr. Lambert: Just one further clarification in this regard, Mr. Chairman. Could the minister tell us in what regard this proportionality applies? I do not have section 52 of the B.N.A. Act before me, but if the minister could clarify that point we may be satisfied. I think the minister should be able to tell us clearly to what extent he envisages the provinces, as a result of this accord, being able to determine the membership in the composition of this house.

Mr. Favreau: There would be no difference in the status or in the proportion of representation between what exists now and what would exist if the proposed amending formula were passed by the parliament at Westminster. If afterwards there is a question of a modification of the proportions presently existing as a principle, then the basic rules contained in paragraph 5 of the proposed amending formula would apply. The effect of that is that at least two thirds of the provinces, representing at least 50 per cent of the population of Canada, according to the latest general census, will have to give consent to any modification of the proportions which are presently stipulated under section 51 of the British North America Act, or any modification to any of the principles which are contained in that section.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the minister whether, when he referred to proportions, he was referring to the rules which apply, because I hope he is not suggesting that proportionate representation of the various provinces is going to be fixed? As I understand section 51, proportionate representation will vary with the variation in population of various provinces. It seems that any amending formula must be applied to the various rules which exist.

Mr. Favreau: At the present time we have 263 seats in the House of Commons, allocated among the provinces, and one seat each for the Yukon and Northwest Territories. Section 52 of the British North America Act states that this number is not sacred. What is sacred are the rules which regulate the number of seats to which each of the provinces is entitled after each decennial census.

I could read the rules which are contained in section 51 of the British North America Act, but what they mean is, once a new decennial census has been made, and the resulting figures have been published and a readjustment effected, one must apply the rules contained in section 51 in respect of proportionment. We have been very careful in this regard not to apply the limitation to numbers of proportionate representatives in the House of Commons as prescribed by the constitution of Canada. Until there is a change in section 51 of the British North America Act by amendment, as the result of the consent of the parliament of Canada and seven provinces representing 50 per cent of the population, the principles spelled out in section 51, in so far as the proportions to which each province is respectively entitled in the House of Commons, will have to be respected. This whole question depends on changes in the distribution of the over-all population of Canada.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Chairman, there is one other aspect of this problem that is sacred, and I should like to pose a question to the minister in this regard. Was any decision taken at the dominion-provincial conference that would in any way diminish the protection the senatorial floor provides the maritime provinces?

I ask this question for two reasons. First of all, there were submissions made in the press, before the conference commenced, to the effect that British Columbia was annoyed because it could not increase the number of representative senators, which threw that province out of proportion. Second, when the union of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia was discussed at this conference, in the first stages in a preliminary way, some thought was given to the idea that the total number of parliamentary representatives for that union might be diminished. I asked the Acting Prime Minister about this situation, and whether there was any guarantee that the same senatorial floor arrangement would apply to the united provinces as now applies to the individual provinces. The Acting Prime Minister said it was regrettable that I did not ask this question before the conference commenced. The implication of that answer obviously was that some decision was taken which would change the present situation.

For those two reasons I should like the Minister of Justice to assure us that no decision was taken at that conference which would in any way diminish the protection we now receive in the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia as a result of the senatorial floor arrangement.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, unless you rule me out of order I should like to make the following statement. Aside altogether from whether this is relevant to the issue under discussion, I must say that the proportionate number of senators is not affected, but rather has been entrenched. That section of the constitution is the safeguard which preserves the minimum number of senators to which each of the provinces is entitled, and it shall remain in force unless an amendment is concurred in by the legislatures of all the provinces. The hon. member will realize that the representation is completely safeguarded and entrenched, not only by implication, but by expression.

The Chairman: After listening to this discussion I am wondering whether the members of this committee will agree that we have perhaps gone beyond the limited terms of the clause with which we are now dealing. The hon. member for Edmonton West initially raised a proper question in respect of proportions, but I think since then we have gone a little far afield in our discussion. Perhaps at this point we can return to a specific consideration of the clause before us.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, in spite of the explanations made by the Minister of Justice, some ambiguities remain in so far as this subclause is concerned.

As I understand the situation, under section 51 of the British North America Act there are certain rules in respect of the decision as to how many members there shall be, and how they shall be distributed among the provinces, taking into consideration such things as the senatorial floor. However, under the proposed amendment to section 51 of the British North America Act I envisage this problem. The minister suggests that whenever the proportionate number of representatives for the provinces is to be changed, such change requires the consent of seven of the ten provinces representing 50 per cent or more of the population. Presumably we must decide this proportion by calculating the total population of Canada and dividing that population by, as at the present time, 263 members. But if there is a shift in the population which, using this mathematical calculation, would in fact change the number of seats that would be assigned to the provinces, then according to what the Minister of Justice is now telling us it would seem that in spite of the change indicated by the mathematical calculation it will require agreement by seven out of the ten provinces representing more than 50 per cent of the people of Canada before the number of seats in a province can be changed. I understood the minister to say this would be the effect of the proposed method of amending section 51 of the British North America Act.

Mr. Favreau: No, Mr. Chairman. I agree that the words I used might have been a little too technical, and when I say that I hope the hon. gentleman will not take offence because whenever one deals with the words of one's own profession he sometimes makes the mistake of using them to too great an extent.

I did not say that if there was a change in the relative population of all the provinces as shown by a new decennial census you would need the consent of seven provinces to increase the number of representatives of one province whose population has increased very much, and to decrease the representation of another province whose population has decreased. What I said, and the hon. member has referred to it, is that it is completely ruled or regulated by the principles of section 51 of the British North America Act which establishes the relationship between the population of a province in relation to the over-all population of Canada and the number of seats which that population will entitle the province to in relation to the over-all number of seats in the House of Commons. So if the amending formula is adopted its precise effect will be that this rule, this proportion or this relativity will continue in effect. Each 10 years we will have to determine, in accordance with the new census and according to the rules which exist at present, in what proportion and to what extent the relative number of seats to which each province is entitled will change.

What I said was that to change the rules in accordance with which we do that every 10 years, to change the proportionality, if I may express myself that way, we will need to amend the constitution of Canada. We will need to change section 51 of the British North America Act and enact a new proportion. In other words, we know at present that if the province of Ontario has a population of 6,500,000, let us say, it is entitled to so many seats in the over-all total of 265. If 10 years from now the new census shows that the population of Ontario is then nine million people and Quebec is down to three million, in applying the rule at present found in section 51 of the constitution the relationship or proportion will be maintained but there will be a new number of seats to which Ontario will be entitled and a fewer number of seats to which Quebec will be entitled. That proportion under the formula, not the number of seats but the rule of proportionality—that is why we use that word in subsection (g) of section 6—will be maintained. Does that answer the question?

Mr. Olson: When the minister used the word "proportionality" I was a little confused with regard to whether he was referring to the total population or as between provinces.

The Chairman: Shall the clause as amended carry?

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I want only a moment or two. I think it is clear that the formula in the proposed arrangements for amending the constitution will not prevent us from changing the number of seats that each province might have under the rules in section 51A of the constitution, but it will prevent us from changing the principles or rules themselves as set out in section 51A. I am not going to discuss that now, but I suggest that when we get to the point where we are discussing the minister's formula for amending the constitution, what will be brought into sharp focus is the fact that in 1951 or 1952 we were able to amend section 51 of the British North America Act and write into it the rules that are there now, including the rule that saved Saskatchewan two seats, and we were able to do it on the authority of this parliament alone. But under the minister's formula we would not be able to do that again because this would be changing the rules, changing the principles of proportionality as among the provinces and we would have to get the consent of seven provinces. I do not propose to debate the minister's formula now. I am as out of order as everybody else has been, but I do point out that there is a problem in that field when we get to it.

The Chairman: Shall clause 22 as amended carry?

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate that I think we have been entirely in order all along because subclause 2 indicates that "the draft representation order shall specify the number of members of the House of Commons who shall be elected from each of the provinces," and therefore the whole thing is entirely germane.

Mr. Knowles: Read the rest of the sentence.

Mr. Lambert: "As calculated by the representation commissioner under section 12". Section 12 refers to section 51 of the British North America Act. Using a specific example, I want to put one question and I will take the province of Saskatchewan about which there has been speculation that it will be seriously affected in that it may lose two or three seats. Notwithstanding the calculations of the representation commissioner under section 12, if it were determined that this should not happen, then according to the explanation of the Minister of Justice we would require the consent of seven of the provinces to do that because that would be disturbing the proportionality. It would be disturbing the proportionality because it would require a change in the result from the working out of the formula laid down in section 51, which is quite clear. Therefore any thought of adding members to certain provinces in order to save Saskatchewan two or three seats will require the consent of the provinces according to the explanation of the minister. I should like him to verify that.

Mr. Favreau: This is true, of course. To change the rules either to give a province more seats than the number to which it is at present entitled under the application of the rules or to decrease the number of seats to which a province would be entitled in applying the rules in respect of a new decennial census, we would, of course, need the consent of two thirds of the provinces having 50 per cent of the population. But this goes two ways. This is a protection against an undue increase, because the proposed formula says that you will not amend the constitution to reduce the number of seats below the number of senators to which the province is entitled. Therefore it is a two way proposition. But I know the hon. member will not be offended if I say that this, of course, has no effect under this bill because it presupposes, as he has just noted very exactly and aptly, the application of the formula devised and enacted under section 51 of the B.N.A. Act. Therefore there is no question in this bill of changing the rule of proportionality.

Clause 22 as amended agreed to.

On clause 23—*Proclamation declaring order in force; effective date.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I would like an explanation from the sponsor of the bill. If, as was explained to us a while ago, the reports from the provincial commissions should arrive one after the other and be adopted, in turn, at different intervals, supposing for instance that the reports of five provinces are accepted, these reports would come into effect immediately. Now, in the meantime, during those two months, parliament may be dissolved and new elections called for. Therefore, the new provincial representations would be valid in five provinces only and not in the other five which will not have submitted their reports.

In other words, supposing a study of the provincial commissions' reports gets under way, that some are accepted but not all, if in the meantime elections are called, would the new electoral districts as approved by the House of Commons stand for these elections in those provinces for which they have been accepted, and not in the others?

Would the minister give us some explanation on this, for I feel the clause does not define at all this aspect of the problem?

The Chairman: Order. Is the hon. member referring in his remarks to clause 23 now before the committee?

Mr. Grégoire: Naturally, Mr. Chairman, clause 23 deals with the effective date and says:

> ...the governor in council shall by proclamation, declare the draft representation order to be in force, effective upon the dissolution of the then existing parliament or effective upon the dissolution of the next following parliament if upon the issue of the proclamation parliament is then dissolved, and upon the issue of the proclamation the order shall have the force of law accordingly.

But if a draft representation order has precisely been accepted by the House of Commons and the Senate, in a word, by all, and approved by the governor in council for certain provinces only, and not for everyone of them, will the effective date start immediately for the provinces whose draft representation order has been accepted and not for the others?

There may be some danger of a mix-up then between certain provinces whose new draft representation order will be in force following approval by the governor in council, while the draft representation order of other provinces will not yet be in force, because those provinces were not ready and an election has been called in the meantime—I feel therefore, Mr. Chairman, that this is certainly related to clause 23.

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: The situation is that the representation commissioner does not submit his draft representation order until all the reports are in, as is specified in clause 22, with respect to each of the reports referred to in clause 18, so that there is no intention to have successive proclamations with respect to draft orders for each commission report. When they are all in there will be a representation order covering all the provinces.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: I do not think that is exactly what the minister told us a while ago when a time limit of 15 days was mentioned as concerns motions which must be introduced in the house for the purpose of rejecting certain representation drafts. The minister said that a province—he even mentioned Prince Edward Island—could submit its report before others, and then the house would take that report into consideration before any other, since it had been submitted to it. This could bring about what the minister now denies; the report of some provinces could be accepted before that of others.

The representation commissioner could submit all those reports at the same time; and let us suppose that among the reports submitted at the same time by the ten provinces, five would raise no objections because those reports had been unanimously accepted by everyone, then the house could accept those five reports from the provincial commissions. But in the case of the five others which are returned to the provincial commissions, should elections be held in the meantime, would the new draft order be applicable before the election date to the other provinces whose reports had already been accepted? Could the minister include a section providing that no election could be held while the draft representation of some provinces was being amended, while that of others remained unchanged, and that all representations be changed at the same time, even if that meant deferring those changes until the next election?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: It is true that all reports may not come in at the same time. Indeed, it is unlikely all reports will come in simultaneously. What will happen is that the representation commissioner will wait until the final report is in and then he will prepare his draft representation order. It will be impossible for a proclamation to be made for five provinces. The proclamation will be made with respect to all the provinces when all the reports are received.

Mr. Lambert: But that does not prevent the house being furnished with copies of the reports, under clauses 18 and 19, seriatim as they come in.

Mr. MacEachen: No.

Mr. Lambert: In other words, we may get little dribs and drabs in that regard.

Mr. MacEachen: Yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Still in the same vein, let us assume that the representation commissioner

presents to the Speaker the ten provincial commissions' reports and that, precisely in the case I was referring to, those representation orders for five provinces are accepted in the house but that there is an objection in the case of five or maybe two other provinces and that those orders are returned to the provincial commissions, the house might then be allowed to adopt the orders to which there is no objection while those to which there is objection will be returned to the provincial commissions.

Still along the same line, if in the meantime we have an election, what is going to happen?

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: Would the hon. member permit a question, and may I say this is in an attempt to be helpful. I wonder if the hon. member is not confusing the word "report" with the word "order." It is a report when a provincial commission files its recommendation. There can be ten reports but there can be only one order. The order is the document the representation commissioner produces after all ten reports are received, and I wonder if this is not the basis of the hon. member's confusion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: It is quite clear in my mind and, also, it is just what I was thinking of. The *projet*, as it is called in French, that is the draft representation order, is what the representation commissioner brings in. He brings in—

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: After the ten reports are in.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: —what you call the draft order prepared for the ten provinces by the representation commissioner. Then, we all have before us that draft representation order. However, in the case where seven or eight provinces would have no objection but three others did, is there anything which provides that the draft representation orders for the seven provinces submitted by the representation commissioner could not be passed? Is there something in the legislation now which provides that those draft representation orders could not be passed?

Mr. Lambert: No, nothing at all.

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: Is the hon. member aware that the point at which objection can be made is when the reports are before us. When a report has gone through the mill completely and an order has been made by the representation commissioner there is no room for objection. At that point, the job is done.

Mr. Churchill: I have a point to raise in connection with this clause. If you do not mind, Mr. Chairman, I will read the clause.

> Within five days after the receipt by the Secretary of State of the draft representation order, the governor in council shall by proclamation declare the draft representation order to be in force, effective upon the dissolution of the then existing parliament—

Then the second part of the clause reads as follows:

> —or effective upon the dissolution of the next following parliament if upon the issue of the proclamation parliament is then dissolved, and upon the issue of the proclamation the order shall have the force of law accordingly.

I want to draw the attention of the committee to the first part of that clause where it indicates an order being effective upon the dissolution of the then existing parliament. Under our parliamentary system in Canada and under parliamentary systems elsewhere there have been occasions when governments have somewhat unexpectedly been retired from office. It might well happen that a parliament expecting to continue for two, three, or four more years might proceed to proclaim an order to be effective upon the dissolution of the then existing parliament, believing that dissolution would not occur for a year or two years. Suddenly a crisis might develop and parliament might be dissolved within a week or even a shorter period. We would then be faced with a most difficult situation in the organization of constituencies whose boundaries had been substantially altered.

I confess I have not pursued this thought to any finality; I have not pursued it to the point at which I am prepared to suggest some amendment to provide authority under which the effect of what I am now suggesting could happen would be deferred. The second part of the clause is, I think, all right, although I judge it might be unusual for the proclamation to be issued after parliament had been dissolved. But I wonder whether the minister has given any consideration to the point I have raised. If it is not a valid point I am prepared to have my error disclosed.

Mr. Moreau: I think the point made by the hon. gentleman is, in one way, a technical one because it would be impossible for the chief electoral officer to conduct an election on such short notice without having the forms printed for the new ridings and the

machinery of the election organized. It would not be possible for him to complete these arrangements within the 60 days provided under the Canada Elections Act. I do not think it would be possible for any government to contemplate such an action.

An hon. Member: Suppose it is beaten.

Mr. Lambert: That is the point my hon. friend made. There is a sudden cessation of life of the government. In other words, it is defeated.

Mr. Moreau: Would not the chief electoral officer simply have to make the decision? The hon. member is taking the position that proclamation would already have been made—

Mr. Lambert: Oh yes. The representation order has been presented and the law is mandatory in this regard. It says five days. There is no one who can control it. This is an area in which one must tread very carefully.

Mr. Bell: May I present the problem differently? Suppose a government did not wish to have an election under the new electoral boundary arrangements. Suppose it knew a proclamation was to be issued. It could bring about in various ways the dissolution of parliament and then it could have an election under the old boundary arrangements because the new boundaries would not become effective until there was a new parliament. Thus it is not obligatory on a government, once this machinery gets going, to have an election on the basis of the new boundaries which are to be put forward.

Mr. MacEachen: I think the hon. member is making a valid point. This could happen, but there is an inexorable movement of time envisaged by this bill. Any government would have to take this movement of time into account. In other words, if it intended to do as the hon. member suggested, dissolution would have to take place—

Mr. Lambert: Before the fatal ten days.

Mr. MacEachen: That is right. I do not know how it could be avoided. I agree that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has raised an important point. I am advised that this matter has been considered and wrestled with but that nobody has been able to provide a solution which would meet this problem of the proclamation of the draft order occurring, let us say, two weeks before a dissolution. There would obviously be a great problem in the constituencies. I would certainly be glad to hear any views from the committee as to how to meet this situation, or how it could be avoided. I would point out that the government itself would be faced with the same chaotic problem with respect to its own electoral ridings and would not likely resort to the procedure suggested, and would seek to time a dissolution so as to avoid the difficulty to which the hon. member referred. However, as the hon. member for Edmonton West pointed out, when a government is defeated dissolution is inevitable. In that eventuality, of course, the timing would be known to the other parties in the house.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): A thought which occurs to me is this: The decennial census is taken up in years the dates of which are fixed. On the other hand, terms of parliament are irregular. A situation could arise where a new redistribution had just been completed at a time when a parliament was almost at the end of its life. What would happen in these circumstances? It would be obligatory to dissolve parliament. Would the proclamation necessary under this legislation be delayed so that the new parliament could be elected under the old redistribution arrangements, despite the fact that a census had recently been taken?

Mr. MacEachen: There is theoretical validity about the point which the hon. member raises—

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I have not figured it out, but I know there is a census taken every ten years and the average life of a parliament used to be four years. One period does not divide into the other evenly. The situation to which I have referred might occur every few years.

Mr. MacEachen: It would happen, no doubt, but in the case cited a government would be required to run its full term of five years before it would be involved in the kind of situation the hon. member has outlined. This is not a frequent occurrence; in fact, it is very rare.

The Chairman: Shall the clause carry?

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, would it be possible to give 90 days of grace by some such wording as this in line 43, after the word "force":

—the draft representation order to come into force within 90 days or to be effective upon the dissolution of the then existing parliament if that dissolution occurs subsequent to the said 90 days.

I just said 90 days to give the electoral officer an opportunity to take the action that he simply must take prior to an election, be-

cause of the forms he has to have printed, the various conferences he has to have with the returning officers, and things of that nature.

Mr. MacEachen: As I understand the proposal put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, certainly the provision of 90 days would give a government an opportunity, would it not, to avoid the application of the new representation order? If it were not to come into effect unless a lapse of 90 days had occurred, within that time the election could have taken place. So it seems difficult to devise a formula that would meet this situation. I admit the possibilities. They may not be as real as one might think, but they are possibilities.

Mr. Churchill: I refrained from using the expression "60 days".

Mr. MacEachen: I appreciated that.

Clause 23 agreed to.

On clause 24—*Publication of order and proclamation.*

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, in clause 24 there is a mandatory requirement that publication shall take place in the Canada Gazette not later than five days after the issue of the proclamation. Publishing schedules of the Canada Gazette being what they are, how can you guarantee this?

Mr. MacEachen: I am advised that the Canada Gazette produces extras very readily on a 24 hour notice.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, since subclause 2 of section 17 has been amended, can the minister tell us whether he plans to propose a similar amendment to section 24 or whether he prefers to have the section passed in its present form.

An hon. Member: The section is already passed.

The Chairman: Is section 24 passed?

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to point out that when the house studied subclause 2 of clause 17, it was decided, that a notice would be published in newspapers. In my opinion, when the map of a new electoral district is passed, it would be a good thing if the electors were told what is their constituency, because many are often confused since the limits of the ridings are constantly being altered.

In fact when provincial elections are held, they vote in a certain riding and in the case of federal elections, they vote in another riding, so that confusion sometimes results. I therefore ask the minister if he wishes to give his opinion in that connection.

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, the necessity for using the medium of the newspapers to publicize the representation order is not as apparent as in the other cases we have dealt with, because we want to notify persons in view of subsequent actions they are to take. This is a publication in the Canada Gazette of a representation order that has the effect of law, and this is the normal way in which these laws are made known officially.

Clause 24 agreed to.

On clause 25—*Construction of order; doubtful cases.*

Mr. Enns: Mr. Chairman, I believe that clause 25 (2) is the first place in which there is any reference to the names of constituencies.

There are in other clauses several references to maps being used. I am sure the representation commissioner will find it necessary to completely subdivide very large constituencies; in other words, creating entirely new ridings. What names will he use? Does this clause give the authority, or anywhere in the act—I am just asking the question; it is a very small point—is there authority for the representation commissioner or the commissions to devise new names for the few new constituencies that had not existed before?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, the task of assigning names to the constituencies is for the provincial commissions. It may be that changes will be made; it may be that the present names will be retained. That is a matter for the commissions. But my hon. friend will bear in mind that it is possible to make representations to the commissions at hearings, and this may be one of the matters upon which interested parties may wish to make representations. Again, when the reports come from the commissions there will be an opportunity to object to them, and it may be this would be a matter with which persons could object. Therefore, while the commissions have the authority to set the names, there are opportunities when people can make their views known.

Mr. Enns: Mr. Chairman, I quite understand that this is a matter for the commissions. However, with regard to those few large constituencies which might be made

into two, a name has not existed before. The next clause, clause 26, provides that maps shall be published. How are these new districts to be designated? It is a minor point, but there will be a small problem faced by the representation commissioner in this regard.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, on the point raised by the hon. member for Portage-Neepawa, I presume that the matter of names, and so forth, will be discussed when the report is before the house, and if there were objections that would be the time they would be dealt with. Let us hope that the representation commissions will use their good sense and listen to some proper representations in this regard.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, with regard to clause 25 (2) I just want to underline to the minister one of the dangers with regard to the names of territorial divisions. As the minister said previously, the government will be aware, or might be aware, but not the other parties in this house, as to when an election would occur, and the name that may be chosen for the designation of these territorial divisions may sometimes exclude some of the existing divisions which are well known to the people voting in those areas, to the benefit of existing areas which are held by members of the government. This is a very practical question, but I feel that the members of this house who belong to opposition parties, whatever they may be, might find that the names of their constituencies would disappear entirely. Existing members of parliament who are members of the government may take advantage of this situation. It may be that a district might keep its present name but the name of a constituency held by a member of the opposition could entirely disappear, which might be disadvantageous to the members of the opposition.

Mr. MacEachen: Personally I should like to see the traditional names of the constituencies maintained. It is really up to the commissions, and government members will have to take their chances along with opposition members as to the names of their constituencies—which is not going to bother me as much as the kind of constituency I might be looking after when the draft order is put into effect.

Mr. Valade: Just one further observation. I do not want to hold up the minister but this is a very important point. I am not talking so much of the members themselves as of the electors in a riding the name of which disappears entirely, or perhaps changed by your next door neighbour who unlike you might be a government supporter. I am not injecting partisanship into this, but that is a situation which may arise. I think provision should be made so that if one district name disappears then the neighbouring district name should also not be retained in its entirety. I think members of parliament should be able to make representation to the commission in this regard.

Mr. MacEachen: There is no difficulty about members making representations. Presumably members of parliament can take advantage of the provision in regard to making representations, and attend hearings if they wish.

Mr. Knowles: It depends on the definition of "interested persons".

Mr. MacEachen: Yes; that is one stage. Then when the reports come back members will have the chance to object, and it would be surprising if there were not objections to the names of constituencies.

Clause 25 agreed to.

On clause 26—*Maps to be prepared and printed.*

Mr. McMillan: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask one question on this clause. At what stage would the interested people in a federal electoral riding come to know the boundaries of their area? Would this be before the production or publication of these maps?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The commission may sit, as provided in clause 17, and hear representations. In the notice of such hearings there shall be a map or drawing prepared by the commission showing the proposed division of the province into electoral districts. So that is the first time members will get the news.

Mr. McMillan: One other question. If it were proposed to transfer a municipality, or let us say a town, into another federal district, would the local council have an opportunity to discover this and to make representations?

Mr. MacEachen: This would be evident from the maps which would be contained in the notice. The council will have an opportunity to make representations and appear before the commission of the province, which must hold one sitting in the province.

Mr. Lambert: This may be expressing a pious hope, but the director of the surveys and mapping branch of the Department of

Mines and Technical Surveys should prepare an up to date map. If I recall rightly my constituency maps were based on the 1951 projection of a growing suburban portion of the city of Edmonton. Let me assure the committee that the map distributed to me by the chief electoral officer bears very little real relationship to the actual city itself, in that there have been replots and all sorts of things. So let us hope that they work with up to date information which is kept current.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, my understanding of clause 26 and also of the following clause is that both of them have to do with the enabling of certain preparations to be made in order that an election may be conducted after the redistribution order is put into effect. If I might for a moment consider the two clauses together, a question which occurs to my mind is whether or not these two clauses are adequate for the purpose. If I read clause 26 correctly, I understand it to mean that once the proclamation is issued the director of the surveys and mapping branch shall prepare and print maps. I take it that the preparation of those maps can be carried out prior to the effective date of the proclamation, which is contingent upon the dissolution of parliament. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes.

Mr. Barnett: Then in that connection, as far as I understand it the only other reference to enabling advance preparation to be made is in clause 27, which provides for action in the appointment of returning officers under the elections act. I have not got the elections act before me but the question arising in my mind is whether under either one or both of the two clauses to which I have referred any sort of authority is given to the chief electoral officer to make preparations for providing any other forms or documents which are involved in the conduct of a general election. I can understand that there may be a larger time element involved in the preparation of maps than is the case with other documents; but I can hardly see the point of our giving authority for the appointment of returning officers for the proposed new constituencies unless the chief electoral officer is authorized to supply them with a preliminary batch of materials which will be required in order to commence the necessary arrangements for conducting an enumeration, and that sort of thing, in a constituency. Perhaps the minister could elucidate on the point I have raised.

Mr. MacEachen: My hon. friend may recall that the Representation Commissioner Act which was passed last December contained a provision that on the completion of any decennial census the commissioner shall prepare maps, and so on, with respect to the electoral districts of provinces, and shall thereupon supply such maps to the appropriate electoral boundaries commission. So that this is provided for in the Representation Commissioner Act.

Mr. Barnett: I do not quite see that that covers the points I have been raising. The advance preparation by the representation commissioner for the work of the commission is one thing. Clauses 26 and 27 make some provision whereby the chief electoral officer is able to make certain advance preparations prior to the coming into full force and effect of the results of the new representation order. The question I am raising is whether the proposals set out in clauses 26 and 27 are inclusive enough to enable the chief electoral officer, as distinct from the representation commissioner, to make adequate preliminary preparations. I note that as far as clause 26 is concerned, authority is given only and solely for the preparation of maps of constituency boundaries, but not for the preparation of any other document. On the other hand, clause 27 provides for the appointment of electoral officers under section 8 of the Canada Elections Act. As far as I can see, it makes no provision for the chief electoral officer to give the electoral officers whom he has appointed any authority to do anything after their appointment. There is no authority for example to supply them with any material or instructions. Perhaps there is an obvious answer to this question which has not occurred to me.

Mr. MacEachen: The Canada Elections Act gives complete authority to the chief electoral officer to prepare for an election after redistribution has taken place.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, the minister says that authority is given to the chief electoral officer to prepare for an election after redistribution becomes law and, as I understand the situation, redistribution becomes law upon the dissolution of the then existing parliament, presuming there is a parliament in existence. The purpose of clauses 26 and 27 is to enable certain preparatory work to be done prior to the time a new distribution

becomes law. The question I wish to raise is, within these provisions is there sufficient authority given to that chief electoral officer?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, the chief electoral officer is satisfied that he has the power necessary to carry out the tasks referred to by my hon. friend. He has that authority under the Canada Elections Act. The clause now under discussion provides that the director of surveys of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys shall prepare certain maps of the electoral districts, but these maps cannot be prepared until the issue of the proclamation putting the representation order into effect. This clause really is to put into effect, the results of a representation order.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, if the minister is able to give us his assurance that the chief electoral officer is satisfied with these provisions, I am prepared to accept them.

Mr. MacEachen: The chief electoral officer has the authority to prepare for an election at any time, and perhaps that is not very reassuring for anyone.

Clause 26 agreed to.

On clause 27—*Returning officers.*

Mr. Lambert: In this regard, Mr. Chairman, I have the suspicion that there will be some unforeseen results from the passage of this clause, in that at the time of proclaiming a representation order the appointments of all returning officers holding offices shall terminate, and there shall then be a renomination of all returning officers. If that is the situation I think this committee should be made aware of it. Is that what is contemplated by the government under this clause? If there is going to be a complete refashioning of constituencies, and section 29 of the Representation Act is being repealed, and the ridings in respect of which these returning officers hold positions disappear, their appointments will disappear. Is that contemplated by this clause?

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I may be allowed to comment in respect of that point. This matter was raised before the committee on privileges and elections during its consideration and review of the Canada Elections Act. That act provides, as I recall it, that as soon as the boundaries of a riding are changed in any way, or the riding itself is changed in any way, the returning officer's office is vacant, and the riding is considered as a new riding. I understand that to be the situation under the existing act.

One of the matters that was considered by that committee was whether these offices should be made permanent. I think the hon. member will recall that under the Canada Elections Act, as passed in 1960, these positions became vacant. That is one of the provisions of the Canada Elections Act which I do not think should necessarily be covered by this bill. Perhaps a discussion of this particular point should properly take place during a consideration or revision of the Canada Elections Act.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, on that point I believe that the subject is important enough. Indeed, in the constituencies the returning officers are appointed by the government in office, and often these appointments are—I do not speak for my constituency, far from it—but in several constituencies these are political appointments and the returning officer is there to protect the interest of the party in office. Therefore, I feel that this is a major point to decide.

In the event that new boundaries are fixed, will all the returning officers presently appointed lose their jobs and will others be appointed by the government?

If that is the case, we should provide, before going through with this, a new procedure for appointing returning officers in the constituencies, because in many cases the actions of some returning officers give rise to complaints. Thus, we fear that with another party in office, or a change of government, returning officers would also change and we would constantly be faced with the same problems, for any time there would be a change of government there would also be a change of returning officers, or a way would be found to amend the act in order to be able to appoint new returning officers.

Therefore, I think a new procedure should be devised for the appointment of returning officers, in order that appointments be made in a manner which would be fair and equitable to all candidates in an election.

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: Let us consider clause 27. As I understand the situation, a representation order does not come into effect until a dissolution of parliament. This clause permits a representation order to take the effect of law whenever it is proclaimed, so that returning officers can be appointed under the Canada Elections Act for ridings that are

designated in the representation order. In other words, by bringing it into effect in respect of the returning officers, it is possible to appoint the returning officers before a dissolution.

Mr. Lambert: May I ask how you would have them vacate their offices?

Mr. MacEachen: This has nothing to do with that point. As a matter of fact, there is nothing in any of the clauses here that determines the point about which my hon. friend is talking. My hon. friend asks when the office of returning officer becomes vacant. If the representation order establishes a particular constituency with a new name, for example, and if there is a returning officer for Inverness-Richmond or Digby-Annapolis-Kings and the new riding is—

Mr. Nowlan: Inverness-Guysborough.

Mr. MacEachen: —Inverness-Guysborough, then the electoral district disappears and the returning officer for that particular electoral district more or less disappears, at least from the point of view of an office.

Mr. Lambert: But the act does not come into force until dissolution and therefore the newly designated constituency does not come into force until dissolution and the old riding does not disappear until dissolution. Reasons for vacating his office, such as the returning officer no longer living in the constituency, do not apply because the constituency does not come into being until dissolution. So what are we going to be faced with? A vast number of returning officers being out of office on the dissolution of parliament and then a whole new group taking over on the first day of the election period.

Mr. MacEachen: I am advised that the purpose of this particular clause is to avoid the possibility put forward by the hon. member for Edmonton West.

Mr. Lambert: The possibility; but I am interested in why they would have vacated their offices. What sort of blackjacking is going to be done to get them out?

Mr. MacEachen: The representation order with respect to returning officers comes into effect on proclamation. That does the job.

Mr. Lambert: It is on the proclamation of the order that the returning officers are out.

Mr. MacEachen: I would gather this is correct. However, if a riding is unchanged and the name is unchanged nothing happens to the returning officer because he is still there for that particular riding; but if there are changes presumably his job disappears in the way I have mentioned.

Mr. Lambert: Even though the act has not come into force, but with respect to returning officers it comes into force on the date of proclamation.

Mr. MacEachen: Yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, may I direct a question to the hon. minister?

Does this mean that this legislation will allow the government to change the returning officers in all constituencies, or at least in those where there is the slightest change as soon as the representation order is accepted and approved by the governor in council? Then, will the government be able to change the returning officers in the constituencies where there is a change?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: The government may reappoint or change. Mind you, I do not think there is anything in these clauses which really determines this.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister this: As the present act empowers the government to change the returning officers in all constituencies where there are changes, would it not be advisable or preferable to provide at the same time for a non-partisan method to appoint returning officers in the constituencies.

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: This is really a matter for the Canada Elections Act and the consideration of the privileges and elections committee. It cannot be done this way.

Clause 27 agreed to.

Clauses 28 and 29 agreed to.

On clause 30—*Electoral district of Yukon.*

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask another of my legalistic questions. It applies both to clause 30 and to clause 31. I wonder why there appears at the beginning of each of these clauses the phrase "notwithstanding anything in this act". These two clauses provide for constituencies to be known as Yukon and Northwest Territories, but may I point out that is provided for on a mandatory basis in the British North America Act.

It is there as subsection 2 of section 51 of the British North America Act, so why do we now say "notwithstanding anything in this act"? Should the language not be "by virtue of the provisions of the British North America Act" or "as provided in the British North America Act"? After all, nothing in this act could set aside the British North America Act in any case.

Mr. MacEachen: The reason this is put in is found in the repeal of the Representation Act which provides for these seats.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, the fact is that, Representation Act or no, it is already required and called for under section 51, subsection 2, of the British North America Act.

Mr. MacEachen: That may be the case, but the reason it is put in here is the repeal of the Representation Act. It may be it is not necessary, but that is the reason for it.

Clause 30 agreed to.

Clauses 31 and 32 agreed to.

The Chairman: Clause 6.

Mr. Churchill: Could we stop at this point?

Mr. Knowles: Let us carry the amendment to clause 6 and go home.

Mr. Churchill: For our convenience could we have listed at this point in *Hansard* for ready reference the clauses still to be passed?

Mr. MacEachen: The clauses still to be discussed are 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13. I want to thank the committee for their excellent co-operation.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: May I ask the acting house leader about the business for the rest of the week?

Mr. MacNaught: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will take up the discussion of main estimates commencing with the Department of Veterans Affairs, then the balance of the estimates of the Minister of Industry, namely the remainder of the estimates of the Department of Defence Production and the votes for atomic energy and the national research council; then the balance of the estimates of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, the balance of the estimates of the Department of Labour including the unemployment insurance commission, and the estimates of national revenue.

[Mr. Knowles.]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

TRADE—VISIT TO CANADA OF U.K. HOME BUILDERS MISSION

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, as the voice of the Kootenays I addressed a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce on orders of the day today with respect to the visit to Canada of the home builders mission from Britain to study the Canadian timber trade, housing methods and so on and asked him if arrangements could be made for this very important mission to visit the Kootenays while en route from Vancouver to Calgary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is an important mission as indicated by the news release issued by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, which reads as follows:

> A 26 member home builders mission from Britain will arrive in Vancouver on October 15 for a two week tour of this country to study Canadian timber frame housing construction methods. Sponsored by the Department of Trade and Commerce, the mission will comprise ten directors of British housing construction firms, and representatives of the British government's ministry of public building and works, the royal institute of British architects, the national building agency, the London county council, the timber trade federation of the United Kingdom the British woodwork manufacturers association and British building societies and trade unions. The mission will visit Vancouver, Calgary, Toronto and Ottawa.

The release goes on to describe the purpose of the mission, which is a most interesting one.

> One of the primary purposes of the home builders mission will be to study Canada's timber frame construction methods and their application to a wide variety of dwelling designs. Members will also have an opportunity to see the milling of Canadian surfaced lumber and the manufacture of softwood and hardwood plywoods. Canadian builders and lumber interests will also have an opportunity to meet the British builders to discuss possible ways of participating in Britain's accelerated housing program.

This is a mission which is of great importance to all Canadians, of importance to the Canadian economy, and of particular importance to the forest products producing areas; and I happen to represent one of the largest and most important forest products producing areas in Canada.

The reasons for my suggesting this visit are several. First of all, the Kootenays have often been overlooked when arrangements were being made by this and former governments for groups in other countries visiting

Canada. If I had time I could give several illustrations of this, but I shall only mention one, which was when the British forestry commission visited Canada. It visited certain areas interested in forest production and certain other areas, but it overlooked one of the highest producing yield areas in Canada, the Kootenays. This has been noted by the industry and by the organizations in the constituency which I have the honour to represent.

I also make this suggestion because the Kootenay forest production area people are interested in the expansion of markets, both domestic and foreign, including markets in Great Britain. Third, we have a particular type of species in the Kootenays and interior B.C., a very high quality species, and high quality producing species, which is treated in the processing plants there. Fourth, we have a varied type of house construction, and the uses of timber for housing and other purposes in that area would be very interesting for these visitors to see. Fifth, if they visited this area they would have the opportunity to meet the local people, the local operators, and discuss questions which would be of mutual concern to them both.

It would also provide an opportunity for these visitors to witness different methods of production, and compare those methods with the ones used in other parts of Canada. We have, in the Kootenays, some of the most up to date mills and producing plants in Canada. Finally, such a visit would give them an opportunity to enjoy most unusual scenery and unparalleled natural beauty.

I urge that even at this late date consideration be given to having this mission visit the Kootenays and the interior of B.C. while en route from Vancouver to Calgary. Furthermore I urge upon ministers in this government that in future, when arrangements are being made for these visiting groups, whether they represent agriculture, labour, the forest industry, the mining industry or any other industry, to consider the interior of B.C. and the Kootenay area in particular, areas which have been often overlooked during previous visits. I should like the parliamentary secretary to let me know whether arrangements can be made, or whether he can promise that in the future the situation will be remedied.

Mr. Jean-Luc Pépin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): May I say I am quite sure the minister will read with great interest the wise remarks made by the hon. member.

In the meantime I wish to make it clear that the mission has come to Canada, not so much to look at our forests or to enjoy the landscape, even the landscape of the beautiful Kootenays, as to inspect Canadian building methods and techniques of timber frame construction. This is part of a program designed to demonstrate the advantages of timber frame construction using Canadian lumber and plywood, and allied building materials.

The mission which is now in Vancouver already has a very heavy program of visiting construction sites, building associations and government agencies across the country. Therefore it would be difficult, if not impossible, to fit a visit to the Kootenays into its program. However, approximately 30 per cent of the total time of the mission in Canada will be spent in British Columbia and this should be a source of satisfaction to the hon. member.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.08 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, October 21, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. VALADE—ALLEGED WRONGFUL POSSESSION OF LETTER BY MEMBER FOR SHERBROOKE

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege concerning the general behaviour of members of parliament as far as the provisions of the Post Office Act are concerned and I am doing so in order that the public may continue to have the confidence it should have in the Canadian postal service. I should like to refer to the Post Office Act, Revised Statutes of Canada 1952, vol. 4, chapter 212, and more particularly to section 39 which reads as follows:

Subject to the provisions of this act and the regulations respecting undeliverable mail, mailable matter becomes the property of the person to whom it is addressed when it is deposited in a post office.

I also wish to refer to the provisions of section 55 which read as follows:

Every person who unlawfully opens or wilfully keeps, secretes, delays or detains, or procures, or suffers to be unlawfully opened, kept, secreted, or detained, any mail bag, post letters, or other article of mail, or any receptacle authorized by the Postmaster General for the deposit of mail, whether the same came into the possession of the offender by finding or otherwise, is guilty of an indictable offence.

In order to elaborate further my question of privilege, I should like to quote section 73 (1) dealing with penalties:

Every person who is guilty of an indictable offence under this act is liable, on conviction, to a fine not exceeding three thousand dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years or to both fine and imprisonment.

Subsection (2) reads as follows:

Every person who is guilty of an offence under this act, other than an indictable offence, is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two months or to both fine and imprisonment.

I have here an affidavit relating to the above sections which I have just read and, with the consent of the house, I would like to table this affidavit.

It reads as follows:

Sherbrooke, October 13, 1964.

I Robert Delisle, a student at Sherbrooke university, after having been sworn on the Holy Gospel, declare and say:

1.—I have taken note in *Hansard* of October 8, 1964, of Mr. Gérard Chapdelaine's question of privilege.

2. In that question of privilege, the member of parliament for Sherbrooke mentions a letter which was sent to me by Mr. Maurice Allard, secretary of Hon. Léon Balcer.

3. I admit I won the Molson trophy at a golf tournament at Sherbrooke university.

4. I never gave to Mr. Chapdelaine the letter Mr. Allard wrote to me.

5. I never received the said letter and it was never given to me by anybody.

6. I conclude that the said letter was intercepted for reasons I am personally unaware of.

7. As a Canadian citizen, I want to receive the letters addressed to me.

In witness whereof, I have read this document and signed

Robert Delisle.

Sworn before me at Sherbrooke, this 13th day of October, 1964.

Louise Bruneau, C.S.C.
St-François district

Now, Mr. Speaker, on October 8 last the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Chapdelaine) raised in this house a question of privilege concerning the same Robert Delisle, a student at Sherbrooke university, in relation to a letter he never received, according to his affidavit, and which is in the hands of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, as he stated in this house on October 8, 1964, and as reported in the left hand column of page 8864 of *Hansard*.

In the circumstances I ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) to order an investigation into this matter and to make the result known to the house as soon as possible.

Besides, I have also in hand page 8864 of *Hansard* for October 8, 1964, reporting the statement of the hon. member for Sherbrooke as follows:

I am ready to table this letter so that all the hon. members might see it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Postmaster General to order an investigation and to report to the house on the next occasion.

Question of Privilege

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: I have listened with the greatest of care to the hon. member for St. Mary, and it seems to me he has given extended publicity to the matter at issue. Inasmuch as there is no request or motion before the house I do not think any question of privilege lies. However, the matter has been aired thoroughly this afternoon, and I am sure that if any steps are necessary they will be taken.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Due to the absence of the member for Sherbrooke, I would like to point out a fact of which I am aware. Since the Post Office Department did not seem to know the addressee, it decided to return the letter to the sender at the House of Commons.

Due to the fact that this letter was postmarked from Sherbrooke, I imagine that the Post Office Department thought that it should be returned to the member for Sherbrooke, since no other address appeared on the envelope.

I am sure that when the member for Sherbrooke is present he will explain, but I am personally aware of those particular facts.

Mr. Valade: As regards the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is no question of privilege.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. I do not understand Your Honour's ruling that I should not be allowed to air this question, since the hon. member has taken a stand on this matter which he does not know anything about.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has been given considerable leeway this afternoon, and he has consumed a good deal of time in presenting a series of allegations. I do not know whether they are facts or not. I am not concerned with that, but I am concerned with seeing whether there is a question of privilege, and in my opinion there is no question of privilege. The hon. member should not debate that decision unless he wants to appeal it.

Mr. Valade: In that event, sir, I rise on a point of order in reference to the question of privilege. I have read certain articles from the postal regulations which make it quite clear that no one has the right to interfere with or hold letters which are directed to other persons. Since the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Valade: On the point of order, sir—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The sections of the law to which the hon. member has made reference speak for themselves. I do not think we need any interpretation in this regard. The only question before the house is whether there is a question of privilege, and in my opinion there is not.

Mr. Valade: If Your Honour will allow me, I should like to bring—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Since the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency was allowed to place some information before this house I think I should be allowed to complete my remarks.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member must know the rules as well as the Chair. If, after the Chair has made a decision it is to be argued by every member in turn, we will never get any business done in the house. A decision has been rendered, and I think it is up to the hon. member to accept that decision.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION BUILDING—N.C.C. CONSULTATION

Question No. 1,606—**Mr. Aiken:**

Was the national capital commission consulted (a) about the decision not to proceed with the erection of a citizenship and immigration building (b) about the decision to lease space in a building for which the excavation had not been commenced?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): The answer of the national capital commission is in the negative.

STUDENTS' CAMPUS IN GATINEAU PARK

Question No. 1,766—**Mr. Martineau:**

Has the national capital commission deeded to a corporation called "Corporation de la Cité des étudiants de Hull" property for developing a campus in the Gatineau park district and, if so, (a) under what conditions was the property deeded (b) who are the directors of the said corporation?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): No.

Questions

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND

Question No. 2,008—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. As of this date, what is the financial state of the unemployment insurance fund?
2. What are its future prospects?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): 1. On September 30, 1964 the unemployment insurance fund showed a credit balance of $37,833,285.54.

2. It is expected that the contributions to the unemployment insurance fund will continue to increase the financial state of the fund until some time in December 1964. From approximately January 1965 during the heavy claims season it is expected that the outgo from the fund will exceed its income.

C.N.R. MASTER AGENCIES AND SATELLITE TERMINALS

Question No. 2,013—**Mr. Howe (Wellington-Huron):**

1. How many master agencies and satellite terminals are to be set up under the new express and freight handling service proposed by the C.N.R.?
2. Where are these master agencies and satellite terminals to be located?
3. What are the names and locations of the stations that will be closed up if this plan is carried forward?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows:

1 and 2. The establishment of master agencies and satellite terminals on system-wide basis is still in the planning stage and it is, therefore, not possible at this time to indicate how many agencies or satellites will be established or where they will be located. At present, there are master agencies in operation at Moncton and Edmonton.

3. The closing of any station as a result of the foregoing is dependant on approval being obtained from the board of transport commissioners.

ROCKCLIFFE, ONT.—RELOCATION OF SEAPLANE BASE

Question No. 2,047—**Mr. Thompson:**

Where does the Department of Transport expect to relocate the seaplane base presently located at Rockcliffe which is about to be transferred to the Department of Transport from the Department of National Defence?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): The department does not plan to relocate the seaplane base at Rockcliffe. It is proposed to make this a civil facility at its present location.

REPORT OF ONTARIO LABOUR FEDERATION RESPECTING POVERTY

Question No. 2,048—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. Is the government aware of a report by the Ontario federation of labour to the effect that 2,500,000 Canadians are living in destitution and, if so, has a similar study been undertaken by the government?
2. Has the government considered the establishment of a royal commission to examine and report on the question of poverty in Canada?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): 1 and 2. The government is aware of the report by the Ontario federation of labour and constantly evolving range of policies and of federal jurisdiction, to develop policies and programs that will eradicate the varied causes of destitution. This has been, and will continue to be, a prominent objective of policies designed to enhance Canadian economic growth, of programs such as those of the area development authority, Atlantic development board and ARDA designed to meet the special problems of particular areas and regions, of programs designed to raise and extend the skills of Canadian workers, and of the broad range of programs, both established and prospective, to improve standards of social welfare, health and housing.

It is equally of concern to the government to assess the effectiveness, in terms of the living standards of all Canadians, of this wide and constantly evolving range of policies and programs in order to identify residual areas of special need. In this sense, the government is engaged in a continuous assessment of the location and causes of economic distress in Canada, and of the measures best suited to its eradication.

BIDS FOR PENITENTIARY CONSTRUCTION, SPRINGHILL, N.S.

Question No. 2,073—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many bids were received for construction of the young offenders penal institution to be constructed at Springhill, Nova Scotia?
2. What are the names of the firms submitting bids and the amount of the bid in each case?
3. What is the anticipated date for the initiation of construction on the said young offenders penal institution?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. Six.

2. Foundation Maritime Limited, Halifax, N.S., $8,940,000; Modern Construction Limited, Moncton, N.B. $9,316,600; Fraser Brace Engineering Co. Ltd., Montreal, P.Q., $9,359,000; Argo Construction Limited, Montreal, P.Q., $9,374,000; Thomas Fuller Construction

Co., Ottawa, Ont., $9,428,000; Atlas Construction Co. Ltd., Fredericton, N.B., $9,750,000.

3. A recommendation for contract award is being submitted to treasury board. Construction will commence shortly after authority has been received.

*C.B.C. BROADCAST ON CONSERVATIVE CONFERENCE

Question No. 2,075—**Mr. Irvine:**

1. Were there any telephone conversations between the Prime Minister and Mr. Norman DePoe of the C.B.C. on September 9 or 10, 1964, while the latter was in Fredericton, New Brunswick?
2. Did the C.B.C. receive any complaints from any member of the federal government concerning the broadcast in connection with the national Conservative conference on Canadian goals?

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, question 2,075 is in two parts; and the answer to each of those parts is in the negative.

COMPLAINTS RESPECTING MAIL SERVICE, HAMILTON, ONT.

Question No. 2,077—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Has the Hamilton, Ontario post office received complaints regarding missorting and delayed delivery of mail and, if so, what action has been taken?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): No complaints of missorting. Three complaints of delay: (a) To mail from Montreal. Explained to the satisfaction of the patron. (b) To a local letter. No evidence found that postal service failed in its responsibility. (c) To mail from the United States. Found to be due to diversion for customs examination. Problem reviewed by customs and postal officials and explained to patron.

EXPERIMENTAL SPRAYING FOR SPRUCE BUDWORM CONTROL

Question No. 2,078—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. What was the role of the federal government in the experimental spraying of 160,000 acres in New Brunswick with phosphamidon for spruce budworm control?
2. Why was a much smaller area not chosen for experimental spraying?

Hon Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): 1. The spraying of 160,000 acres in New Brunswick with phosphamidon in 1964 was carried out as part of the provincial operational program of Forest Protection Limited, the crown company charged with control operations against the spruce budworm in that province. Their decision to employ phosphamidon on an operational scale was reviewed and accepted by the interdepartmental committee on forest spraying in November 1963 with members representing fisheries interests expressing their strong desire to have phosphamidon used for the entire spray program for approximately 2.4 million acres because of its recognized low toxicity to fish. The 160,000 acres treated with phosphamidon were selected to include the major fish spawning streams within the spray program and to cover certain areas where a developing insistance of spruce budworm populations to D.D.T. was known to exist. Cost considerations prevented the broader use of this material which had been under study by the Department of Forestry for several years in its concerted search for alternative material to D.D.T. that would produce a desirable degree of budworm control with reduced effects on fish and also wildlife. Following laboratory toxicity trials against the budworm and fish in 1960 and 1961, experimental aerial applications were made in 1962 to several plots in New Brunswick involving about 600 acres of forest. The results were encouraging and prompted an operational test on about 40,000 acres in 1963. Again the results were satisfactory and formed the basis of the Department of Forestry's recommendation prior to the 1964 spray program that phosphamidon might be used with benefit on areas where the fish hazard was high or where budworm resistance to D.D.T. was apparent.

2. The area of 160,000 acres was decided upon by Forest Protection Limited as the minimum necessary to cover areas of high fish hazard and of developing budworm resistance to D.D.T.

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT SHIPS, WEST COAST

Question No. 2,079—**Mr. Basford:**

What are the names, sizes, headquarters port and intended purpose, or use, of all Department of Transport motorized ships of 20 feet over-all length or more, stationed on the west coast?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): The following Department of Transport vessels are stationed on the British Columbia coast and use the facilities of the Victoria and Prince Rupert marine agencies as supply and support bases as required:

Questions

Ship	Length	Gross tonnage	Function
Camsell	224′	2,022	Full icebreaker.
Estevan	200′	1,161	Lighthouse supply and buoy vessels.
Sir James Douglas	150′	730	
Alexander Mackenzie	150′	556 gross	Lighthouse supply and buoy vessel.
Katherine B	43′	24 gross	Agency tender.
Skidegate	70′	136 gross	Agency tender.
St. Catherines	283′	1,895 gross	Weather ship.
Stonetown	283′	1,883 gross	Weather ship.
St. Stephens	283′	1,890 gross	Weather ship.
Ready	95′	153 gross	Search and rescue cutter.
Racer	95′	153 gross	Search and rescue cutter.
Bamfield	33′	11 gross	Shore based lifeboat.
Tofino	33′	11 gross	Shore based lifeboat.
Mallard	40′	8 gross	Search and rescue cutter.
Moorhen	40′	8 gross	Search and rescue cutter.
Canada Pilot No. 20	37′	16 gross	Pilot boat.
Canada Pilot No. 22	57′	40 gross	Pilot boat.
Canada Pilot No. 24	41′	18 gross	Pilot boat.

BUDGETS AND EXPENDITURES, NATIONAL DEFENCE DEPARTMENT

Question No. 2,084—**Mr. Prittie:**

1. What was the total amount of the budgets of the Department of National Defence for the fiscal years 1949-50 to 1963-64 inclusive?

2. What was the total amount of actual expenditures by the Department of National Defence for the fiscal years 1949-50 to 1963-64 inclusive?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1 and 2. Information requested for the years 1949-50 to 1962-63 has already been made available in the official publication "Public Accounts of Canada" issued by the Department of Finance. In so far as the year 1963-64 is concerned the following figures are from official departmental records: Appropriation, $1,728,882,707; expenditure, $1,683,471,003.

SAINT JOHN, N.B., POST OFFICE

Question No. 2,090—**Mr. Bell:**

1. Have any surveys been conducted regarding a new post office in Saint John, N.B. and, if so, with what result?

2. Has it been decided to rebuild on the present site or in the outskirts of the city?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. No special survey has been conducted regarding a new post office building. Examination of the post office situation has resulted in some recent adjustments of space in the present post office. No decision can be made with respect to a new building until the question of road and railway relocation has been determined by the municipal and railroad authorities.

2. Answered by No. 1.

*SALE OF H.M.C.S. "PREVOST", LONDON, ONT.

Question No. 2,101—**Mr. Irvine:**

1. What bids were received, and for what amounts, by the war assets disposal corporation for the properties formerly known as H.M.C.S. *Prevost*, London, Ontario?

2. Who was the ultimate purchaser?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): In so far Crown Assets Disposal Corporation is concerned, the answer is as follows:

1. The only offer received by Crown Assets Disposal Corporation on the former H.M.C.S. *Prevost* property at Carling and Richmond streets, in London, Ontario as a result of four advertisements in the London newspaper, was from Carlonne Holdings Limited, of London, in the amount of $162,010.

2. Carlonne Holdings Limited.

REQUESTS FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH GRANTS

Question No. 2,109—**Mr. Grafftey:**

1. What was the total amount of grants requested this year by the Canadian medical research council for basic research in Canada?

2. What portion of the amount requested by the Canadian medical research council this year was actually granted by the federal government?

Questions

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): In so far as the national research council is concerned, the answer is as follows:

1. For the year 1964-65 the medical research council requested an appropriation of $7,000,000 of which $5,500,000 was to be allocated to grants in aid of research.

2. The medical research council estimates for 1964-65 have not yet been passed by parliament. To date $4,522,125 of the funds made available to the council through interim supply have been spent on grants in aid of research.

REPAIRS TO RETAINING WALL, PARRSBORO, N.S.

Question No. 2,112—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many firms submitted tenders for repairs to the retaining wall at Parrsboro, N.S.?

2. What are the names of the firms and the amount of each tender submitted and was the contract awarded to the lowest bidder?

3. Is the federal government assuming full responsibility for the repairs to the retaining wall?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. One.

2. Mr. A. I. Cochrane, Parrsboro, N.S., $3,846. Contract awarded to A. I. Cochrane at reduced price of $3,445.50.

3. The federal government is assuming responsibility for payment of the cost of these repairs.

POST OFFICE CONSTRUCTION, TASCHEREAU, P.Q.

Question No. 2,120—**Mr. Laprise:**

Will a post office be constructed shortly at Taschereau, Chapleau county and, if so (a) what lots have been considered for such construction (b) what lots have been purchased (c) who owned these lots (d) what was the price paid for the lots (e) when will tenders be called for the construction of the said post office?

[*Translation*]

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): It is proposed to construct a standard plan post office at Taschereau during the coming winter of 1964-65, subject to funds being available.

(a) The following lots have been considered for such construction: (i) Part of lot No. 952 on Privat avenue owned by C.N.R. (ii) Parts of lots No. 656 and No. 657 on Privat avenue owned by François Caouette Inc. (iii) A parcel of land with a 50′ frontage located south of the railway owned by Mr. Marcel Audet. (iv) Lots No. 7 and No. 8 of block No. 2 owned by Mrs. Wellie Bergeron.

(b) Part of lot No. 925 on Privat avenue, measuring approximately 70′ × 100′.

[Mr. Grafftey.]

(c) Canadian National Railways.

(d) $500.

(e) Tenders for this project are expected to be called late this fall.

[*Text*]

STATUS OF SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN REGIMENT

Question No. 2,124—**Mr. Southam:**

1. Have representations been made to the federal government by various interested bodies in Saskatchewan, and in particular from the city of Estevan, Saskatchewan, for the retention of the South Saskatchewan regiment?

2. Has the Minister of National Defence, or his officials, come to a conclusion on the future status of this famous regiment?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1. No.

2. Not yet.

IMPORTATION OF CHARLOAIS SEMEN

Question No. 2,137—**Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson):**

1. Has any change been made in the past 12 months on the importation of Charloais semen into Canada from France and, if so, what are the new regulations?

2. If not, what effect will the new U.S. regulations have on Charloais breeders in Canada?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): 1. No change has been made in the past 12 months on the importation of Charloais semen from France.

2. There have been no recent changes in the United States regulations governing the import of semen from France. The department is working jointly with the United States on possible regulation changes and, if and when changes come into effect, it is intended both Canadian and United States regulations will be uniform.

RETIRED OFFICERS EMPLOYED WITH FIRMS SUPPLYING DEFENCE MATERIAL

Question No. 2,140—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Has the government taken steps to determine the number of retired officers of or above the rank of major in the army, and the equivalent rank in the other two services, presently employed with the following firms who have secured contracts through the Department of Defence Production: Canadair, De Havilland, Canadian Aviation Electronics, R.C.A. Victor, Canadian Marconi, Hawker Siddeley, Canadian Vickers Ltd., Litton System Ltd., Canadian Pratt and Whitney, Canadian Westinghouse, Collins Radio Co., and Computing Services of Canada?

2. If so, what are the names of the individuals in question and what positions do they hold in the aforementioned companies?

3. On what date did they secure employment with the firms in question?

4. If such a study has not been made, when does the government plan to undertake steps for this purpose?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1. No.

2 and 3. Not applicable.

4. The government does not plan to take steps for this purpose.

TRANSFER OF NAVAL PERSONNEL TO GUARD QUEBEC ARMS DEPOTS

Question No. 2,141—**Mr. Coates:**

Why were 50 members of the Royal Canadian Navy transferred from Halifax to guard arms depots in the province of Quebec during the royal visit?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): No R.C.N. personnel were transferred from Halifax to guard arms depots in the province of Quebec during the royal visit.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

DISCIPLINARY PENALTIES FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Question No. 1,826—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. When did the Post Office Department adopt its policy of disciplinary penalties for postal employees?
2. What are the disciplinary penalties for each offence?
3. Are the penalties the same for all postal employees in every part of Canada?
4. Who decides on the nature of the penalties?
5. Were the postal employees and their organizations consulted about these penalties?
6. Did they agree to this type of penalty?
7. Is there any other government department following the policy of imposing this type of penalty on employees whose work is unsatisfactory?

Return tabled.

*ROYAL VISIT TO OTTAWA—ACCREDITED PHOTO AGENCIES

Question No. 2,143—**Mr. McCutcheon:**

1. On the occasion of Her Majesty's Ottawa visit what Canadian news or photo agencies were accredited to the tour to photograph the participation of our armed forces?
2. Were units of any foreign or international news or photo agencies accredited for this purpose and, if so, who were they?

Return tabled.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, motions Nos. 169, 174 and 175 are acceptable to the government. Motion 171 is acceptable subject to the usual reservation concerning the consent of the province. Will Your Honour call motions Nos. 172, 173 and 176? I ask that motion 170 be allowed to stand.

Motions for Papers

PROTEST RESPECTING C.B.C. BROADCAST CONCERNING HAL BANKS

Motion No. 169—**Mr. Coates:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of a telegram dated October 4, 5 or 6, sent by the Minister of Justice, or by anyone on his behalf, to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation complaining about the program which featured his views on Hal Banks.

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS SERVICE AT ATLIN, B.C.

Motion No. 171—**Mr. Howard:**

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 other documents exchanged between the government or any department, agency or branch thereof and any other person, group, organization or government since January 1, 1964, relating to customs service at Atlin, B.C.

Motion agreed to.

AGREEMENTS UNDER GOVERNMENT WHARVES REGULATIONS

Motion No. 172—**Mr. Knowles (for Mr. Howard):**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all agreements entered into pursuant to section 33 of the government wharves regulations.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the hon. member is agreeable to having this order limited to the agreements respecting floats on the Pacific coast, and with that understanding there is no objection to the motion passing.

Mr. Knowles: That was agreed to by the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion subject to the reservation?

Motion agreed to.

EXEMPTIONS UNDER GOVERNMENT WHARVES REGULATIONS

Motion No. 173—**Mr. Knowles (for Mr. Howard):**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all exemptions granted pursuant to section 28(2) of the government wharves regulations.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, no exemptions have been granted pursuant to section 28 (2) of the government wharves regulations, and I understand that the hon. member in whose name the motion stands has been so advised. I would accordingly ask that this motion be dropped.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Knowles: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Motion dropped.

BREAKWATER AND HARBOUR FACILITIES, PORT SIMPSON, B.C.

Motion No. 174—**Mr. Howard:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams or other documents exchanged between the government or any agency or branch thereof and any person, group, or organization regarding the question of a breakwater and/or harbour facilities at Port Simpson, B.C. since January 1, 1963.

Motion agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF GOVERNMENT WHARVES REGULATIONS

Motion No. 175—**Mr. Howard:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of all agreements entered into between the government or any department, agency or branch thereof and any other person, group, organization or government relating to the administration of the government wharves regulations or the collection of wharfage fees thereunder except on agreement made pursuant to section 33 of the said regulations.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE CONSTRUCTION, NOTRE DAME DE LA GUADELOUPE, QUE.

Motion No. 176—**Mr. Langlois:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and letters exchanged between the Minister of Public Works, the Postmaster General and the municipality of Notre Dame de la Guadeloupe in the constituency of Megantic, concerning the construction of a post office and the acquisition of land for this purpose, since January 1, 1958.

Some hon. Members: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Motion stands.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the request of hon. members that motion 176 stand, may I say I was prepared to deal with it today and if it is going to stand I would ask that it stand for two weeks.

Mr. Speaker: Stands for two weeks.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

LEGISLATION RESPECTING DISSEMINATION OF "HATE" LITERATURE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Justice whether he is now in a position to advise the house what the government intends to do in connection with an amendment to the Criminal Code relative to hate literature. A spate of this literature of a scurrilous nature has been distributed in the last few days. The Canadian *Jewish News* stated in a recent issue it had been advised that legislation had been prepared and was ready for presentation to the house. Months have gone by while this matter has been studied. Would the minister take the house into his confidence now and tell the house whether any action is going to be taken in this connection?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question I am pleased to report that on Monday the Prime Minister received a joint delegation of the Canadian Jewish congress and the Canadian Zionist movement, I believe it is called, and I had the honour of attending that meeting, at which further submissions were made in relation to hate literature. We repeated to the congress, and to the other members of the delegation, that the matter was still under active study in the department and we would consider immediately the further representations that had been made. It is my view that very shortly I will be in a position to submit recommendations to the government in connection with this subject.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): May I ask a supplementary question with regard to the distribution of hate literature. I should like to address it to the Postmaster General. The other day he intimated that a board of review would be held at which a person by the name of Stanley was to appear. The minister stated he would advise the house when and where this meeting would be held and if the public were to be admitted.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): I am not in a position as yet to make a report, but I assure my hon. friend it will not be long delayed.

LEGISLATION TO DEAL WITH FRAUDULENT BANKRUPTCIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Justice in connection with new legislation to be introduced by his department. Is the minister in a position to give the house any information about possible bankruptcy legislation, particularly in view of the announcement by the solicitor general in

Quebec about an investigation into the whole bankruptcy situation?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): I have told the house already that the question of bankruptcy is being studied on a very broad basis and at the same time, within that broad framework, particular phases of the question are being studied. There will be a short bill introduced within a few weeks, and I shall be in a position to report to the house further at a later date as to the status of the study with regard to the broader scope of the act.

INQUIRIES OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. In view of a statement made in Montreal yesterday by the premier of Saskatchewan to the effect that under certain circumstances it may be necessary for him to arrange to have his province join the United States, I wonder if the Prime Minister is making any arrangements for overflight rights for Air Canada or other necessary travel arrangements, so that Canadians who travel from Manitoba to Alberta might be able to do so without going via the Northwest Territories?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the circumstances are so hypothetical that I do not believe I need to comment on them, except to say I am quite sure Saskatchewan will never become a Polish corridor.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a short question to the Minister of Finance.

Does the government intend to follow the course taken by French minister of finance, Mr. Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, who is going to table a bill to make mandatory the balancing of the state's budget and who will entrust to government agencies the task of providing the credits required for the improvement of the nation's economy?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CONGO—INQUIRY AS TO CANADIANS HELD AS HOSTAGES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. A large number of foreign nationals are being held by the rebel regime in Stanleyville as hostages, and amongst this group are a number of Canadians. I know of one or two who have not been heard from since July 30. Does the minister have any information for the house regarding Canadian nationals being held in that part of the Congo?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I have been asked about this matter several times. I must say that the situation is a serious one. There are 800 Europeans in the area, including 20 Canadians, who are being held as hostages. On September 25 a Swiss plane bearing international Red Cross markings was permitted to land at Stanleyville with much needed medical supplies and food. It was hoped at that time that evacuation of women and children by the Red Cross plane might be permitted, but the rebel authorities refused. The international Red Cross is continuing its negotiations, but the head of the rebel organization is having difficulty in convincing the extremists in his army to agree to plans for evacuation.

We have today made some suggestions to certain governments and I may have something more to say about this later. But I must agree that the situation is, regrettably, a serious one.

RECOGNITION OF QUEBEC DELEGATION IN PARIS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): I should like to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and ask him whether there has been any change respecting the status of the Quebec office in Paris since the hon. gentleman, on October 19, confirmed the intervention of his department to obtain from the government of France certain privileges and immunities for the agent of Quebec. Would the minister confirm reports that Premier Lesage expects to obtain official recognition of a Quebec consulate in Paris?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I know of no situation such as that implied in the last part of the hon. member's question. The government of Canada has asked the government of France to accord to Quebec house in Paris the same privileges that are accorded by the government of Britain to Ontario house and to Quebec house in London. It is not a question of a consulate being set up by the government of Quebec. This is a request made by the government of Canada to the government of France with regard to according to Quebec house in France the same privileges that are accorded to Quebec house in London.

The hon. member may possibly have misunderstood the announcement of the establishment of consulate service by the government of Canada at Bordeaux and Marseilles. That announcement may have provoked his question.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): The minister cannot read everything that appears in the press; I would not expect that. But has there been no request by the government of Quebec for the extension of consular privileges other than the privileges of which he spoke a moment ago? In other words, has there been any request for the granting to the province of Quebec a consulate in France, at the instance of Premier Lesage?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Could the minister tell us whether he has received a reply to this request whereby the Canadian government asked France to grant to Quebec the same privileges that London has granted to the various provinces and was this reply in the affirmative?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, we have not received a definite reply through our ambassador yet, but we expect one any day now.

[*Text*]

FINANCE

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND—U.S. BORROWING TO PERMIT REPAYMENT OF CANADIAN ACCOUNT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): I was asked two questions yesterday. Perhaps I might reply first to the question of the Leader of the Opposition, who inquired:

—whether it is a fact that the United States borrowed moneys from the international monetary fund within the last few days in order to lend Canada funds needed to repay the Canadian account with that fund.

The simple answer to this question would be no. However, I should like to reply more fully.

On September 30 I stated that the Canadian government had repaid a further $50 million U.S. to the international monetary fund, reducing to $57.2 million U.S. the remaining Canadian debt to the fund. The original borrowing in June, 1962 was for $300 million U.S.

On the same day the United States for its own purposes borrowed $100 million U.S. from the fund. The currencies borrowed by the United States included the equivalent of $25 million U.S. in Netherlands guilders and $25 million U.S. in Deutsche marks. Canada used its holdings of U.S. dollars to purchase these currencies from the United States, and used the currencies thus acquired to repay the fund.

I should like to explain briefly the reason for following this procedure. Canada holds most of its reserves in the form of U.S. dollars, but the fund cannot at the present time accept U.S. dollars in repayment of outstanding debts because the fund's holdings of U.S. dollars are in excess of 75 per cent of the United States quota. Therefore, to repay the fund, Canada had to use currencies other than U.S. dollars. We could obtain these currencies either by purchasing them in the open market or by purchasing them from the United States in the manner I have just described. The latter alternative was chosen because it provided more effective support to the United States balance of payments and this, of course, would not in any way increase the cost to us.

BANK OF CANADA COMMITMENT UNDER AGREEMENT WITH U.K. GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Finance. Could he make the statement he promised us for today respecting the loans made by the Bank of Canada to England?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): In reply to the question asked by the hon. member for Lapointe I would say that in September of this year the Bank of Canada, in conjunction with a number of other central banks, entered into an arrangement with the Bank of England to place a short term credit facility at their disposal to help protect sterling against speculative pressures that might arise. These arrangements were made before the British election, and no new arrangements have been entered into since. Some use was made by the Bank of England of this facility before the British election.

This arrangement with the Bank of England is similar in nature to those which have been made on several occasions among central banks over the last few years in support of various currencies which might at the time have been open to some speculative pressures in the exchange markets. In June 1962, for instance, the Bank of Canada entered into such an arrangement with the federal reserve system and with the Bank of England in support of the Canadian dollar.

The British authorities have not yet announced the amount of the recent new standby arrangements made by the Bank of England or the extent to which the facilities have been used. As I have already said in the house, I do not think there would be any advantage in disclosing here the details of arrangements made on the initiative of another country. Such an announcement should obviously come from the other country concerned. The rates of interest applicable under these arrangements have not yet been published by the parties to them, but I am informed they are based on prevailing market rates.

May I say again that having in mind the support accorded to Canada by the United Kingdom and others when it was needed, it is a pleasure to have been able to reciprocate by means of these arrangements, which were initiated under the previous British government and are being continued under the present British government.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance.

Could he tell us whether interest was charged to the Bank of England for those sums recently made available to it, although we do not know what they amount to?

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: Yes, Mr. Speaker; to the extent that these credits are drawn on, there will be an interest charge.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may we know what rate of interest the Bank of Canada asks from the Bank of England?

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: I have just said that the particulars have not yet been published, and I think it would be preferable—

Some hon. Members: Why?

Mr. Gordon: May I finish? I think it would be preferable that this whole arrangement should be made public by the country which initiated the arrangement, that is by the United Kingdom. The same courtesy was extended to Canada when the shoe was on the other foot.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

MONTREAL—BENEFITS TO LONGSHOREMEN SUSPENDED BY INTERNATIONAL UNION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, my question is intended for the Minister of Labour and I feel it is both very urgent and serious.

Is the Minister of Labour aware of certain activities of the longshoremen's international union in Montreal which led to the suspension of three longshoremen from September 24, 1964 to December 31, 1965, because they reportedly inquired about the state of their pension fund?

Since those individuals, heads of large families, do not draw any unemployment insurance benefits and are without income, could the minister investigate and see to it that in the meantime they draw unemployment insurance benefits?

[*Text*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, this matter was raised some time ago by the hon. member for Lapointe. I have given an explanation of the situation with respect to the rights of these longshoremen, as I understand it, under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, to unemployment insurance.

Mr. Valade: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I asked the Minister of Labour whether he is aware that these persons have not received any unemployment insurance since September 24. I understand these cases are being investigated by the unemployment insurance commission, but would the minister make sure that these people receive unemployment insurance; because they have no other means of support.

Mr. MacEachen: It is not possible for me to do that, Mr. Speaker, because under the law the insurance officer in the first place, and later the board of referees, is responsible for determining the eligibility of workers to benefits under the act. As I suggested earlier, if the insurance officer has rejected a claim, it ought to go forward to the board of referees for further adjudication.

AGRICULTURE

QUEBEC—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOLLOWING RAIN DAMAGE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture, but since he is away I shall put it to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Has the government taken action or will it take any to assist farmers in the Abitibi and Témiscamingue areas as a result of the serious damages caused by 69 consecutive days of rain in those areas since the end of July?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: This is a question for the order paper.

HOUSING

VANCOUVER—REQUEST FOR MEETING RESPECTING VETERANS PROJECT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General in his responsibility for national housing. Has the minister received a petition bearing the names of over 600 Fraserview residents requesting a public hearing?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I have received a petition. I cannot say whether there are 600 signatures on it—I doubt that there are—but there are a great many signatures asking for a public hearing. I have said before I do not believe that, under the circumstances of this case and in view of the long delay, a public hearing is called for.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Mr. Chatterton: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I presume the minister has received the first petition and the second petition is on its way. In view of the statement by the minister as reported at page 9142 of *Hansard,* that only some 70 people are still complaining, would the minister now, since more than half the residents have complained, reconsider his decision and arrange for a public hearing so the matter can be thoroughly aired?

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, the answer is briefly no, but I would supplement it by saying that the petition to which I believe the hon. member refers, which has several signatures, says these people have signed the new agreements, and I can confirm that they have also paid the increased rents. They say that notwithstanding the fact that they signed these agreements, they only did so because they had received notice that they would be evicted if they did not.

I have already told the house that notices to that effect went out several weeks ago, and that this was a legal requirement that had to be followed. We believe the rents are fair; they are not unreasonable. These people are changing their minds; they are now objecting to paying the increased rents. A great many people have that objection, but I certainly see no reason for a public inquiry in this case just because people have subsequently changed their minds.

Mr. Chatterton: A supplementary question. Would the minister not agree that in view of the fact that more than half the residents now indicate they do not agree with the agreements they made—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chatterton: —or are not satisfied, there should be a public hearing?

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being repetitious I would say that they do not say this in the petition. They say they would prefer not to have increased rents. The petition is to that effect. Then they say they would like a public hearing.

TRANSPORTATION

NOVA SCOTIA—REPORTED INTENTION TO REDUCE SERVICE BETWEEN HALIFAX AND YARMOUTH

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Acting Minister of Transport. Can the minister

now report on the position of the board of transport commissioners regarding the D.A.R. passenger train cancellation?

Mr. MacInnis: We got the answer to that yesterday.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

How is it that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) can ask a question relating to the cancellation of trains and his question is allowed whereas the other day the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac (Mr. Latulippe) asked a question relating to the same cancellations as the hon. member and, in the case of the member for Compton-Frontenac, the matter was somewhat urgent as the cancellation could be put into effect very shortly, his question was ruled out of order and he was told to put it on the order paper?

Are questions from the Liberal party accepted and those from other parties refused?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: There is obviously no question of privilege here. However, perhaps the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) would like to say something. My understanding of the two questions was that they were completely different; the first question, asked by one of the hon. members to my left, required a detailed answer concerning a small section of railway between cities A and B, and I understand the second question had to do with the general principle.

Mr. Regan: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I submit also that there is urgency in this matter, inasmuch as the D.A.R. service was to have been curtailed at the end of this week. I also understand the minister is in a position to make a brief statement in this regard.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Regan: If I can make myself heard over the noise from the opposite side of the house—

Mr. Speaker: Order. In order to settle the matter, would the hon. member put his question on the order paper.

Mr. Lambert: It was a stooge question, anyway.

Mr. Winch: It was decided two days ago by transport, and you know it.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

STUDY OF EXTENSION OF TELEVISION SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State whether he is now in a position to answer the question which I directed to him through his parliamentary secretary on October 6, regarding a study of the extension of C.B.C. television services.

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend might recall, the decision with regard to extension of service or alternative service will not be made until the advisory committee on broadcasting presents its report, which I hope will be early in 1965.

Mr. Simpson: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The question I asked was in two parts. I asked whether the government had made a request to the C.B.C. for an up to date study; and if they have not, would they consider doing so at this time, namely asking the C.B.C. for an up to date study regarding the extension of television services to the unserviced parts of Canada?

Mr. Lamontagne: I am quite sure that the C.B.C. is giving very active consideration to this very important matter and will present its views to the advisory committee.

IMMIGRATION

TORONTO—STATUS OF PERSONS CONCERNED WITH NEWSPAPER STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration whether he has completed the investigation he has been making for the last couple of weeks into the status of the people employed by the newspapers in Toronto in connection with the strike, and in particular the status of the six individuals who are apparently here without status.

I wonder whether we could have a report on that.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in my absence my parliamentary secretary made a statement to the house on the problem concerning the group of people who came to Canada or were allowed to work for the news-

papers which were involved in a strike in Toronto.

I know the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) inquired more specifically about the status of six persons, and I have yet to receive the details of the inquiry carried out in Toronto. I hope to receive them within the next few days, at which time I will be pleased to answer the question of the hon. member.

[Text]

STATEMENT ON REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF CASES OF GREEK SEAMEN

On the orders of the day:

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I should like to give an answer to the Leader of the Opposition who, on October 8 and again on October 14 inquired concerning the government's attitude toward deserting seamen. He made specific reference to a number of Greek seamen in Toronto now awaiting hearing of their appeals from convictions handed down by the courts for illegal entry to Canada.

Considerable publicity has been given to the subject of ship deserters, both in the house and in the press, during the past several months, and the problem and difficulties attendant to this question have occupied my department's attention for an even lengthier period. In our review of these problems one point became abundantly clear at the outset; that is that there has been an alarming increase among certain groups of the resort to this particular means of gaining entry to Canada. They are doing so in the hope that even if they are caught they will be able to bring enough public pressure to bear to allow them to remain in this country. These people, the majority of whom are otherwise inadmissible as immigrants, are knowingly and purposely breaking the law, and if this practice were to go unchecked it would only result in utter chaos and a complete disregard for Canadian law.

When discussing the cases referred to by the Leader of the Opposition it must be remembered that there are two separate and distinct issues involved here. In the first instance, because of their actions these persons became the subject of immigration inquiries under the Immigration Act, and were properly ordered deported under section 19 (1) (e) (x) of the act for having remained in Canada without the permission of an immigration officer after the departure of their vessels. In very exceptional cases where the strongest compassionate grounds exist, and where the fullest co-operation has been forthcoming, I have directed that the person might be allowed to remain in this country to see how he progresses. I would also like to make it clear, however, that where deportation has taken place this has not ruled out the possibility of the individual being permitted to come forward again at some future date as a legal immigrant in the normal way if he can comply with all other immigration requirements.

As to what may be the outcome of the specific cases referred to by the Leader of the Opposition, it is not possible to say just what action may eventually be taken in their cases. All I can say at the moment is that they will be examined carefully in the light of the policy considerations I have set out above. The specific case of Ilias Vitsas is no different than any of the others, and this man's case will also be carefully reviewed under this policy.

The second issue involved in these cases is that by reason of their method of gaining entry to Canada they have broken the law, and like anyone else who does not adhere to the laws of Canada they become liable for arraignment by the responsible police authorities before the competent courts of the land. It would be inappropriate for me, of course, to offer any comments whatever concerning the action taken or the decisions reached by the courts in these cases.

Regarding the right hon. gentleman's inquiry concerning any direction given to the government's counsel in these cases, I would just like to confirm the position I took earlier in this respect, that no instructions were issued to counsel by either officials of my department or the Department of Justice as to the degree of vigour with which these cases were to be pressed. The role of the prosecuting counsel in these cases was no different than it is in any other court proceeding, and that is to pursue the prosecution only to the point required in the interests of simple justice.

PROCEDURE

CORRECTION OF ELEVENTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE IN "VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS"

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the house to a correction appearing in *Votes and Proceedings* for Tuesday, October 20. It relates to the eleventh report of the special committee on procedure and organiza-

tion, concurred in on Monday, October 19. The report was first printed, and without error, in *Votes and Proceedings* for Wednesday, October 7. Unfortunately, however, when reprinted on Monday, October 19, a transposition of certain lines occurred, and this has now been corrected by the erratum following page 813 of *Votes and Proceedings* for yesterday. I draw this to the attention of hon. members because it is part of an important report concurred in by the house.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

DISCIPLINARY MEASURES RESPECTING APPLICATION OF FUNDS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. A few weeks ago the minister announced that he was going to make a statement concerning the investigation now being carried out with regard to the R.C.M.P. in Montreal. Can the minister tell us if this investigation has now been completed and what changes have been made as a result of the said investigation?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, all the proceedings have not yet been completed in this regard.

Mr. Martineau: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Was this followed by changes in the high command of the R.C.M.P. in Montreal?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, changes have been made in the high command of the R.C.M.P. at Montreal and they were announced in the press. I must say, however, that they should not be attributed to the results of the investigation because, as I have already pointed out, it will only be proper to make comments on the investigation as such when all proceedings have been completed.

[*Text*]

INVESTIGATION INTO ALLEGATIONS OF POLICE BRUTALITY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Justice a question. Last Friday he said he expected to receive fairly soon a report regarding police activities in Quebec city during Her Majesty's recent visit. I want to ask the minister whether he has yet received such a report and, if not, when he does receive it will it be made public?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received the report; but I might add that today I once more asked that it be forwarded to me promptly.

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt, but we are already four minutes overdue. Question time was up at 3.25 p.m., but on account of the long statement made a few moments ago I thought three or four minutes extra should be granted as a bonus. But we are over the half hour period.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the difficulties with which you are confronted, but I had been attempting to get the floor for some time before you called orders of the day. I thought we were going to continue on orders of the day, so I sat down; and then you called on the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam.

Mr. Speaker: There is a slight misstatement there. I did not call on the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam; he took the floor.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I had forgotten it was Wednesday and I had not realized that time was up. I apologize to the hon. member.

SUPPLY

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

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

1. Departmental administration, $6,491,400.

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to make a statement at this time because the estimates of the department have, of course, been thoroughly examined by the standing committee on veterans affairs. I only want to say that I think I should put on the record the fact that I am sure all members of this committee will join with me in expressing our highest commendation for the very efficient and cooperative manner in which the estimates were dealt with in that committee. Perhaps I should also put on the records of the house the resolution moved by the hon. member for Kootenay West in that committee, which is as follows:

I would like to move that this committee express its appreciation of the clear, concise and informative

way in which the deputy minister and other officials have answered questions during this hearing.

I should like to add my commendation to that remark.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to go any further at this moment, because as I said the estimates were thoroughly dealt with in the committee. I will of course answer any questions that are asked during our examination of the estimates this afternoon.

Mr. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the estimates were dealt with quite thoroughly by the committee, but I did anticipate that the minister would make a statement about government policy in respect of veterans affairs at this time. Simply because these estimates were considered thoroughly by a committee does not in itself relieve the minister from his responsibility to indicate on the floor of this chamber, at the beginning of a consideration here of his estimates, what government policy is in respect of veterans affairs. I think the minister should indicate what legislation he has in mind for the veterans of this country. The minister has given us no indication in that regard this afternoon, the first opportunity we have had for a general discussion.

The minister has not satisfied me, nor presumably other members on this side of the house, by simply suggesting that because these estimates were considered thoroughly by a committee it is not necessary for him to make a further statement here. This is the forum in which the government has the opportunity to outline policy in respect of major questions, such as veterans affairs, and the forum in which we have a responsibility to listen and to commend or criticize those policies. I hope that at some later time the minister will consider what I have said in this regard and give us an outline of the government's intentions.

When questions were asked during the committee meetings about legislation or review of legislation in respect of veterans affairs, the minister said he hoped that the government's intentions in respect of this legislation would be introduced in the house by the end of this month or early next month. I am sure the minister must realize, as we do, that the members of this committee are very limited in their approach to this important subject without having in their minds some idea of government policy.

On December 10, 1963, the third report of the standing committee on veterans affairs was presented to this house. It contained a number of recommendations which called for legislative action. As yet we have not seen evidence of any action of that kind. At this time we can only hope that there will be something done in the way of legislation in respect of veterans affairs. The minister said that there would be some legislation of this kind introduced. I think it would help us in our consideration of these estimates to know what that legislation is.

A period of ten or 11 months has elapsed since that committee report was received by the house. Surely that is sufficient time for the minister to make a review of the veterans legislation and consider the steps which ought to be taken in respect of the recommendations of that committee. Surely the minister has had time to consider the representations that I am sure he has received during that period of time. Obviously there is necessity for a review and revision of veterans legislation. The minister did not enlighten us in this regard by his statement this afternoon. As a result, I think we must consider the recommendations contained in the report of the veterans affairs committee, keeping in mind some of the changes which have occurred since that time. Many of the difficulties which were discussed by the committee have not been sufficiently covered by the minister today.

I should like to refer to two aspects of veterans affairs legislation which were not the subject of recommendations contained in the report to which I have made reference, and I refer to veterans allowances and disability pensions. In view of the substantial increase in the cost of living during the past year, and the various representations which I am sure have been made to the minister and the government—certainly many members of this house have received representations—what consideration is being given to the difficulties being encountered by recipients of war veterans allowances and disability pensions? These recipients are now realizing that their present levels of pensions and allowances are not adequate. We do not know what the government's intention is in this regard. Nothing has appeared on the order paper which would give us an indication. We have been assured that when the legislation does appear on the order paper it will meet all our requirements, but we are not absolutely sure that that is an accurate statement.

In view of the increase in the correspondence received by the members of this

house dealing with this situation, undoubtedly there is a strong realization among the veterans in this country that the present level of pensions and allowances is not sufficient to meet the increased costs they must meet from day to day. Rents have increased as a consequence of increased building costs, about which I think the government has heard a great deal. Food and clothing costs have increased. Because of the fixed level of incomes of veterans, and increasing costs, the veterans are now finding themselves in what our agriculturist friends refer to as a cost-price squeeze. Surely the government has had ample opportunity to do something to alleviate this situation, or at least to give the veterans some assurance that action is contemplated.

I should now like to refer to the recommendations contained in the report of the standing committee on veterans affairs, as presented to the house on December 10, 1963. Recommendation No. 9 in that third report to this house is as follows:

> Your committee feels that the time has come when major pieces of pensions legislation should be reviewed and is of the opinion that much of the difficulty can be overcome by reviewing the sections in question so as to clarify the following points:
>
> (a) "Benefit of doubt". At the moment there is some evidence to show that the interpretation now being given by the commissioners is not sufficiently broad to be entirely in keeping with what we believe to be the spirit of the act.
>
> We suggest that the word "doubt" in the phrase "benefit of doubt" be interpreted to mean "a reasonable doubt" as might be expected to arise in the mind of a reasonable man in the street.

As the minister is well aware, this question about the benefit of doubt was raised during the deliberations of the committee. The chairman of the pension commission said that the benefit of doubt in his opinion is adequately exercised in reviewing every case that comes before the commission. We do not doubt the sincerity of the chairman of the pension commission in that regard. We believe that within the general terms of reference to that commission they do exercise the benefit of the doubt. I am sure there is not one member of this house who does not have a thick file of representations from veterans in respect of applications for pension or revisions of pension. As a result I am sure most members have come to the conclusion that the benefit of the doubt clause has not been exercised as generously as has been suggested, or as generously as we in this house think it ought to be. We do not think it is being exercised as generously as was intended by the parliament of Canada when it enacted the legislation which contains that clause.

I should like to refer to a specific case, and there have been a great many over the last six or seven years. An individual of the Royal Canadian Navy while on board a vessel in the port of New Orleans between 1943 and 1944 underwent an appendix operation. From that time he has had a history of continuous illness, both while in the service and after his discharge, including tuberculosis, which resulted in a period of confinement in a t.b. sanitorium. This was followed by bouts of blindness, deafness and continuous pain. The veteran required drugs over a period of many years, all of which he paid for. No help was provided in this regard through any pension award because no benefit of the doubt was given. Unfortunately the doctors were unable to come to a final diagnosis of the disease and because they could not diagnose the disease they would not give an opinion whether it was as a consequence of war service. But one fact that was known was that the recurring illness was continuous from the time the man had the initial operation while on service until the time he applied to the pension commission. Finally after 18 years the pension commission did grant a pension but made it retroactive for only 12 months.

Where is there adequate application of the benefit of the doubt in such a case? This is what the committee had in mind when it asked the government to consider reviewing the legislation in order to provide a far more generous interpretation of the phrase "benefit of doubt" and far greater attention to the needs of the veterans in order to eliminate cases of the kind I have just cited, where years and years can elapse and the veteran is perhaps finally given pension entitlement only as a consequence of the exercise of the benefit of the doubt. But how many years of suffering, financial uncertainty, job loss and agony of mind must a veteran go through before the benefit of the doubt is applied in the manner in which the parliament and government of Canada meant it should be applied, I believe, when this provision was placed in the legislation?

I go on to the second part of recommendation No. 9 in the committee report where in paragraph (b) they state:

> That the burden of proof rests with the commission and not with the veteran applicant.

Then there is a reference to an extract from Lord Denning's report which appears in the

evidence during the committee's hearings last year. I believe it is up to the minister to tell us very soon whether these recommendations have been fully considered and whether legislation is going to be presented to us based upon them. He should also tell us why it has been found necessary to bring forward the general discussion of veterans affairs on these estimates before the legislation has been made available to the house for study. Section 10 of the committee's report reads as follows:

> Your committee further feels that instead of a "one-shot" appeal which is both final and binding, there should be two appeals as follows:
>
> (a) a preliminary appeal in which all the evidence is transcribed and then the ruling is given in the form of a written judgment in which all points of evidence both medical and legal on which the ruling is based is set forth in writing and signed.

In the committee we heard officers of the department say that when a final judgment is given by the commission the veteran is acquainted with all of the facts and knows the reasons for the commission's decision. Although I do not deny that this information is available, I am not certain that those who have made applications and receive word of rejection are completely aware of all of the reasons. If they are, if they know the procedures to follow, if it is common knowledge among these people what they must do next, then how is it that so many members of parliament spend so much of their time endeavouring to secure answers for them? There is not one member of the house who does not have case after case in which he finds himself acting as an intermediary between the veteran and the minister and his departmental officials.

If the means by which veterans are informed of their rights and of the reasons for the rejection of pension applications are adequate, surely there should be no necessity for the voluminous quantity of mail in this regard with which members of parliament have to deal. There must be something missing in the procedures. Surely it would be a very simple matter to improve the procedures so that veterans who make application to the commission will have a far better understanding of the precise reasons for rejection, what they have to do next and how to go about entering an appeal. The second part of recommendation No. 10 in last year's report reads as follows:

> (b) a second ruling as at present. Your committee recommends that this procedure would correct the disadvantage the veteran now suffers as he would know what arguments must be rebutted instead of having to prepare his appeal blindly as at present.

It may be that the committee report goes a little too far. In my experience the chief pensions advocate and the pensions advocates across the country do a remarkable job in helping veterans to present their appeals. Once the pensions advocates become familiar with the case and get in touch with the veteran their work on behalf of the veteran is outstanding. They give very sympathetic attention to these matters and I do not believe they permit veterans to go blindly into appeals.

However, strangely enough, although we are assured that the procedures are well understood by all applicants we find that time and time again members of parliament must intervene in order to bring a veteran who does not seem to know his rights into contact with the officers of the department, including the veterans advocates, who can assist him. Therefore in this instance it is perhaps not so much a failure of administration or policy but a failure of communication. If this is all that is missing, then for goodness sake let us get something done about it because it does not need to wait for legislation. This is an administrative matter that can be taken care of.

Because of the substantial volume of mail that members continually receive, I am afraid it is not going to be enough to suggest to members that the present procedures are adequate. Furthermore, I am sure the minister knows from his own experience, as do his departmental officials, that the mail we receive is not frivolous. It does not involve somebody trying to get something for nothing. The Legion branches and other veterans organizations do very valuable work in this regard, and time and time again when cases are brought to the attention of members of the house or the Legion it turns out that the applicant has not understood his rights and has finally approached a Legion branch or another veterans organization or a member of the house in order to try to get proper attention to his legitimate rights. A failure of understanding has intervened and has been the cause of considerable hardship and suffering for some veterans when in fact procedures exist to relieve such conditions.

The eleventh recommendation of the committee was in these words:

> Your committee is of the opinion that the time has come when the excellent prosthetic service developed by the D.V.A. should become a national service available for all Canadians.

It would be interesting to know how far the government has proceeded in looking into that question, and I believe other speakers may be dealing with it in more detail later today. The twelfth recommendation reads as follows:

> Your committee is aware that a point has been reached where a decision must be made regarding treatment services in both areas of responsibility and administration. Your committee recommends that fullest consultation be carried out with veterans organizations before any changes are made.

During the past year and a half we have had a good deal of discussion of this question in the house. I believe we can accept the fact that the minister is now consulting in advance with the veterans organizations and he has given the committee the assurance that he will do so in the future, for which we give him full credit. However, as the minister must be aware, if there should be any deviation from this intention there are members of the house who will have something further to say on the question. In view of the testimony given in the committee and what we have heard in answer to questions in the house I believe we can assume that the interests of the veterans are paramount in any change that is contemplated, that their interests will be given first consideration and that the veterans organizations will be consulted prior to any change.

I hope the minister has taken fully into account the recommendation that was made with regard to the payment of increases in veterans pensions and allowances. The recommendation of the committee was to the effect that such changes should be favourably considered whenever similar adjustments are made to the salaries of civil servants and members of the armed services, and consideration should be given to legislation which would bring this about. This would have the result of eliminating increases in pensions and allowances by the sort of hit or miss method that is used at the present time when other considerations than the ones to which I have referred are taken into account. If the government comes to the conclusion that the salaries of civil servants or members of the armed services are not adequate, they act. The procedures in this respect have been greatly altered and a continuous review now takes place. A similar procedure should be adopted with regard to war veterans allowances and pensions. Perhaps the minister has given approval to this idea or something like it, but we do not know. Again, I can only say that it is unfortunate we do not know because we expected we would know before these estimates came before us.

Finally, there is a very special recommendation in this report upon which I should like to comment. It reads as follows:

> In view of the special problems that time and experience have revealed concerning the Hong Kong veterans this committee urges that a special study and survey be made of their problems and particular disabilities.

We understand that such a survey is taking place within the pension commission or within the department. How much longer is it going to take? It has been ten months since this report was made and approximately 20 years since the Hong Kong veterans were brought back to Canada and the Canadian people and the department became aware of the special problems confronting them. During the last year or two, perhaps for a longer period, I do not believe there has been very much new ascertained within the Department of Veterans Affairs about the particular problems of the Hong Kong veterans. The diseases to which they were subjected and the conditions under which they were imprisoned were so severe that a much higher proportion of these prisoners of war have died during the years since the war than in any other particular group of veterans. They are living with continuing afflictions resulting from the diseases and conditions of their environment, their diet, the treatment they received and the things to which they were subjected and from which they have been unable to recover physically, and in many cases mentally as well.

I would expect the minister to be particularly sympathetic because of his own experience. I shared the somewhat similar experience myself in a German camp. I am one of the lucky ones and I expect the minister would consider he is one of the lucky ones, too. The Hong Kong veterans are not lucky. I do not suppose it was ever really lucky to be a prisoner of war, anyway. However, the Hong Kong veterans did encounter particularly difficult circumstances. We know the survey is being made. What are the results? There have been interviews, discussions and questions on this subject in the public forum for years. I feel it is time now we knew what it is the government intends to do. Is this survey going to go the way of so many surveys, and disappear into the limbo of pigeonholes? Let us have some answers. There have been sufficient months now in which to secure and correlate all the information. Give us some indication of the

government's intention with regard to the Hong Kong veterans. I am sure there is no member in this house who would not regard sympathetically any action by the government in this regard.

Generally speaking, Mr. Chairman, these are the questions that come to the minds of the members of this committee in dealing with these estimates. Of course it is quite possible that details may be raised on individual items as we go along. One of the things that occurs to us now is that sufficient time has elapsed for us to be made aware of the government's intentions with regard to veterans legislation. We are no longer satisfied to sit here quietly and wait while the government continues to use up further months making up its mind. We want to know now. We want to know precisely what the intentions are and when they are going to be implemented.

So far as the members of the Department of Veterans Affairs are concerned, the senior officers and other officers there, I think it was stated very well in the committee, and it could be repeated here, that every one of us knows the men and women who direct the affairs of the department are dedicated to the interests of the veteran. They have the support of this house in their efforts, regardless of where a member sits. We appreciate what they do, and we will support them in the doing of it. We do want some policy announcement now from the government.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, like the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke, I was somewhat disappointed that the minister did not take the opportunity in introducing his estimates to inform the house of the government's intentions with regard to amendments to legislation which have been sought by veterans organizations and members of the house for some time. I trust that this brief, shall I say, prologue on his part only indicates we shall hear much more when we come to the epilogue so far as these estimates are concerned. I do want to say this to the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke: I trust he shows the same vigour in protecting the rights of veterans whose property is about to be flooded by the Columbia river development as he has shown this afternoon with regard to these estimates. I can say that in all sincerity because I have had correspondence with many of them. I trust he shows the same sense of urgency in protecting the property and civil rights of these veterans against the British Columbia power authority.

[Mr. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke).]

Having said that, I want to say that I appreciate the courtesies I have received from the minister. I say quite frankly I have appreciated his personal attention to any questions I have brought before him. I believe that applies as well to inquiries directed to the officials as well. I should like to pay tribute also to the senior officials in Ottawa of all branches of the Department of Veterans Affairs and to the field staff. I support the remarks made by the previous speaker in that respect. There is no question about the services rendered by the officials of this department who, I think it is safe to say, throughout the years have dealt directly with more human beings than any other department of government.

Now, before proceeding, I want to pay tribute to the work of the Royal Canadian Legion, the army and navy veterans association, the Canadian corps, the imperial veterans, the amputation association, the Hong Kong veterans association, and all of those other veteran organizations, who have studied veterans problems so closely. These organizations have made it possible for this department, with the experience of 20 years, to accomplish a great deal for veterans and their dependants. I should like to say that this department is a rather unusual one. It is the department responsible for providing services to the veterans and their dependants. This has been a great experience so far as Canada is concerned. This department has pioneered legislation that has shown the way for the development of legislation in social welfare, and so on. The department has pioneered certain medical research, as well as the question of manufacturing artificial limbs and that sort of thing, which has been of advantage to Canadians other than veterans. It has pioneered in the treatment service as well. It has pioneered administrative services—administrative procedures and methods. Moreover the Veterans Land Act administration pioneered certain things in connection with farm credit. It is my opinion that the farm credit legislation which was placed on the statute books a few years ago was largely based on the experience of the Veterans Land Act administration.

I have always taken a personal interest in the work of this department and the problems it has to deal with. I am, I believe, well into my twentieth year as a member of the committee on veterans affairs, more recently known as the standing committee on veterans

affairs, and I am sure that when the time comes for me to create a breath of fresh air by disappearing from this chamber I shall be able to say with the poet Moore:

> When Time who steals my years away
> Shall steal my pleasures, too,
> Fond memories of these days will stay
> And half my joys renew.

I wish now to deal briefly with a few of the matters which have been considered by the veterans organizations, by the standing committee on veterans affairs and by a good many members of this house. Time will not permit me to deal fully with all the questions which concern veterans and veterans organizations. However, I expect colleagues of mine in tnis group to discuss other matters which are of importance. I wish to deal first of all with a resolution which has passed at the last national convention of the Royal Canadian Legion. I think this is a matter to which the minister should give some consideration. I will read it:

> Whereas Canada achieved nationhood in large measure through the efforts and sacrifice of those who served in the forces in time of war; and
> Whereas the Royal Canadian Legion is composed of many ethnic groups which comprise a large portion of Canada's population:
> Be it resolved that we urge upon the government that the Royal Canadian Legion be represented on all national committees that may be set up for the purpose of considering Canada's status as a nation.

I support the principle of that motion and I support the thought behind it. However, I would suggest it might be advisable to ask all the veterans organizations to get together and nominate persons who could serve on these national committees. I think the veterans of this country should have representation on these important committees which deal with the national questions mentioned and I urge the minister to give this resolution his consideration since I believe it to be very constructive and appropriate.

I wish to turn briefly to the question of pension rates. When the veterans legislation was first under consideration it was established that pensions would be related to the earnings of the ordinary workers of this country. I think this has been the generally accepted principle throughout the years. In recent years there has been an increase in the cost of living across this nation. Salaried people and wage earners have received a measure of compensation by way of increases in salaries and wages. Naturally the veterans organizations have been urging the government to consider granting an increase in disability pension rates. I support such requests and I support the recommendation of the standing committee on veterans affairs that these rates should be increased to meet the circumstances of the day. We are looking forward with a great deal of anticipation to the introduction of legislation to amend the Pension Act.

There is too this question of the benefit of the doubt, which has been brought before the committee on veterans affairs on a number of occasions. I think this is one of the most contentious and longstanding problems with which the committee has had to deal. We listened last year to the evidence given by the chairman of the Canadian pension commission and we have also listened to the evidence presented by the veterans organizations. The representations of these organizations convinced members of the committee that the benefit of the doubt was not being given in accordance with the expectations of members of parliament when the bill was passed. A recommendation to this effect was included in the committee's last report to the house; I will not deal at great length with this question because one of my hon. friends will be discussing it in greater detail.

Another matter which came before the committee was a request that there should be automatic pension increases for all 50 per cent pensioners on the basis of age. The resolution passed at the convention reads as follows:

> Whereas veterans in receipt of 50 per cent pensions for conditions other than gunshot wounds are also experiencing diminished earning capacity:
> Therefore be it resolved that all 50 per cent disability pensioners be entitled to the automatic age increase.

I support that resolution, as do other members of our party. I have felt throughout the years that there was a measure of injustice in the working of this section of the Pension Act. I am aware that in the first instance the section was included so as to provide a measure of compensation for those who were wounded in battle. But I think there are many veterans who suffered disabilities in similar circumstances, on the field of battle or otherwise, and I would therefore urge that consideration be given to this proposal also.

An hon. member who spoke earlier mentioned the survey now being undertaken by the department in connection with the needs and circumstances of the Hong Kong veterans. I join with all others in expressing the hope that this survey will soon be complete and that there will be a report followed by some action on the part of the government to meet the needs of these men. In this connection let me say again that one of my hon. friends will

be dealing with the question of these veterans at great length later on.

Another matter in which I am particularly interested is the resolution passed at the last dominion convention of the Royal Canadian Legion to the following effect:

> Whereas it appears that the Canadian pension commission from time to time adopts matters of policy in deciding pension cases which are not anywhere stated in law or by regulation:
>
> Therefore be it resolved that whenever any new policy is decided by the commission in dealing with any case, the same shall be made available to the Royal Canadian Legion.
>
> And that all present existing policy which is not stated by regulation or law also be made similarly available.

I strongly support this resolution and I believe this information should be made available to veterans organizations. I recall some years ago requests being made year after year on behalf of veterans organizations that the table of disabilities be made public. This was denied by successive governments. Finally—and I consider this one of my major achievements since I have been a member of this house—I moved a motion for the production of papers asking that this table of disabilities be produced. There was a certain timidity and hesitation on the part of the government of the day, but finally the minister took the bull by the horns and said he was agreeable to the production of the table. It was produced, and it is available now to the veterans organizations of this country. It has been a most valuable document to them. Though there was a certain reluctance about producing it, it is admitted now—I think the minister and his officials will admit it—that it has been a useful document for veterans organizations and their advocates to have in presenting the claims of veterans before the pension commission. I suggest that this further recommendation is very worth while and its implementation would be a positive contribution toward the co-operation that has existed throughout the years between the department and the veterans organizations in Canada in the administration of veterans legislation.

I now come to the War Veterans Allowance Act. I want to make a plea for the consideration of an increase in the war veterans allowance, on the same grounds upon which an increase in disability pensions is being sought. It is obvious from the interest taken in this question by veterans organizations at national, provincial and branch levels that this is a matter of serious concern to the many veterans and their dependants who do require a substantial increase in the war veterans allowance. I know from personal experience in meeting a good many veterans throughout the constituency that there is a definite need for such an increase. I have discussed with the veterans their difficulties; I know their problems and the domestic circumstances of a good many of the veterans I have the honour to represent, and I have no hesitation in saying, in association with other members in this house, that those veterans on war veterans allowance urgently need an increase in the allowance.

I suggest that at the same time there should be an increase in the permissive income. I think the minister indicated to the committee that this question is receiving some consideration. I am of the opinion that there should be the abolition of the means test in respect of those veterans over age 65. We have never been able to secure general approval for this proposal, but I believe that for those over 65 years of age there should be the abolition of the means test in connection with war veterans allowance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I come to the question of veterans hospitals. The policy announced by the minister has caused some concern in veterans organizations across this country. First of all I want to congratulate the minister on the way he presented his case before the dominion convention of the Royal Canadian Legion. I fully expected to see a bit of fireworks there. I sat in the audience and listened to him, and I thought he presented his case in such a way that it indicated he knew the spirit and temper of veterans. I heard a good many delegates to that convention, while not agreeing with all the minister said, speak in quite complimentary tones of his very tactful and, shall I say, gracious approach to a prickly problem.

Mr. Fane: Don't embarrass him.

Mr. Herridge: After the minister had spoken, that convention passed the following resolution:

> Whereas many veterans with chronic disabilities must have domiciliary care and frequently must have expert medical advice as is evidenced from a further statement made by the director-general of treatment services that "they all have some degree of medical reason for being in the hospital and many of them have a very great degree of medical reason":
>
> Therefore be it resolved that no transfer of any D.V.A. hospital to civilian administration be made by D.V.A. at the present time without full consultation at the outset of negotiations and mutual agreement with both dominion and provincial commands of the Royal Canadian Legion; and

Be it further resolved that no such operational transfer be effected until adequate domiciliary care, with the necessary medical services actually in being; and that if and when any active treatment hospital facilities are shared with civilian authorities, D.V.A. must control the admission, the care and the discharge of all veterans, and provision must be made for their admittance, regardless of the pressure of civilian demands.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, I think all reasonable people recognize that there are changing circumstances with respect to admissions to veterans hospitals across this country. I hope and trust that the minister will, in dealing with this problem, recognize the spirit and purpose of the resolution passed by the Royal Canadian Legion. Personally I am quite optimistic in that respect.

Now I come to the Veterans Land Act. A resolution was passed by the Royal Canadian Legion in this connection. I am just picking a few resolutions out of the many that were passed, because they are of particular interest. There was one with respect to the removal of the time limit for serving personnel, which reads as follows:

Whereas it has been determined that many veterans with wartime service now in the Canadian forces are eligible for benefits under the Veterans Land Act:

Therefore be it resolved that the Veterans Land Act be amended to ensure that benefits may be available to veterans now in service upon discharge, regardless of that date.

I think that is a very reasonable request on the part of the Royal Canadian Legion, and the members of this group support it. We look forward to an amendment to the Veterans Land Act to meet the situation that is covered by this resolution. I could go on at greater length to some other minor amendments with respect to the Veterans Land Act, Mr. Chairman, but I will leave those to a later date.

I now come to a question that has been concerning veterans organizations and a good many veterans generally across Canada. This is the question of the maintenance of the veterans preference in the civil service. We will soon be 20 years away from the last world war, veterans are aging, and there is a tendency on the part of some people to feel that the veterans preference should no longer apply, and so on. But, Mr. Chairman, we strongly support the maintenance of the veterans preference in the civil service. The resolution passed by the Royal Canadian Legion dealing with this matter says:

Therefore be it resolved that the existing statutory preferences for war veterans as set out in the Civil Service Act be maintained.

They were very concerned about the Heeney report of December, 1958, and the Glassco report of July, 1962, which recommended the substitution of a less embracing form of veterans preference for the existing absolute preference. The Royal Canadian Legion also recommended that additional preference be established for world war II veterans. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas these veterans do not qualify for veterans preference over a non-veteran for employment in the federal civil service:

Therefore be it resolved that section 40 of the Civil Service Act be amended to provide an additional veterans preference after the overseas preference to the active veterans of world war II, regardless of where the veteran served.

I trust the minister will give consideration to that recommendation. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words on behalf of the corps of commissionaires. A resolution was passed at the Royal Canadian Legion convention in this regard. I discussed this matter with a number of the delegates present at the convention who are concerned with the growing practice of government departments and private employers in employing private detective agencies. As a matter of fact I was rather shocked when I visited the national art gallery recently and noticed that the building is policed by a private detective agency; I think it is called the national security service, or something of that sort. This has caused veterans some concern, because it reduces the opportunities for veterans who are getting on in years to undertake useful employment and provide a useful service that is not beyond their physical capacity.

In this connection the Legion passed a resolution which is critical of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation because it replaced the corps of commissionaires in certain areas. It says amongst other things:

Whereas a great many veterans who were employed with the corps of commissionaires carrying out these duties have consequently lost their employment; and

Whereas the Legion is becoming increasingly concerned over the failure of governments at all levels to maintain the provisions of the veterans' preference and to promote the employment of ex-servicemen in government positions:

Therefore be it resolved that the government be requested to immediately halt any further replacement of corps of commissionaires personnel by private security agencies and urge other levels of government to follow suit.

I am sure all members of our standing committee on veterans affairs will support that recommendation by the Legion and I urge the minister to look into the question to see

what is happening at the present time. Because this practice of employing private detective agencies is growing.

I know my time is fairly short but I want to make reference now to a matter which concerns veterans in my own constituency. I have raised the matter in the standing committee on veterans affairs. I am referring to those veterans who will be affected by the building of dams under Columbia river treaty projects. There are two classes of veterans: There are those who are purchasing property, but have not completed their purchase from the Veterans Land Act administration, and those who have purchased it in other ways. I think this provides an opportunity for the department to set a pattern which will be of value to the other property owners who will be affected.

At this time I want to thank the minister for his prompt attention to a matter which I brought up by way of a question asked in the house. I am informed that the B.C. power and hydro authority soon got wind of the question and answer and immediately sent their men in to meet this veteran in question, to settle the matters of which he complained. These were not matters of price but matters of inconvenience and that sort of thing which I thought were thoroughly unnecessary. Anyway the matters were settled and I thank the minister for his prompt attention and the complete reply I received from him in this respect.

I think the department can perform a service to the veterans who come under its jurisdiction, namely those who still owe money on their properties under the Veterans Land Act administration, and also other veterans and property holders who are affected. I know that a good many of my colleagues in the house think I get a little too disturbed about this question, but I am representing people some of whom I have known for 50 years and the majority of whom I have known for many years. I urge the minister to make certain that everything is done to protect the rights of these veterans under the V.L.A. because, as we were informed in the committee by the director, who I am sure is most sympathetic, the Veterans Land Act administration could not agree to the sale of the property unless the veteran concerned gave his permission. If he failed to give permission, then as a last resort the administration had to get an order in council. I hope that the Department of Veterans Affairs stands right up squarely for the veterans who are depending on them.

[Mr. Herridge.]

In this connection I want to read a letter written by a veteran who lives in the riding of Okanagan-Revelstoke. This letter was published in the Revelstoke *Review* on Thursday, October 15 last, and I have received numerous letters in similar vein to this from people living up and down the shores of the Columbia river and along the Arrow lakes, both veterans and other property owners. I mention this letter because this indicates the spirit of the B.C. power and hydro authority. The letter says:

> Editor, *Review*:
>
> Farmers in Sidmouth are now facing the darkest time in their lives. Soon we will be forced to leave our farms and homes at hydro's price.

There is no bargaining on their part; B.C. hydro sets the price and people have to take it or leave it. There is no negotiation. The letter continues:

> We have nothing to say even if we have lived here 50 to 60 years, worked hard and made a place for ourselves where we could make a living as long as we live.
>
> If that is just around the corner for us, 42,000 Canadians who died for freedom must be turning in their graves at this display of freedom and civil rights.

That figure is wrong; it should be 60,000 odd.

> We might as well join the 42,000, as there is little to live for now.
>
> We know we are living in an awful troubled world, but the Bible tells us that the time will soon be here when the lion will eat with the lamb—instead of now—when the lion eats the lamb.

That is the B.C. power and hydro authority to which he is referring.

The Chairman: Order, please. I must interrupt the hon. member as his time has expired.

Mr. Herridge: I have just two or three sentences more and I am finished.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Chairman: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Herridge: I appreciate the courtesy of hon. members. This letter concludes:

> The present situation in our valley shows that water is getting more and more expensive and our farms less and less valuable.

I mention that because it is typical of the letters I have received from veterans; and I received another the other day from a veteran near Castlegar. It is obvious that people would not write in this vein unless they thought they were being treated unfairly and

unjustly and I urge the department to do what they can to help these veterans.

There is one more matter before I conclude. There is a veterans cemetery in the area, with individual veterans graves. I trust that the department will do all it can to see that the rights and wishes of relatives are respected. I hope they will make an investigation to see what cemeteries will be affected and what individual graves in other cemeteries will be affected; and I hope the department will do all it can to ease the difficulties of the veterans who are affected by this development.

Mr. Patterson: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to say we appreciate the fact that the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs were referred to the committee for detailed study and analysis. I believe this gives an opportunity for a more thorough examination of the details of the estimates which are contained in the blue book. I was rather surprised at one or two references today to the absence of any extended remarks by the minister. It was my understanding that reference of estimates to a committee was not only to help expedite a thorough study of the estimates but also somehow to reduce the necessity of extended debate when they came back to the house; but perhaps my understanding is not quite true to the fact in this connection. However, I do not intend to prolong the debate on the estimates at this time, although I do want to make several brief references to a number of items of special concern which have been referred to me by constituents and others from time to time.

In the course of the committee hearings the Minister of Veterans Affairs indicated that amendments would be introduced to a variety of acts concerning veterans, and perhaps I was rather naïve but I expected him to come through with them in due course. However, this afternoon it was pointed out that we have not anything at all in this regard except the minister's says so. We have nothing definite or positive, so therefore we are somewhat held in suspense. As I pointed out on another occasion, I think we have to take the minister's words at face value, and we expect in the very near future to have him bring before this house the amendments he has predicted and promised concerning various acts having to do with veterans affairs.

Mr. Chairman, reference has been made this afternoon to the possibility and desirability of an increase in war veterans allowances, and I should like to give my full support to this request. It is not necessary to enlarge upon it or state once again the reasons for this request, but perhaps I should clarify the situation. There are two factors which ought to be taken into consideration. One is the constantly increasing cost of living, and the second is the upward revision of pensions that are being paid to Canadian citizens through other types of legislation. These two reasons alone would be sufficient to support an upward revision of war veterans allowances. Therefore when the minister does introduce amendments I trust one will deal with this matter.

Another matter in this same connection which has been brought to my attention on a number of occasions by veterans is the necessity for amendment relating to the service-related disability pensions. There is a strong feeling that these have been somewhat bypassed, and a number of veterans feel they had been completely left out in the cold. On their behalf I recommend that consideration be given to veterans who fall within this specific category.

Another request was made for an increase in the ceiling on permissive income. The hon. member for Kootenay West made reference to this particular matter. I do not think there can be any argument as far as this request is concerned, because we are all aware of the increased cost of living, and that with an increase in that cost there is a decrease in the purchasing value of our dollar. That is one of the reasons we have been advocating that, as far as personal income taxes are concerned, there should be an increase in the basic exemption. I believe that is absolutely necessary, and suggest the same principle applies to veterans. Veterans require more in order to maintain the standard of living which they have been used to. I was going to say the standard of living which they have enjoyed in the past, but perhaps I should not go that far. In drafting his legislation I would ask the minister to remember these veterans and bring in some definite recommendation or proposal in respect of an increase in the ceiling on permissive income of veterans.

There is just one other matter I should like to bring to the attention of this committee, although I was not very successful when I broached this subject during a meeting of the veterans affairs committee. I have reference to the quite general dissatisfaction in regard to decisions handed down by the pension commission. I was given to understand most of the personnel on the pension

commission are veterans and are bending over backwards to accommodate veterans, to the extent of bending the regulations almost to the breaking point. There is considerable room for improvement in this particular respect.

Reference was made to the benefit of doubt clause, and perhaps that is one of the most important issues to be considered, because like many other members of parliament I have received communications and briefs outlining the positions in which many veterans find themselves. In view of the method by which appeals from decisions of this commission are considered one could hardly expect the decisions to be altered. Looking at these decisions from the point of view expressed in the many representations we have received we can only feel that in many cases far better treatment could have been accorded to those individuals who have applied for pension or who have asked for revisions of their pension benefits. In this connection I suggest the minister should give close and diligent attention to this aspect of veterans problems. As was pointed out during the meetings of the veterans affairs committee, the greatest number of complaints and gripes lodged by veterans relates to this aspect of their problems. That being the case, it would seem to me that there must be some justification for this attitude of dissatisfaction toward decisions rendered by the pension commission.

As I pointed out earlier, Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to prolong the debate on these estimates, but I did feel that I should bring these points to which I have referred to the attention of the minister, and to give my support to the various suggestions which have been raised and which will no doubt be raised by hon. members during the course of this debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: At this stage in the study of the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs, I would like to make a short remark concerning the difference which exists between the veterans, or the active army, and the servicemen who serve in this country in peacetime.

I must point out that the minister and the government pay special attention to veterans, and I realize that this is necessary. In my opinion, there is surely room for improvements, and I realize that the minister, with his understanding and good will, is giving consideration to those future improvements.

[Mr. Patterson.]

But if some of our men who were on active service, whether on the battlefield or not, have recognized rights, we should also think about those who serve in this country in peacetime.

When a soldier serves overseas for a period of one, two or five years, or even only one year or six months, he has some rights. One realizes that those who serve in peacetime for periods of five, eight and even 11 years, do not get the same attention.

I therefore ask the minister to give more attention to our soldiers serving in Canada in peacetime, so that when for some reason or other they leave the army, they will not suffer hardships and have to rely on social welfare to provide for their needs. This is the recommendation I wished to make to the minister at this stage.

[*Text*]

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to congratulate the minister upon his courtesy in always giving immediate attention to questions directed to him. I do not intend to prolong this debate for any length of time, but I do feel that I should express my hope that there will be no further encroachments on veterans hospitals across Canada. This is a day and age when we need more research centres. By and large, the veterans hospitals have proven to be great reservoirs for research.

It is almost 20 years now since the end of the last war, and it is obvious that most of the veterans of that war are over 40 years of age, although of course, there are some younger veterans of the Korean war. The illnesses and injuries these veterans suffered during combat, and for which they now require treatment, are becoming chronic and more disabling. It follows that the majority of cases will fall under the following headings: cardiovascular renal disease, chest cases, cancer, prosthetic cases or the effects of wounds and contusions suffered in battle.

Hospitals are established by the Department of Veterans Affairs for research purposes, the training of interns and as teaching centres in postgraduate work. All of the active treatment hospitals with which I am familiar are approved by the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada and this puts the stamp on them to indicate that they are number one, so far as the training of personnel is concerned. In that regard I am not only referring to doctors. We are going to be very short of doctors quite soon. In fact, doctors are in short supply right now but the

need is going to increase over and over again. The same thing applies to personnel such as laboratory technicians, radiology technicians and so forth right down the line.

It is interesting to note that there are 270 doctors taking training in veterans hospitals across Canada and that there are over 157 interns in occupational therapy, physiotherapy, psychology and laboratory work. Another interesting fact is that there are some 90 research projects under way. If we are going to set up more medical schools across Canada, surely one of the things we must have is more trained personnel. We have to have more people who have done research work and have become professors because we are short now of such personnel.

A great many of the projects appeal to all of us because they are in the field of geriatrics, and there is not one of us in this house who is not getting older. In this field of course investigation is concerned with arteriosclerosis and why people develop it. This is in the news today because all one has to do is to visit the old people's homes and chronic invalid hospitals across Canada and he will see people being cared for there day after day at great expense to the taxpayers. I am trying to focus attention on the fact that if through research we can prevent the development of this disease we will have done a lot to relieve the burden that the taxpayer has to bear today, to say nothing of the suffering of the people involved, which is of course the greatest of all considerations.

Geriatrics also is concerned with the field of coronary disease and strokes. I am sure that all of us have friends or even members of our own families who have had a coronary attack or a small stroke. We see the mental ability of people who suffer strokes one after the other slipping away, unless something is done to keep the condition under control.

As I have said, our chronic hospitals are loaded with victims of these diseases. Surely the veterans hospitals are doing a worthwhile work from a dollars and cents point of view. This point is not emphasized enough. If the work they do can prevent a person suffering from a chronic disease having to be placed in an old persons home or chronic hospital where somebody has to look after him and where he becomes a complete and total liability, then they are certainly doing a great job in reducing the cost, to say nothing about restoring the happiness of the individual.

In cutting down the number of veterans hospitals are we leaving out of consideration the rights of the veterans, the promises made to them and our debt to them? After all, there would not be a Canada today if they had not gone overseas and fought for this country. I am going to be brief but I want to draw the attention of the minister to the question of the application of the benefit of the doubt provision. I recall the case of a man who was receiving $8 a month in war veterans allowance. He had been ill for years and was unable to work. His wife went out and worked and maintained the home. She had to have a car to operate her business and she brought somebody into the house to look after her husband when he needed care.

If my memory serves me correctly, this man was awarded a war veterans allowance of approximately $8 a month. In addition, his hospitalization was paid for as well as his doctor bills and his drugs. This man has been in and out of hospital four or five times over the years to my own knowledge. When he was well enough that he could go home he was sent home for his wife to look after him and she did so and got help when she needed it. She did a very good job. When he became acutely ill again from his cardiovascular renal disease he had to go back into the hospital and be given oxygen treatment. He was treated many times in this way but after four weeks or so in an acute illness hospital the hospital wanted to get rid of him, so he was sent home again. Not once was he put into an institution or home. His wife looked after him.

After this man had received the allowance of $8 a month for two or three years an investigator called and looked into their bank book and a lot of other things. I understand that the wife had not earned over $3,600 in any one year. However, the investigator went to the bank and looked into the matter. The last I heard about the case was that the lady was supposed to pay all the money back. This man is 70 years of age. Where in the name of common sense is there any milk of human kindness or decency in such an action? I bring this case to the attention of the committee as one with which I am familiar and about which I feel very sad, because what has been done is not right. This man is a veteran of the first world war and is now 70 years of age. Those are the facts as I understand them.

I recall the case of another man who is a veteran of the second great war. He was in

the tank corps and was blown up a few times. He was an A-one risk and was in the army for five years. I knew his doctor very well and I asked him about this fellow. His doctor said he was a real hardy buck, just like the whole family. After spending five years overseas this man returned and tried several things but was a failure. Finally he became a patient of a certain doctor. Under any stress or strain this man breaks down. In other words, he was psychologically damaged.

This case was brought before the pension commission. The doctors gave their evidence and said that the man was pensionable. But what pension did they give him? Twenty per cent. With the great upsurge in education today, how in the name of conscience do they expect veterans who fought in the last great war to compete in a world where more and more education is needed and where it is harder and harder to get a job and keep it? This man is unemployable but he was only awarded a 20 per cent pension. This is not right, Mr. Chairman. I appeal to the minister to look into these cases and see to it that a little more of the milk of human kindness is shown. I know there are regulations, but for heaven's sake do not have the regulations completely loaded in favour of one side.

Then, I wanted to dwell for a moment on the problems facing the sons of deceased veterans. I understand they receive $500 per year if they are going to university. If they are going into medicine, which is a six year course, they receive this allowance for only four years. I should like to know if such a student could apply for a student loan under the new legislation and thus secure the extra $500 or $1,000 which may be needed.

In conclusion, I should like to say that I know the minister must be sympathetic to the veterans problems because he has been through the mill himself. Do not let us sit down and make a soldier who went over and fought for us subject to the balancing of a group of statistics, weighing this on one hand and that on the other. Do not let us treat him in that way. We know that the cost of living has gone up. The last time there was an increase in the pension was in 1961 under the previous government. Surely to goodness, when everyone else gets a salary increase or a pension increase, the veteran is entitled to one too. The members of this house have had their salaries increased. Why do we have to leave the veterans to the last? Probably the minister has been thinking about the things along this line that he should do, and for heaven's sake let us do them. Let us put the veteran back where he should be. We always seem to be late in looking after the fellow who went over to fight for us.

[Mr. Rynard.]

Mr. Otto: Mr. Chairman, I should like to take a few moments to say something about the transfer of military hospitals to civilian authority. I support the previous speaker and say, with great respect, that I feel the minister should look very carefully into the question of the transfer of hospitals. The first question is, what is civilian authority? There is a presumption that there is some overriding authority in every city which controls the administration of hospitals. We know that in Toronto this is not so. Each hospital has its own administrative body. It is a well known fact that a doctor on the staff of one hospital cannot practise in another hospital. It is well known that some hospitals do not release patients on Saturday or Sunday. It is suspected also that some doctors keep their patients in hospital a little longer than necessary because of the system of allocating beds. In fact, the question comes up, how are beds allocated in hospitals? Is it on the basis of seniority in practice or seniority on the staff? Everyone knows that there has been trouble in the larger centres in connection with hospital beds and the shortage of beds. For that reason I feel this department should look into the matter carefully before transferring any veterans hospitals to these civilian authorities. The administrative control of hospitals should remain with the department.

Then you will also have to face the question of the doctors in the department being paid a salary. If you are going to have another group of doctors who are in business for themselves in these hospitals, you are going to have a conflict of interest. Who is going to be in control? The department should remain in control until there is some satisfactory conclusion of the problem of the shortage of hospital beds. We have discussed these questions in the committee and it is clear that the patients are becoming more and more of one type, either rheumatic or aged. This does not give enough challenge to the doctors. We agree with this. We agree with a lot of the problems that Dr. Crawford has put before us. We agree with him when he says he wants to maintain the highest standards in his treatment centres across Canada.

There is another avenue that perhaps the minister has not explored, and that is to allow veterans hospitals to be used by veterans

and their families. Then the administration of these hospitals could still be maintained by the department. You could have all types of cases in these hospitals and it would also relieve the shortage of beds in other hospitals. Another advantage would be that mentioned by the previous speaker, the opportunity for research and for the development of new ideas in hospitalization. No one in Canada as yet has investigated the concept of hospitals that is quite common now in Switzerland, where they were faced with a shortage of nursing staff, too. With a slightly larger capital outlay, they have constructed duplicate rooms so that the relatives of some patients can live in and do a lot of the nursing chores, thus leaving the nurses free to perform medical chores. This practice has resulted in many people being drawn to the nursing profession. After all, we all admit that a lot of the chores nurses must do are not really medical chores. This is something which I believe the department could investigate in connection with veterans hospitals.

I should like to add this one word of caution to the minister: Do not transfer administrative control of veterans hospitals to the civilian authority, as you call it, until you are absolutely sure that the veterans will get first class treatment, without knowing a doctor or having had a doctor for a certain length of time, without qualification as to the size of his purse or any of these things. A veteran must have the best of treatment immediately. With that note of caution, I just want to say that I have received the greatest co-operation from this department and the minister. He should be proud. There has never been a question left unanswered or a problem left unattended to by this department.

Mr. Martin (Timmins): Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to repeat many of the things that have been said here this afternoon, other than to endorse the idea that it is about time some attention was given to the pensions of veterans, and in particular the recipients of war veterans allowance. As has been said, people who are on a fixed income such as this are completely dependant on this government and this House of Commons to look after their present and future welfare. Certainly the time is long overdue, in the face of the rising cost of living and other circumstances, when some attention should be given to this matter.

I should like also to compliment the minister on the manner in which he deals with problems. Even when he says no, as he unfortunately has to do on different occasions, he does it in a very nice way. My purpose today is not to criticize this legislation in general but to draw attention to some of its inadequacies. I believe this legislation was passed by people of good will who believed at the time it would be adequate to look after the needs of our veterans. But as time went on we found that loopholes and inadequacies existed, and it is to these that I wish now to draw attention in the hope that action will be taken to correct the situation.

One of the matters which has come to my attention, and I am sure it has come to the attention of other members of this house, is the predicament in which veterans of the first world war who are now in their sixties find themselves. Maybe they have found gainful employment over the years and belonged to various medical plans, either those they have joined in the course of their employment or others which exist across the country. These men are now in their late sixties. When they give up whatever jobs they are engaged in they may lose their medical coverage and find it extremely difficult to get coverage under private plans. This is a situation which calls for attention, and I think the Department of Veterans Affairs should consider whether it would not be possible to make medical and hospital coverage available to these people through a scheme which would cover all veterans reaching an age at which they are denied coverage by the various private plans which exist in this country.

There is another matter which is of considerable concern to me because I believe that in addition to its unfairness to those involved it is a contradiction of common sense. Consider a recipient of war veterans allowance who does have medical and hospital coverage himself. If he is a married veteran and if he wishes to get coverage for his spouse he finds that in order to do so he has to insure himself as well as his spouse. I feel this is unfair because the Department of Veterans Affairs is already providing medical coverage for the veteran himself. Yet he has to pay a premium for double coverage despite the fact that he, like many other veterans, may be in straitened financial circumstances. I do not think this makes sense. I think it is a situation which should be straightened out. I believe that having regard to the small extra cost which would be involved, coverage should be

provided for the spouses of all recipients of war veterans allowance.

This leads me to another problem and it is a much more complicated one. It has to do with recipients of war veterans allowance who still have dependant children. I fully realize that this allowance was originally intended for elderly veterans. But as I have mentioned we find these loopholes occurring from time to time. In recent years we have found that younger veterans, some of them considerably below the age of 60, may through some chain of circumstances, illness or accident, become completely unable to provide for their own living, and the existing legislation has been stretched so as to include these cases under the war veterans allowance provisions. However, no provision can be made for their children and their dependants. I believe something should be done in this connection.

I should like to illustrate this contention by drawing attention to one case which really highlights the loophole which exists in the legislation. I believe the minister is familiar with this case; part of these 61 letters which have accumulated in this file over the last 15 months are letters to his department. I should like to show the committee just what can happen to a veteran and his family under the present legislation. This has to do with a veteran who is only 42 years of age. This man is completely crippled, unable even to walk around, let alone provide any sort of living for himself and his family. As a result of various representations we have been able to establish a partial war veterans allowance which now amounts to $99 a month. In addition I was able to establish through the Ontario department of welfare a partial dependant fathers allowance. But I should like to draw attention to the ordeal through which this particular family has gone in the last 15 months. Aside from the war veterans allowance which has, thank goodness, been stable throughout these months, this is exactly what the family has received; I have the correspondence here to show the amounts to which the provincial department ruled these people were eligible. In September, 1963, they were entitled to $145.20; in October, $145.45; in November, $96.70; in December $45.95; in January $47.20; in February, March and April, $30.25; in May, $9.25; in June, $39.05; in July and August, $54.70, and now, $78.70. It is a miracle to me not only how this family can keep body and soul together but how they can keep their sanity.

[Mr. Martin (Timmins).]

Mr. Teillet: Just to make sure I have this straight—the hon. member is not now speaking of the war veterans allowance?

Mr. Martin (Timmins): That is correct.

Mr. Teillet: The variations in these amounts are not variations in W.V.A.?

Mr. Martin (Timmins): No, the minister is correct. I mentioned earlier that the war veterans allowance of $99 a month has remained stable throughout this period. But I am illustrating the ordeal which veterans and their families are going through under the existing legislation as it applies across the country in cases where they have to turn to two or three different sources in order to try to eke out a minimum standard of living. This is an actual case.

Moreover, some time last June I was able to get the department to reassess this case and the department came to the conclusion that there was a back payment due of $124.20, which they said would be forwarded to the family by the end of June. Well, that cheque arrived less than two weeks ago. In other words, this family was kept dangling on the end of a string for five months waiting for a cheque to come. How can these people budget, how can they have any peace of mind in circumstances such as this? This is why I say that while the veterans legislation in the main is good there are a number of loopholes in the various acts, and these loopholes must be plugged up.

There is one other point I should like to raise in the course of my brief remarks today. It has to do with veterans—possibly only a small number of them—who during their service, particularly overseas, came in contact with certain contagious diseases. I think the contraction of these diseases should be regarded rather as an accident; the attitude taken now is to regard them almost in the same way as a self-inflicted wound. I think that especially where families are involved, where children and dependants are involved —certainly no blame can be laid on a spouse or on the children—something should be done, and the department should take a new look at the way in which these particular problems are handled.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, my criticism is not of the legislation in general but rather of the particular things that crop up from time to time. I am sure every other hon. member is familiar with them, because I do not think the mail on these problems is confined to my office.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up much of the time of the committee because I realize these estimates have been carefully examined by the standing committee on veterans affairs. However, I would like to make one plea to the minister, and I do not want him or anyone else to get the impression that if I limit my remarks to this one topic I do not agree with some of the views that have been expressed by other members of the committee with regard to the need for reviewing and increasing the scales of pensions and war veterans allowance.

I would like to make a special plea with regard to a special, small group of veterans. I refer to the survivors of the expedition to Hong Kong in 1941. I think everyone would agree that these men are in a special category. After all, they spent almost four years in prisoner of war camp, where they suffered from malnutrition, and so on. The minister is familiar with the excellent submission of the Hong Kong veterans association made to the veterans affairs committee and I would commend that strongly to him for a further review.

I am aware of the fact that the pension commission is engaged in a survey to determine exactly what the data is with regard to the health, life expectancy, and so on, of this special group of veterans. However, Mr. Chairman, this is a fairly long process and I would urge the minister to give immediate consideration to means of doing something for these veterans to recompense them in some degree for the special suffering they endured. They were in a special category, and still are I believe, because during their time in prisoner of war camp they suffered from malnutrition to an extent not experienced by other veterans. As a result of this, and for other reasons, they contracted diseases which are not even well known in this part of the world, in addition to a great many diseases like beriberi and pellagra, which stem directly from malnutrition. They were undernourished, badly housed, and constantly ill. Nevertheless, during their imprisonment they worked most of the time at hard types of labour such as in the coal mines, shipyards, and so on. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, this has inevitably left not only physical damage with these veterans, but perhaps more importantly, physchological damage.

I would recommend to the minister that in the case of Hong Kong veterans he should consider giving them entitlement to free treatment for any illness for the rest of their lives. In many cases these men have an anxiety neurosis, if I use the correct technical term; they are worried about their life expectancy, their constant illness, and so on, which makes it difficult for them to retain a job or leaves them with a fear that they will not succeed in staying in their job for a reasonable period of time.

I believe consideration should also be given to the possibility, in the case of Hong Kong veterans who are receiving veterans disability pension, of providing that their entitlement to pension should not be less than 50 per cent. This would compensate for the general deterioration in their health and I believe it would have a tremendously useful psychological effect, because they would then know their widows would not be left without recourse to assistance if they died prematurely. I commend these matters to the minister's attention.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to say a word or two of appreciation for the devoted and dedicated men throughout the department who have served the veterans between the wars and since. I do not think any government department is to be so highly commended for the way they have looked after the returned soldiers generally. However, times change, and those things that were done for the soldiers 20 years ago are now out of date. I want to touch on just two things. One is the need for a complete review of the situation with regard to veterans pensions. In my opinion section 70 of the act, which in general is a very generous act as we all know, has not been taken by the pension boards in the spirit in which it was passed by this parliament. I might remind the committee that section 70 provides that the benefit of doubt should be given to the veteran in all cases.

I know, from having sat on the committee myself and from having received complaints from veterans generally, that this is their main objection; the veteran feels that before he can make a case for his pension he is obliged to prove, usually with documents, that he did in fact suffer such and such harm to his health, which is attributable to war service. Of course, Mr. Chairman, in a great many cases it is impossible to prove this. Although records were kept while we were in Canada and in England, and often on the battlefield, in a great many cases the records are far from complete, and in some cases the

most deserving veterans are left without any documents whatsoever with which to prove their case. Then they are obliged, generally, to go through a series of long correspondence with their old pals in order to find out who was their doctor, their old buddies in the line, and so on, and by verbal evidence of one form and another establish a case. Even then I am afraid that in some cases they are not given the benefit of the doubt. This is a difficult problem, but I am sure that we as legislators intended that when the veteran has a case which can be believed one way or the other, in simple terms he is to be given the benefit of the doubt. Efforts were made to put through a private bill, Bill No. C-7, but it has not been put through. It purported anyway, to remove the onus from the veteran, and to put into the statute books a clear ruling so the veteran would in all cases be given the benefit of the doubt.

The general cost of living is constantly going up—I know I am being repetitive, but I do not think it can be repeated too often until definite action is taken in this regard—and the circumstances in which we all earn our living in this modern age have changed. At one time, I suppose, say 30 years ago, if a man had today's veterans pension he would have been well off. However, today he is expected to live on it, pay the average rent paid in Canada and support himself alone; and we must all admit that the average pension does not do that in any style at all. Add to that the fact that, although we do not always like to admit it in our affluent society, a large percentage of our women are working, and if a veteran is completely disabled it means that his wife would have to stay at home. Therefore she is cut off from supplementary earnings to assist the modern family. Let us be realistic and realize that a single pension today, or even a married pension, is not adequate to support a home in the way intended.

The next point I want to make concerns the Hong Kong veterans. It is argued that the Hong Kong veterans should be treated exactly the same as anybody else. That is what people have said; but I personally have known some of these veterans over the past 20 years, and although I am not a doctor I would say without hesitation that the greater percentage of these boys have had their physical ability—and I stress physical ability because it is that on which all pensions are based —to earn their living in a pioneer country like Canada in most cases, I would say, reduced by at least 50 per cent. If there is nothing specifically wrong with them, such as having had a broken arm or having lost their eyesight, something which can be definitely assessed, it is very difficult to say how much pension they should get. This group have asked in their brief for a 50 per cent pension for every veteran taken prisoner in Hong Kong. I would not go so far as to say that every man who served in Hong Kong has had his physical capacity to earn his living reduced, but this is certainly one case where section 70 should be applied.

Let us say a Hong Kong veteran complains of continuous fatigue. In this case his employer could be interviewed and if his employer said that he was one of the most willing men on the staff, but that he was just not capable of pushing a wheelbarrow, that he must be found a softer job because he could no longer earn his living with his hands, then we should apply the principle on which pensions are paid. If the Hong Kong veteran is incapable of earning his living with his hands, as a farm labourer or even pushing a wheelbarrow, then the principle we have always followed is that if he is 50 per cent reduced in this ability he receives a 50 per cent disability pension. Whether or not he has a leg off, if you reasonably believe that the reason he is only 50 per cent capable of earning his living with his hands is a result of serving for four years in a prisoner of war camp in Hong Kong, then that is a legitimate war disability and I for one say he is entitled to our deepest consideration.

Dr. Crawford has done signal service in providing medical services to veterans under D.V.A. Largely of his own volition and in his own time he has made a detailed study of this whole question. I have discussed the matter thoroughly with Dr. Crawford and found him to be a very fine man in his attitude to these people. Not only has he made a study of this question but he himself suffered as a prisoner of war and knows the physical hardships which these men went through from his own personal experiences. He is a giant of a man, but neither he nor anybody else would expect the average soldier to be able to rehabilitate himself and fit into society after the war in spite of the terrible experiences these men went through.

I would say that Dr. Crawford has made perhaps the most outstanding contribution to our information on this subject, but I believe he could do more if he was given more funds and had more help. Either he or some younger doctor could do a great deal more and look into these rather strange symptoms exhibited by a man who has been nearly starved to death or perhaps temporarily

The Hong Kong veterans as a group have no funds available to make such a study or they would be pleased to do so, I am sure. They also have no advocate to pursue the matter for them.

If I as an individual were fighting a pension case I could appeal it and have an advocate assist me with my case. These advocates are usually very experienced in the law, particularly in this type of subject. But to my knowledge, the Hong Kong veterans have no way of getting the services of an advocate to take their case and to make sure that they as a group will get proper consideration. This is rather unique. For example, if I had lost a leg I would have had no difficulty in getting my case attended to. But this group is rather unique in the experiences and problems they have. I suggest they have an across the board problem inasmuch as their physical ability to earn their living with their hands has been reduced as a result of four years of near starvation.

I would suggest to the minister, and through him to his department, that he might take into consideration the appointment of a member of the legal profession or a member of the justice department to make representations on behalf of these men to medical societies, and so on, so as to find out what has been done in this type of case. This sort of evidence is available. The French have made quite an extensive study of the problem of tropical diseases connected with malnutrition and its side effects. The United States has not done as much as one might expect in view of the fact that they had hundreds of thousands of men who served in the Pacific. Nevertheless they have done something, and I suggest that this small minority group—perhaps only 1,200 men are involved—is certainly worthy of our greatest consideration. I should not like to think that the matter of spending a few thousand dollars to make a proper survey would stand in the way. This survey should be made quickly; it is no good bringing in a report 15 years from now. These boys have been out of the prison camps now for 20 years and old age and their physical disabilities are coming upon them. I should like to see immediate attention paid to this question, and if a proper study were carried out and a competent legal officer were to tie things up for them, a recommendation acceptable not only to the department but to the house as a whole could soon be brought down.

Mr. Groos: Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief because I do not wish to delay the passage of these estimates, which have all been thoroughly investigated previously both by hon. members in the committee today as well as when they came before the veterans affairs committee. However, I should like to lend my support to some of the remarks which have been made by the hon. member for Timmins, particularly in respect to granting extra allowances with respect to children of recipients of war veterans allowance. The hon. member made a very good point there and I should like to support it. I also wish to support generally the idea which has been expressed in this house many times today, as well as in the veterans affairs committee, namely that there be a general increase in war veterans allowances. The reasons for this are too well known to require any elaboration here. The increase in the cost of living would justify this support to the hilt.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that I also have a personal interest in the Hong Kong veterans group. You will recall that I introduced a private member's notice of motion in this house earlier in the year. I have been very gratified indeed with the sympathetic reaction this has aroused in the house and across the country. I intended to bring this point to the attention of the minister, and although the speaker immediately preceding me made reference to it, I should like to reiterate it for emphasis. I urge the minister, in respect of the investigation now taking place by the Canadian pension commission in relation to certain Hong Kong veterans, that it be completed at the earliest possible date, and that some time limit be fixed within which a report shall be presented.

Mr. Chairman, I shall close my remarks with those few words. Thank you.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the veterans affairs committee of the house, but I have given some attention to the proceedings of that committee in consideration of the estimates of the minister's department. I was interested to note that at the outset of those proceedings the minister informed my colleague, the hon. member for Kootenay West, that he was glad he would not have to discuss the Columbia river treaty. I notice today that he may be having some difficulty in avoiding that subject matter altogether.

In looking at the proceedings of that committee, and in listening to the discussion that has taken place this afternoon, it seems quite obvious that the main focus of interest of

hon. members of this house at the present time is perhaps more in relation to changes in the legislation, which the minister indicated to the committee he intended to bring forward at an early date, than in relation to some of the questions of administration within his department. Certainly my main purpose in rising in my place today is to indicate my own feeling that that is the most urgent question which lies before us as members of the house.

Mr. Chairman, I have noticed a considerable change in the general attitude of the membership of this house in consideration of veterans affairs questions, even during the comparatively short time I have been a member of parliament. As other members have indicated today, I think there is a general recognition on the part of all of us that the members who initiated what is commonly referred to as the veterans charter did lay some sound foundations in the field of veterans legislation. What we are really seeking is not a basic change in much of that legislation, but rather the kind of improvement which will meet the situation existing today.

Other members have made reference to the fact, as did the minister, that generally speaking, because of the inevitable passage of time, the veterans of Canada as a group today are of an older age group than when the veterans charter was established, and for that reason I think it is perhaps fair to say that the emphasis of our interest is turning more toward questions of pension arrangements, whether disability or war allowances, than toward those matters which were of great concern to the members of this house shortly after the end of the second world war, involving immediate questions of rehabilitation, educational opportunities, the setting up of the Veterans Land Act, and things of that sort.

When the minister appeared before the veterans affairs committee he was optimistic, as ministers very often are, that the proposals he is going to bring forward will meet with the general approval of this house. I hope that will be the case. Other members have mentioned some of the things they hope this legislation will accomplish in the way of increases in war veterans allowances and other pension payments. Before the minister introduces this legislation I suggest that he consider what needs to be accomplished in the light of at least two facts. The first is the fact that the government, of which he is a member, is proposing to introduce a Canada pension plan which, under the terms as presently proposed, will not really become fully operative for a period of ten years from the time of its passage. The second fact is one to which I have already referred, that the age group to which veterans belong generally is getting older. In other words a great many of the veterans in Canada will not really benefit as a result of a Canada pension plan. It seems to me that the steps taken in relation to war veterans allowances and veterans disability pension arrangements should be taken with that fact in mind.

Involved with that question is the other question, which has been referred to by a number of members this afternoon, relating to the benefit of doubt clause—that is to say, whether certain disabilities requiring pension arrangements are wholly or partially attributable directly to war service.

The second point I should like to bring to the minister's attention arises out of a proposal contained in the Canada pension plan, and to which consideration should be given. That is the idea of incorporating into pension arrangements for veterans one of the key principles of the proposed Canada pension plan. I refer to the arrangement whereby the pension plan is to be geared to the cost of living index or the general level of earnings index. During the first few years I was a member of this house, any member who proposed that a pension plan should be geared to that principle was labelled as an economic screwball. I remember that very vividly. Nevertheless as I have pointed out on more than one occasion, the government of Canada is actually taking some steps to incorporate that principle into the Canada pension plan. Certainly if any group in Canada should receive the benefits of the application of that principle to a pension plan, it is the veterans group of this country.

I believe revision should be made to war veterans allowances arrangements and to pensions for veterans, so that all veterans who may have requirements because of disabilities, but who, because of their age group, will not benefit from the introduction of the Canada pension plan, will be eligible for suitable pension arrangements. I hope that will result from the changes the minister has indicated he is going to propose.

The member for Simcoe East made reference to recognition of the need for the milk of human kindness. As a result of my experience in dealing with individuals in the minister's department who look after the ad-

ministration of veterans affairs, I am of the opinion that while there may be some minor incidents which would indicate a certain lack of the milk of human kindness, basically the the question relating to the milk of human kindness is one which the members of this house must consider in relation to legislation. It is fair to say that 99.9 per cent of the problems I have encountered in respect of individual veterans situations arise really, not from administration, but from the kind of legislation we in this house have said these people must administer, and the regulations that have flowed from that legislation.

I suggest it is very much the responsibility of the government and members of the house to take the necessary steps to remedy situations of the kind that have been mentioned by my colleague from Timmins and other members of the house this afternoon. I could also give similar examples if I wished to take the time. I certainly wish the minister well in his endeavours to bring about the early introduction of the proposed legislative changes and I hope they will live up to the anticipations many of us have with regard to improvements in the situation of the veterans.

Mr. Fane: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased today to have the opportunity to say a few words on the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs. It is not my usual custom to congratulate the minister on his work because I feel it is not good to embarrass a minister in such a way. However, there are two points on which I will congratulate him. First, he has been appointed to a department which has always been staffed by dedicated men and women who give everything they possibly can to the cause of the veterans, and who do so willingly and without stint. He has also been appointed to a department with regard to which there is very seldom any real controversy or trouble in getting the estimates passed. Some of us at times may wish to say things that are aimed at being helpful to the department in the administration of veterans affairs, and this may take a little longer in discussing the minister's estimates than the minister might wish.

In making my remarks I know I am reiterating and repeating things that have been said by other members but I feel I should do so. I also want to point out to the committee that any changes in the acts found in the veterans charter are not the responsibility of the people who administer those acts but are the responsibility of the government of the moment and of parliament. Therefore any changes that must be made are our responsibility. Any suggestions I may make will be made in that light.

I feel that the minister must take the advice contained in the recommendations of the standing committee on veterans affairs. Those recommendations are made by a committee composed of a goodly number of members of all parties in the house, and naturally they are made with the idea of helping those veterans who were not so fortunate as some of us who came back from the wars more or less in one piece.

In making my remarks I want to support particularly what the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke, the hon. member for Simcoe East and the other hon. members have said. I also want to remind the minister that all changes in veterans legislation should and must be discussed with the veterans organizations first before they are put into effect.

There are some special matters I should like to bring to the attention of the minister, the first being an increase in veterans pensions and war veterans allowances. In this day and age the recipients of war veterans allowances are not getting assistance adequate enough for them to live decently. The cost of living has increased and that situation affects veterans as well as all others. Most veterans have some other means of livelihood, but those who have nothing more than their pensions are entirely dependant on what they receive in this way, and their pensions should be increased whenever the cost of living rises or perhaps whenever civil servants are given a raise in pay. I know that would be fairly frequently, but what group of people is more deserving of having their means of livelihood increased than those veterans who were not so fortunate as most of us who were in the services?

Adequate veterans legislation is approved by practically everybody in Canada. There are between two and three million people who have a direct interest in veterans legislation and they are the greatest exponents of proper assistance. With regard to veterans pensions and war veterans allowance awards a great deal has been said about the benefit of the doubt. I realize quite well that the pension commission, the war veterans allowance board and the other boards concerned fulfil adequately on most occasions the spirit of the benefit of the doubt clause in veterans legislation. However, there are cases where it does seem that somebody has slipped up with regard to the benefit of the doubt clause, and it would appear to one on the outside that a

little more consideration could have been given in some cases. Personally I have not brought too many cases to the attention of the Department of Veterans Affairs in which the benefit of the doubt clause has not been given full consideration. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Veterans Affairs is very good and, on the whole, I am satisfied with the treatment I have received on behalf of my veterans.

There is something, though, about veterans pensions which I feel should be given greater consideration. As I understand it, if a veteran receives less than a 50 per cent pension there is no continuing pension to the wife should the veteran die. I feel that more consideration should be given to the provision of assistance to the surviving partner in cases where veterans have been receiving less than a 50 per cent pension.

In so far as the war veterans allowance is concerned, I said that in many cases the amount authorized does not seem to be adequate to meet the needs of the veteran concerned. I believe it should be increased. I know there is a movement afoot in places suggesting that there be no means test in connection with war veterans allowance when an applicant is over 65 years of age. I make no recommendation in that respect, except that I would suggest to the minister he pay some attention to investigating the claims of people in this category.

The Veterans Land Act seems to be exceedingly well administered, and there is very little difficulty now with that. I am pleased to note that the Veterans Land Act is again operating as a unit and not as part of the Farm Credit Corporation.

I now come to my few remarks about veterans who were prisoners of war in the east, commonly referred to as the Hong Kong veterans. I know that the director of medical services is looking after these people. I know that he is torn by his loyalty to his fellow prisoners of war from Hong Kong, and I know that he has done everything possible to help them. However, there is a feeling amongst a great many of the Hong Kong prisoners of war that they are getting something less than they deserve. There is a feeling that they should be set aside as a special class, because of the extra privations that they were forced to undergo. I was fortunate. I was not a prisoner of war anywhere, so I do not really know exactly what the difficulties were. However, I do know these men went through great hardship, and the majority of them feel that they were subjected to more severe treatment than prisoners in other theatres of war. I ask the minister therefore to do everything possible to see that these men get whatever consideration they deserve, over and above the consideration which the rest of the veterans receive. I have conferred with many of them and the complaints are the same throughout. They feel their treatment was much worse than that received by prisoners in other countries.

This item was discussed at length in the veterans affairs committee and a recommendation was made by that committee to the effect the veterans of Hong Kong should have their cases investigated.

The last time I spoke on the matter of veterans hospitals and the turning over of these hospitals to civilian control, I said that I thought until adequate facilities for domiciliary care could be provided there should be no question of turning over veterans hospitals to civilian organizations. I still feel this way. As I said, I believe the veterans receive more consideration in hospitals operated by the Department of Veterans Affairs than they would receive in hospitals operated by other organizations. I feel that until adequate care can be assured for the aging veterans who are not surgical cases, the hospitals must be retained within the control of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Chairman?

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: I should like to ask the acting house leader about the order of business for tomorrow and Friday. Will it be the estimates as already outlined?

Mr. MacNaught: Tomorrow we will continue with the discussion of the main estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Then, we will take up the balance of the estimates of the Department of Industry, namely defence production, atomic energy and national research council; then, citizenship and immigration, trade and commerce and public works, the last two or three not necessarily in that order because it would depend upon the availability of ministers when the estimates are to be called.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, October 22, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. PRITTIE—INCOMPLETE ANSWER TO QUESTION ON ORDER PAPER

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, this question of privilege concerns question No. 2,084 which I submitted and which was answered yesterday. The question is in two parts and reads as follows:

1. What was the total amount of the budgets of the Department of National Defence for the fiscal years 1949-50 to 1963-64 inclusive?
2. What was the total amount of actual expenditures by the Department of National Defence for the fiscal years 1949-50 to 1963-64 inclusive?

In replying to the question the Department of National Defence gave the information for the fiscal year 1963-64 but noted that the other information was contained in the public accounts.

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that the information is in the public accounts, but I asked the question because I wanted it to be a matter of public record. I checked *Hansard* and found numerous examples of questions which have been answered with information which is contained in the public accounts, or in departmental reports, or in the Canada Year Book.

Let me quote just two examples. First of all there is question 1,835 which was answered on September 14, as appears at page 7952 of *Hansard*. This concerns hospital grants paid to the provinces for the past five years. The information is in the public accounts, but the question was answered. Question 1,793 was answered on September 9 and appears at pages 7776 and 7777 of *Hansard*. It concerns expenditures on historical sites in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. This information is also in the public accounts, but the question was answered by the department.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is an established practice, and that the ministry should be consistent in this matter.

PUBLIC SERVICE

SUPERANNUATED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—REQUEST FOR INCREASED PENSIONS

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 Prime Minister in connection with representations which Her Majesty's loyal opposition thinks deserve attention, namely the request from the civil service federation of Canada to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance asking for higher pensions for superannuated employees of the federal government because of the reduction in the purchasing power of fixed incomes, and in view of what is described as the ever increasing cost of living. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether attention will be given to this very proper request.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received representations from the organization in question. With the Minister of Finance I am receiving a delegation next week, at which time those representations will be considered with them.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question. If when the government considers the representations from the civil service federation on behalf of retired civil servants it looks favourably upon those representations, will legislation regarding this matter be introduced at this session?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I think we better receive the representations and have a discussion with the representatives of the organization in question before I answer that question in the house.

BROADCASTING

STUDY OF EUROPEAN SYSTEMS BY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the

Secretary of State, and relates to the Fowler commission and its announced study tour in Europe. Will the commission be including Germany in its itinerary as it studies the various broadcasting systems in Europe?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am not too sure about that, but I will make inquiries and give the hon. member an answer at a later date.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

REPORT ON POLICE ACTIVITIES DURING ROYAL VISIT TO QUEBEC

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

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

Could he tell us whether he asked members of the R.C.M.P. who were in Quebec city on Saturday, October 10 last, to report on the events which took place that day, and more especially on the behaviour of members of the local police force?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question which enables me to correct a mistake in this morning's issue of *Le Devoir* concerning a reply I made.

Yesterday, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas), referring to a question he asked me last Friday, requested that I give this house certain information concerning what occurred in the city of Quebec during the visit of Her Majesty.

The daily *Le Devoir,* in this morning's edition, seemed to think that the matter dealt with the reading, or the reception, by myself, of the report of the solicitor general of the province of Quebec, Mr. Wagner. I was not referring to Mr. Wagner's report, the text of which, as printed in *Le Devoir,* I already had in my files, but to the report I was expecting from the R.C.M.P. I received that report at noon today, and I will be in a position to make a statement to the house on this matter tomorrow; however, I do not think it is in order for me to comment, especially in this house, on the behaviour of the provincial or of he municipal police, because the attorney general of the province of Quebec is the only one who has jurisdiction to pass official judgment or take action in this matter.

As far as I am concerned I shall limit my report to the activities of the R.C.M.P., over which the federal government has jurisdiction.

Mr. Grégoire: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

I am not asking the Minister of Justice to make a decision concerning the behaviour of the municipal police of the city of Quebec, but could he give us at least a report from the R.C.M.P. concerning the activities or the behaviour of the Quebec municipal police on that day?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, of course from now until this report is communicated, I must decide how far I can go along this line, but I shall endeavour to do so to the extent that my duties and the limitations of my jurisdiction allow.

[*Text*]

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that under no circumstances should the mounted police be placed in a position of becoming a kind of court of appeal against the actions of other police forces? To put the mounted police in that position would be very detrimental to that great force.

Mr. Favreau: I fully agree, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Justice a supplementary question.

Can he tell us if the R.C.M.P. was in charge of all security measures during the royal visit in Quebec city?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, the delimitation and allotment of the various fields of responsibility will specifically constitute one of the aspects I shall deal with in the statement I intend to make before the house tomorrow.

[*Text*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST OF TRUCKING INDUSTRY FOR EXCLUSION FROM PROPOSED LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Labour, but in his absence I will address it to the Prime Minister who will probably want to take it as notice. In view of the representations that have been made to the government by the interprovincial trucking industry requesting that they be excluded from the application of Bill No. C-126, can

the Prime Minister tell us whether any decision has been made in this regard?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, their representations are being given very careful consideration.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Prime Minister be able to give the same assurance he has just given to my colleague vis-à-vis the managers and operators of country elevators in western Canada?

Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to give that assurance too.

POINT EDWARD NAVAL BASE—CONSIDERATION OF SENIORITY AND VETERANS PREFERENCE IN LAY-OFFS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Does the trade testing of qualified employees at the Point Edward naval base, and the proposed lay-off of tradesmen without right to seniority or veterans preference, represent government policy?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): I shall take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, the question I have asked is not of the type the minister can answer by saying he will take it as notice. If he chooses not to answer, that is one thing; but for him to say he takes such a question as notice is ridiculous on his part.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Speaker, I have a question supplementary to the one I asked previously. I direct it now to the Prime Minister. I would ask the Prime Minister whether he no longer considers the veterans preference and prior agreements made by labour-management as part of government policy. I put special emphasis on the veterans preference as policy.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the veterans preferences as laid down in the regulations will certainly be observed by this government.

Mr. MacInnis: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Now that the Prime Minister has assured the house that the veterans preference will remain as such, would he take the trouble to inform both ministers of national defence?

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): It is not being observed now.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—SUGGESTED DELAY IN ORGANIZATION OF MULTILATERAL NUCLEAR FORCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, to whom I sent notice, I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister. In view of reports from Washington that virtually no NATO country, with the sole exception of West Germany, wants any part in the multilateral nuclear force, and in view of the present international situation, would the government of Canada give consideration to urging the United States to delay consummation of this United States-German nuclear venture until further opportunity is provided for consultation with the new leaders of government?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be the course of wisdom for this government to intervene in a matter of this kind involving consultations between the United Kingdom and the United States governments which will be taking place when the new British secretary of state for foreign affairs arrives in Washington next week.

COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TO INCREASE TRADE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): My question is directed to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and is based on answers given to me this week by the right hon. Prime Minister on commonwealth trade. In the light of Prime Minister Wilson's proposals, and those of our own Prime Minister in 1962 in North Battleford and Edmonton on the question of commonwealth trade, has the Canadian government prepared any specific proposals—I underline the word "specific"—and does it intend to take any special initiative in regard to commonwealth trade? Can the minister give us any information at this particular time?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): As the Prime Minister has said, we would be very happy to discuss with the new government matters of commonwealth trade. We are interested in the promotion of commonwealth trade, and we believe also

that the promotion of world trade in general will help the commonwealth. I expect that we shall be receiving some proposals from the new government, and these we shall look at most sympathetically.

Mr. Grafftey: May I ask a supplementary question. In view of the fact that Prime Minister Wilson's views with regard to this subject have been known for quite some time, may I ask if the department has at this time prepared any specific proposals relating to commonwealth trade?

Mr. Sharp: I should think that since the new Prime Minister of Britain has expressed these views publicly, he will probably be taking some initiative. I would hope and expect that we shall treat the initiative of the British government on this occasion a good deal more sympathetically than it was treated by the government of which he was a supporter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The usual cheap remarks from the minister; cheap and false.

TRADE

WHEAT—NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING FURTHER SALES TO RUSSIA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): May I direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce? In view of the minister's recent statement in Nova Scotia last week, and in view of the rumours that are now current about delays in negotiations with the Russians vis-à-vis wheat particularly, has the minister considered, as one type of initiative he might take, a quick visit to Moscow to establish contact with the new administration and get negotiations back on the rails?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I am flattered by the suggestion that I might be able to help relations between the Soviet union and Canada by taking a quick visit to Moscow. I can assure the hon. gentleman there has been no delay in any negotiations between the Soviet union and Canada, which are proceeding as I expected they would. They will take their course until the Soviet union decides how much wheat they would like to buy. We are in constant communication with them urging them to buy Canadian wheat to the extent that they need it.

[*Later:*]

Mr. M. W. Martin (Timmins): Mr. Speaker, in view of the assurance by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that discussions are continuing between Canada and Russia I would like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Would the Prime Minister inform the house if it is true that two eminent Canadians, Mr. Dalton Camp and Mr. Keith Davey, have flown to Moscow to find out how it is done?

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY—STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT DE GAULLE RESPECTING AGRICULTURAL POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether his attention has been drawn to the statement made by President de Gaulle yesterday that unless there is a reconciliation of agricultural policy France may withdraw from the European economic community. There is also the fact that there is no further point in negotiations in the so-called Kennedy round until these problems are resolved. I would like to ask the minister whether these trade negotiations are continuing and whether the representatives in the negotiations are addressing themselves specifically to this question of trade in agricultural commodities.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Just today I read dispatches from Geneva dealing with the news item that appeared in the newspapers and to which my hon. friend has referred. The continuing difficulties in trying to work out a common agricultural policy for the European economic community is one of the most serious difficulties standing in the way of the opening of the so-called Kennedy round. The United States, supported by Canada, has said on a number of occasions that we believe the negotiations should relate not only to industrial goods but to agricultural products. The United States, in negotiations with the European economic community, has not yet been able to agree with them upon a suitable method of negotiation.

However, the discussions are continuing. I think all those concerned—and I believe this includes all the participating governments without exception—would like to see a successful round of trade negotiations. Therefore I am hopeful, although of course not confident, that a method will be found of negotiating with regard to agricultural products that will enable the negotiations to proceed.

QUEBEC—PROPOSED STEPS TO CURTAIL MOVEMENT OF GOODS IN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the minister's recent statement in Winnipeg, repeated in Halifax last week end, that regional economic barriers should be avoided in Canada, has the minister made any representations to the government of the province of Quebec with regard to sanctions against the free movement of goods within Canada such as are implied in some of its policies?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I should like to ask a supplementary question. I thank the hon. minister for his reply, but in view of his remarks to which I have referred is it his intention to make any representations to that government in this respect?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I made these remarks publicly on a number of occasions. I am quite sure the ministers of all governments in Canada are aware of them, and I do hope they will take them to heart.

AGRICULTURE

QUEBEC—FEDERAL PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RAINMAKING OPERATIONS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. This question arises from newspaper reports published in *La Terre de Chez-Nous* and *La Frontière de Rouyn* concerning tests made with a view to producing rain artificially.

Here is my question. Has the government granted a permit to the Weather Engineering Corporation of Canada to produce showers artificially in northwestern Quebec or in the Saguenay region?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Surely this is a question for the order paper if there ever was one.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, in a little while I shall put down this question for debate at the earliest opportunity.

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I was really going to say I had heard nothing about this matter, but I would look into it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The question asked by the hon. member for Chapleau probably sounds strange to a resident of Montreal, but I do know that clouds are sown over our area and, as a result, there have been so many days of rain in the Saguenay region that crops have completely failed and a large number of farmers have seen their year's work wasted.

That rainmaking has brought about a farm crisis in those areas. As far as our region is concerned, therefore, this is a most important matter.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think sufficient publicity has been given to the question by now.

INQUIRY AS TO MEETING WITH MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture I will direct my question to the Minister of Forestry.

Could he tell us the results of the negotiations and discussions which took place yesterday between the officials of his department and U.C.C. officials?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the Minister of Agriculture had a meeting yesterday with U.C.C. officials.

Mr. Grégoire: It is time you knew.

[*Text*]

RAPESEED—STATEMENT ON REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF QUOTAS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer a question asked on October 19 by the hon. member for Rosthern about quotas in respect of rapeseed.

I have been advised by the Canadian wheat board that the quota for rapeseed, which currently is five bushels per seeded acre, is determined largely by market requirements. At the present time stocks are more than ample.

The rapeseed situation is under continuous review by the board, and indications are that the quota can be increased in the near future.

EDUCATION

LOANS TO STUDENTS ATTENDING INSTITUTIONS IN OTHER PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Is he aware that, contrary to the intent of the student loans act as indicated by the minister when introducing Bill No. C-110, many needy students attending educational institutions outside their home provinces find it impossible to obtain loans simply because of the differing policies of the provinces involved?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would not like to make any comment on the adequacy of the administration of the provinces concerned without knowing more about which provinces are involved, and more about the details.

Mr. Chatterton: As a supplementary question, would the minister look into this matter in that I understand, for instance, the provinces of Nova Scotia and British Columbia will issue certificates of eligibility only to their own resident students for fear they will use up their quotas?

Mr. Gordon: I shall be glad to look into the matter, Mr. Speaker.

TRANSPORT

P.E.I. CAUSEWAY—INQUIRY AS TO CONSTRUCTION START

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Public Works a question which has been prompted by my recent reading of United States magazines. Has the government decided that construction of the Prince Edward Island-New Brunswick causeway will begin in 1966?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): It is under very active consideration, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): As a supplementary question, is the minister aware of the fact that one of his colleagues, at least in a report to this effect, expressed the assurance that the construction would commence by 1966?

[Mr. Sharp.]

Mr. Deschatelets: I am not aware of this, Mr. Speaker.

UNITED NATIONS

UNESCO—VOTE OF CANADIAN DELEGATION ON ADMISSION OF CHINA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs I would like to ask the Prime Minister a question concerning the current conference of UNESCO in Paris. Is there a Canadian delegation there, and did they vote on the question of mainland China and the admission of Formosa?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I shall have to look into that question, and I will be able to reply tomorrow.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

CLOSING OF NAKINA, ONT. AS DIVISIONAL POINT

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Acting Minister of Transport in connection with the Canadian National Railways. I have received a number of representations regarding the closing down of Nakina as a divisional point, which is to take place within the next couple of days. Would the minister take up with the railway the question of postponing that action for a short time, until a decision is made by one of the great steel companies in our country regarding the establishment of an iron pellet plant there? If this takes place naturally Nakina would have to continue as a divisional point, and in view of the shortness of the time within which the closedown is to become effective I would appreciate very much if the minister would do that.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the start of a proposed run-through affecting the Nakina divisional point has been indicated by the railway to commence at the end of this week and to be fully implemented within two years. Representations were made last week by representatives of the municipalities in the immediate area and by certain railwaymen as well. Following those representations made to the Minister of Labour and myself, I passed them on to the railway management. Subsequent to that there were certain other messages received, which were also passed on

to the railway management. But the point now raised by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition is a new one and is additional to what was contained in the earlier representations. I will be very glad to draw the attention of the management to the right hon. gentleman's remarks.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for his very courteous answer.

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN SERVICE TO COMMUNITIES BETWEEN TORONTO AND MONTREAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Durham): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Transport. My question relates to the recent announcement of Canadian National Railways regarding the curtailment of passenger train service to many communities between Toronto and Montreal effective October 25, 1964. Will the minister make immediate representations to Canadian National Railways to reconsider this decision, and in addition request the board of transport commissioners to follow recent precedents and order Canadian National Railways to continue the present service until such time as the board can hold a public hearing on the matter?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will draw the subject matter of the hon. member's question to the attention of both the C.N.R. management and the board of transport commissioners.

INDUSTRY

SYDNEY, N.S.—EFFECT ON DOSCO OF PROPOSED QUEBEC STEEL COMPLEX

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry. In view of the announcement by Premier Lesage of the proposed integrated steel complex in Quebec, which will undoubtedly provide competition for the Dosco steel operations at Sydney, does the minister have any plans either under export credits or other legislation to provide for the maintenance and expansion of the Sydney steel industry?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, the Dosco operation in Sydney is currently a very successful one, as I think hon. members know. This is partly as a consequence of assistance they have been able to obtain from the Export Credits Insurance Corporation. I do not think the hon. member would expect, nor does the government intend to do so, legislation to be passed to provide for the continuing existence of Dosco.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the minister whether the department has undertaken, or will it undertake, any studies of the long term prospects for the Sydney steel industry; and if so, will the minister make them public in order to allay the justifiable anxiety of the people of Nova Scotia in general and the people of Cape Breton in particular?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I think it would perhaps be doing a disservice to the people of Nova Scotia to suggest that they and the steel operations at Sydney are not capable of competing with anybody in the world. They have demonstrated that they can. I may add parenthetically, however, that the Department of Industry is engaged with the Domintion Steel and Coal Company in a research operation in connection with the smelting of the particular iron ore which Dosco employs at Sydney.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister not aware that the success of the Sydney steel operation has been due mainly to government assistance provided under the Export Credits Insurance Act?

Mr. Drury: I do not think I would admit that. The success of the Dosco operation at Sydney has been due, in my view, essentially to the initiative of the Dosco management and labour force.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Thank you, Mr. Goldwater.

[*Later:*]

Mr. J. E. Lloyd (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry. Under the provisions of the Income Tax Act both provincially and publicly owned and controlled undertakings are exempt from federal income taxes. Would the minister assure the house that, should a steel complex located in Quebec and promoted by the Quebec provincial government qualify for such exemption, appropriate action would be taken to equalize the competitive position of privately owned steel corporations such as the steel complex in the province of Nova Scotia?

Mr. Drury: I will take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Pierre Côté (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct to the hon. Minister of Industry a question supplementary to the one asked by the member for Halifax (Mr. Lloyd).

Is the minister aware that most of the shares which shall be issued by the new steelworks in Quebec will be held by private individuals and not by the government of the province of Quebec?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I have read the press reports.

[*Text*]

INCOME TAX

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF REMITTANCE BY EMPLOYERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of National Revenue. Is the new system regarding the remittance of income tax deductions, effective November 1, whereby employers will have to remit the taxes they collect to the chartered banks, the first step in the minister's plan whereby employers will have to remit taxes the week following that in which they are collected?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that the two are necessarily connected. However, if one is to look to pay day remittances, this would certainly be an assistance.

Mr. Hales: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. How does the minister propose to introduce this new system? Will it be by a minister's directive, by order in council, or by an amendment to the act?

Mr. Benson: The collection of taxes is the responsibility of the Minister of National Revenue.

Mr. Hales: How will the announcement be made?

Mr. Benson: I have not as yet said that an announcement will be made.

PENSIONS

CANADA PLAN—INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the assurance given by the Prime Minister that the new legislation respecting the Canada pension plan will be on the order paper before the end of October, can she now tell us on what date this legislation will be on the order paper?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, it is expected early next week.

Mr. Knowles: May I address a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Does the commitment given earlier by the government, that this legislation will be concluded before this session ends, still stand?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I ever gave a commitment that the legislation would be concluded. I gave a commitment that the legislation would be introduced.

Mr. Knowles: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Justice on July 6 gave the commitment to which I refer, and the Prime Minister confirmed it on September 25.

Mr. Fisher: Short memory.

Mr. Pearson: The hon. gentleman knows, of course, that the government can introduce legislation but parliament is responsible for the date of its conclusion.

Mr. Knowles: I also know what the Minister of Justice said.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): I have a supplementary question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I would like to ask her whether all the nine provinces that we hope will be participating in this pension plan have indicated that they are willing to participate.

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): All provinces were represented at the last meeting at which this matter was discussed, and there was no indication from any province that it did not intend to participate.

Mr. Olson: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. That was not an answer to the question I asked. I asked whether the government has received an indication from all the provinces that they are willing to participate.

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, I think my former answer must stand if only on this account. It is not only unusual but I might say rather improper for a federal government

to request heads of provincial governments to approve either in advance or concurrently what is wholly federal legislation. I would say that none of those who were present and who were fully apprised of the information in respect to pension plans indicated that under the constitution it would be prepared to introduce legislation which would usurp the function of a Canada pension plan.

Mr. Olson: A further supplementary question. Could I ask the Prime Minister whether it is the view of the government that this pension plan is solely federal legislation?

Mr. Pearson: It is indeed federal legislation, Mr. Speaker, and only one province has indicated its intention of introducing provincial legislation in this field.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

POSSIBLE ACTION RESPECTING ONTARIO SUPREME COURT JUDGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. In view of the fact that the proceedings against Mr. Justice Landreville have come to an end, would the minister inform the house as to his view of the propriety, in the interests of the administration of justice and in the light of the facts revealed and the evidence which came out in court, of the resignation of the justice?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I think I said yesterday that I would be making a statement shortly on that matter.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Would the minister say whether any consideration has been given, since I raised the matter, to the appointment of a commission? In addition, can the minister give the house an assurance that if there is a resignation here there is certainly no case for pension rights?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sherbrooke.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I want to know whether a commission is going to be appointed, Mr. Speaker. Is there going to be a commission to deal with this matter, or is a flagrant case such as this to remain not subject to the fullest examination by a commission?

Mr. Favreau: I said, Mr. Speaker, that I would make a statement on this matter. At the moment I am not ready to prejudge any question.

PRIVILEGE

MR. CHAPDELAINE—LETTERS ON HOUSE OF COMMONS STATIONERY FROM DEFEATED CONSERVATIVE CANDIDATE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Chapdelaine (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege based on my personal interest as well as that of all hon. members of this house.

On October 8 last I raised a similar question to call the attention of the house to the fact that Mr. Maurice Allard, former member of parliament for Sherbrooke, used stationery placed at the disposal of members of parliament to send congratulations or other messages to people in the riding of Sherbrooke and, at that time I read a letter of congratulations for Mr. Robert Delisle, a student at Sherbrooke, who had won a golf trophy.

I thought that this warning would be enough for that former member of parliament who has no right whatsoever to one of the exclusive privileges of members of this house, namely to use the letterhead of the House of Commons to write to their constituents. Now, outdoing himself in rashness, Mr. Allard has convinced Mr. Delisle to send me a threatening letter and order me to return to him immediately the said letter, forbidding me to make copies or photostats thereof, and also asking me detailed explanations on how it came into my possession.

Moreover, the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Valade), speaking yesterday in the name of the said Mr. Allard on a question of privilege, accused me of a violation of the Post Office Act and told the house that the criminal offence I had committed was liable to a maximum fine of $3,000 or three years in prison or both.

Mr. Speaker, I think the house has already wasted enough time on such a trifle, but due to the way events are shaping, it is my duty to propose that this matter be referred to the committee on privileges and elections.

I am prompted by the following reasons to take this action:

1. I believe that only members of parliament or officials of this house are authorized to use stationery bearing the crest of the House of Commons.

2. The use of this stationery for such frivolous purposes as those invoked by the former member for Sherbrooke reflects upon

the prestige of this house, and in order to convince you of this fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of this house to another letter which was returned to me by mail and which reads as follows:

Mr. and Mrs. Odina Gagnon,
1350 Kingston St.,
Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Dear Friends:—

I learned through the newspapers that your son was recently married.

I am glad to congratulate you on this occasion, and I would ask you to convey my best wishes of happiness to the newlyweds.

Yours truly,
Me Maurice Allard

Member of Parliament for Sherbrooke (1958-1962)
Present secretary to the Hon. Léon Balcer.

That letter added to another one I have in hand at present and to others that I do not have, but which you will allow me to table, confirm the danger that exists when you let unscrupulous individuals use a privilege belonging only to members of parliament.

That individual is using the prestige connected with the stationery bearing the coat of arms of Canada and the words "House of Commons" to promote his personal interests.

Should all Canadians have the privilege to do what the former member for Sherbrooke is doing, then the stationery which is made available to us would no longer have any meaning and it would be useless for the government to spend money so as to provide us with it.

In concluding my remarks, I want to make it clear to the house that I am not holding these letters illegally but that they were returned to my home in Sherbrooke because they were incorrectly addressed and since they bore the seal of the House of Commons they were returned to the only member for Sherbrooke, your humble servant.

I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Portneuf:

That this matter be referred to the committee on privileges and elections for consideration in order that it may be decided what persons are entitled to use House of Commons stationery and what sanctions should be taken against those using it illegally and without authorization.

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, in raising his question of privilege, the hon. member for Sherbrooke mentioned having received a threatening letter from one of the addressees who received a letter not belonging to him, and I would ask that the hon. member for Sherbrooke also table the copy of that letter which he qualifies as threatening in order that the house may have the full story.

As far as the question of privilege is concerned, I should like to quote section 42 of the Post Office Act which reads:

All undeliverable mail and all non mailable matter found in the mails shall be sent to the section of the department established by the Postmaster General for the receipt thereof—

And no other person, even a member of parliament, has the right to intercept, retain or delay delivery of a parcel when he is not the addressee. I hope that this explanation will confirm the complaint I made yesterday.

Mr. Chapdelaine: Mr. Speaker, I do not object to tabling the letter in question and, furthermore, should the hon. member for St. Mary decide to take legal action later on, he can go ahead.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: I may tell the house that this is not the first time I have heard of this matter, nor does it exactly catch me by surprise.

On October 8 the hon. member for Sherbrooke raised this matter, but he did not follow through with any motion to the effect that it should be referred to a committee for study, and the matter died there. Today, October 22, he raises in effect the same question. As all hon. members know, the proper procedure is to raise a question of privilege at the earliest opportunity. In my view the motion cannot be accepted at this time for at least that one reason, that it has not been raised at the earliest opportunity. The hon. member had an opportunity on October 8 to move a motion, but apparently decided at that time not to follow through.

As partial authority for this view I should like to quote Beauchesne, citation 104, subsection 5, as follows:

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 should also like to quote from Beauchesne, citation 113, beginning at approximately the middle of the paragraph, as follows:

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.

In view of the fact that this matter has been discussed now on three occasions it is my opinion that the opportunity for raising this at the earliest possible time was not taken and, consequently, I do not think the motion is in order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chapdelaine: If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that the second letter I read was returned to me only after October 8 last, and that I did not intend to raise the question by proposing a motion to the effect that the matter be sent to the committee on privileges and elections, even though I have had the letter from the beginning of this week. It is the intervention of the member for St. Mary who, intending to accuse me of having committed a criminal act, tends to lead the house into believing that I have acted illegally.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that the illegal act has been committed by the former member for Sherbrooke, and I should like this point to be elucidated once and for all by the committee on privileges and elections or by the competent authorities, in order that we may know definitely where we stand with regard to the use of House of Commons stationery.

[*Text*]

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In my opinion more than enough publicity has been given to this matter. If any mistakes have been made—

An hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. Speaker: If any mistakes have been made I am sure they will be corrected. I still hold to the decision that if the hon. member had a point of privilege on October 8—and there appeared to be a prima facie case—he did not avail himself of the opportunity to propose a motion to the house to the effect that the matter be referred to the committee on privileges and elections. Several days, or perhaps even two weeks later, in my opinion, is too late.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, on a personal question of privilege, the hon. member for Sherbrooke in his remarks—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I rise because of allegations made by the hon. member which are not in accordance with the facts. The hon. member for Sherbrooke has said that I accused him of doing something illegal. I never said that in any of my interventions. I did mention certain articles of the post office regulations which deal with this aspect of the matter, but I never accused the hon. member of having proceeded illegally. I did say the articles did not provide for that procedure.

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I know it is irregular to direct a question to you, but in respect of this very important matter would you consider looking into the situation and examining what has happened? Many of us are very concerned about this kind of thing. I do not particularly want to have the committee go into this case, but I certainly feel you should protect the interests of all of us by examining this matter.

Mr. Speaker: I should like to reply very quickly that I spent considerable time in respect of this matter this morning. I would be very pleased indeed to accept the suggestion of the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, we are also agreeable to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) to the effect that your ruling be deferred, so you may have time to examine the matter, because all hon. members are interested in finding out exactly how things stand with regard to stationery and to their rights and privileges in that connection.

Mr. Valade: And also with regard to the Post Office Act.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The suggestion of the hon. member for Port Arthur was that the Speaker look into the matter, and it was not made to delay or to solicit a further interpretation of the decision.

AIRPORTS

MONCTON, N.B.—PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT OF TERMINAL BUILDING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. What action, if any, is contemplated to enlarge the size of the presently planned new passenger terminal at the Moncton airport, in view of

growing concern that the present plans will not provide sufficient space for present and future traffic?

Mr. Speaker: This is a question for the order paper.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, I would agree with you except for the fact that tenders have already been called in respect of the construction of this terminal, and when they were called this fact become known. Representations have been made to the department in an attempt to have the traffic facilities there enlarged. I am wondering whether that has been contemplated.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice so that I may obtain an answer for the hon. member.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Cameron (High Park) in the chair.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Cameron, High Park): Order. The house again in committee of supply. Owing to the fact that the chairman of the committee, Mr. Deputy Speaker, cannot be here for a short time, and because the deputy chairman is otherwise engaged, I have been asked to take the chair, if it meets with your approval.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Cameron, High Park): The first matter is the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs, item No. 1.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

1. Departmental administration, $6,491,400.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Cameron, High Park): I recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, before I commence my remarks I should like to ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs whether the annual report for the fiscal year 1963-64 has been published.

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Chairman, I am informed that it is now at the printers. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman now when it will be ready, but I will get an answer for him as soon as I can.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, it makes it a bit awkward to discuss the estimates of the department when the annual report is not before the house. As I look back at other annual reports I notice that the letters of transmittal signed by the ministers have been dated in the months of May, June or July. In all these years this is the first occasion that has come to my attention of the report not being in the hands of the house by the last week of October. I am surprised it was not available for the standing committee on veterans affairs when they were conducting their deliberations earlier this month.

I should think the minister would have to look into this matter very carefully to see why there has been such a substantial delay. When he first became a minister of the crown in 1963 he signed the report which had been prepared under myself and my predecessor, the hon. member for Edmonton West. He did so on May 30, 1963. What has happened this year? It is almost the end of October and we still do not have the annual report of the Department of Veterans Affairs. I judge that there has been a dereliction of duty here and I hope the minister will improve his attitude with regard to this department.

On December 19 of last year, ten months ago, the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs were before the house for consideration. Those estimates had been prepared by the former Conservative government. Consequently we did not spend as much time examining them on that occasion as we are spending in examining the estimates on this occasion, when the estimates are new and have been prepared by the new government.

However, on that occasion the minister had been in office for quite a number of months, and when he introduced his estimates he restricted himself to a very short speech of about three minutes or less. When he introduced his estimates this year he cut his remarks down even more. On both occasions all he really said to us was "The estimates have been before the standing committee on veterans affairs; consequently I have nothing to add to the committee proceedings."

I think this is a wrong attitude on the part of ministers of the crown. When their estimates come before the House of Commons they should make statements indicating what they have been doing during the course of the year, because virtually a year elapses between their appearances for the purpose of discussing their estimates. They should make statements concerning the policy of their departments, tell us what has been done as the result of suggestions made the previous year, and also give an outline of future policy.

We have had nothing of that sort from the minister.

Last December I put three questions to the minister. We accepted the fact that he had not been long in office, and for that matter not long in parliament. But I suggested to him that even then he was derelict in his duty in not giving us some idea as to what he and the department intended with regard to certain matters pertaining to the department. I thought that amendments to the Pension Act should have been looked at, including the question of the benefit of the doubt clause. I also asked him about the section dealing with servicemen now in the regular forces whose affairs come under the jurisdiction of the pension commission. I think it is section 13, subsection 2, but in any event it causes a lot of trouble. I also asked him about the question of veterans hospitals.

The standing committee on veterans affairs also made a report last year containing ever so many recommendations, which the member for Okanagan-Revelstoke drew to our attention yesterday. Not one word was said by the minister with regard to those recommendations of the standing committee. There were 14 paragraphs in the report of the standing committee made on December 12, 1963, but not a word have we had from the minister. He said nothing about the Hong Kong veterans, a question also raised a year ago. I use that as an example because the subject has been aired in the house on two or three occasions in the last few months.

Some members who spoke yesterday said that in view of the fact that the standing committee on veterans affairs had examined the estimates there was not much need to discuss them in the House of Commons. We have recently had a report from the committee on rules and procedure advocating a more extensive use of committees, and there is a general feeling that if problems are referred to committees everything will be all right and the problems will be solved and settled.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that is a careless view of what actually happens. In the years I have been here I have served on a great many committees, and I know exactly what a committee can accomplish and some of the omissions that occur with regard to committees. In looking at the record of the present standing committee on veterans affairs I notice that although it started off with a membership of 40 it found it necessary to reduce its quorum to 10, which is a clear indication the committee was having difficulty in assembling members to discuss veterans problems.

So I do not see that it makes very good sense for people to say here in the house that these estimates were carefully examined and scrutinized by a committee, which had only four or five meetings, and that on that ground we in our turn should not give much attention to these estimates in the house. I do not take that stand at all. I have had too much experience with committees. It is here in the House of Commons that the minister has to answer to the house with regard to his knowledge of the department and his system of administration. He must also be prepared to give us an indication of the policy of the government and an accounting of what he has been doing.

The minister has been in office now for a year and a half, long enough to indicate whether he is maintaining the Department of Veterans Affairs at the level at which it should be maintained, long enough for him to be able to give us decisions with regard to some of the problems still affecting veterans. In the interests of the general public I think in his opening remarks each year the minister should say something about the veteran population of this country which still requires assistance. People get the wrong impression with regard to our veterans, and that impression should be corrected from time to time by the Minister of Veterans Affairs himself here in this public assembly.

There is a misunderstanding in the country with regard to our veterans hospitals. That situation should be explained again. Granted the minister made a statement last March, I think, but this is the end of October. Let us have a statement now as to the situation with regard to these veterans hospitals.

Why has he not done something with regard to the problems raised by the director of medical services, who last year and again this year in the standing committee on veterans affairs raised the problem of staffing veterans hospitals? In effect, on both occasions he said that although he could manage moderately well under the present terms of reference, it is up to parliament to decide this question for him and give him the necessary direction. If this means we should be building institutions for domiciliary care to look after chronic cases and relieve present hospitals of those cases, then let us have a policy on the part of the work of the department.

The present minister may say, why did you not do that while you were in office? I

had this subject under discussion, but I did not have time to complete it during the years our government was looking after veterans affairs. We made ever so many amendments to the veterans charter; we kept the house busy and the officials of the department very busy making the necessary amendments to the veterans charter. We looked after the situation with regard to disability pensions, war veterans allowances and things of that nature. During the years we were in office we raised very substantially the amount of money available for our disability pensioners and those on war veterans allowances. We made it possible for the Veterans' Land Act to operate more effectively by increasing the loans. All told we increased by almost $100 million the amount of money available for our veterans who required assistance. We were repairing some of the neglect of earlier years.

Now, what is this present minister doing with regard to our disability pensioners, with regard to people on war veterans allowances? In the time we were in office we were not able to solve all these problems. There are other problems that arise. Veterans associations right across this country keep bringing forward suggestions for the improvement of conditions with regard to veterans. The department is a good department; we all admit that. It is well staffed. However, the departmental officials themselves require direction. If parliament passes a measure they are obliged to follow the terms of that measure. They have no authority to deviate from it. If there are modifications of the charter that should be introduced, parliament should introduce those modifications.

I am sure the parliamentary secretary to the minister must be frustrated, because in days gone by I recall him as a very active worker in connection with veterans affairs. When he was sitting in opposition he always participated in the debates on veterans problems when we had bills or estimates before the house. He made some very useful suggestions for which I commended him. Some of those suggestions were put into operation later. He must be a very frustrated man now, sitting here as parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, and we have not heard a word about the suggestions he made two or three years ago. I feel sorry for him because his interest in veterans always impressed me, and I am sure it continues. Where is his influence? Has he no affect on his minister? I am afraid not.

[Mr. Churchill.]

I am not here to praise the minister, as may be evident. I think the minister must show whether he has any value as a minister of veterans affairs. A year and a half has gone by and we have had no declaration of policy from this minister, no amendments to the veterans charter. He talked in the standing committee about amendments he was going to bring forward, but was rather vague and nebulous about them. He said nothing about disability pensioners, nothing about war veterans allowances. He said nothing about the Hong Kong veterans. He has not given us an up to date report with regard to hospitals, and a year and a half has gone by. This Department of Veterans Affairs is not just a department. It has a very important function to perform. I think the department, under this minister, has not received the attention it deserves.

I wonder how the minister fares with his cabinet colleagues. Do they just brush him aside and say "You may have some ideas but we are not ready for them, we have other problems with which to deal." I wonder about his influence with the members of the treasury board. Are they brushing him aside and saying "No, you must not ask for any increase anywhere down the line at all"? Who is responsible for the veterans of this country? The rising cost of living and the vast number of requests that are coming to members of the house mean that the minister must very quickly do something about these particular problems.

I draw these matters to the attention of the committee. I feel the minister should become active so that this department may continue to function at a high level of efficiency and with continuing regard for the veterans of this country. There are still living in Canada over one million veterans of the various wars in which we have been engaged. Fortunately 80 per cent of them do not require assistance, but approximately 20 per cent do. This 20 per cent require help because of wounds suffered in wartime or because of serious economic conditions. We are maintaining our veterans hospitals to look after those who require medical assistance. The department therefore has a continuing responsibility, a responsibility that goes on and on and on.

As I pointed out on one other occasion, once a nation enters into war; once that fateful decision is made, as was done in September of 1939, you are obligated for 70 years to those people who suffer in that war. It is for this reason we are still looking after

some members of the South African force. The disability pensioners of the first world war will still be around for a number of years, although their average age is now about 70. There are hundreds of our veterans who are living to what we call a ripe old age, up into the nineties. They enlist at 19 or 20, so we have a 70 year obligation. The veterans of the second world war will present problems for this parliament and for this country for another 50 years. We cannot brush these problems aside. This is a debt of honour that the country owes to her veterans.

Let me remark again that 80 per cent of the veterans do not require any assistance at all. They are the fortunate ones who escaped serious injury in wartime. We must give help to the other 20 per cent, their dependants, their widows and orphans. I hope the present government will make sure the Department of Veterans Affairs is maintained as one of the important departments over which the government has jurisdiction. I am afraid that in the last year and a half there has been a cooling off of interest with regard to this department and the welfare of the veterans. What I am attempting this afternoon is to draw attention to the importance of reviving that interest so that people generally will have an understanding of our obligation.

The figures in the 1960-61 and 1962-63 annual reports are the most reliable we have, because the annual report for the last fiscal year has not yet been distributed. These show that in 1960-61 first world war disability pensioners totalled 48,000, and their number declined to 41,000 in 1962-63. I may add that I am giving the round figures. World war II disability pensioners numbered 104,000 in 1960-61, and increased to 106,000 by the end of 1962-63. The number receiving war veterans allowances increased from 48,000 in 1960-61 to 54,000 in 1962-63, and these figures show that the decline in the number of first world war veterans is matched by the increase in the attention that must be given to the second world war veterans and the boys from Korea.

I anticipate that with the improved economic conditions over the last 20 years, better conditions than we had between 1920 and 1940, the number of veterans from the second world war who will require war veterans allowance will not reach the same percentage as those from the first world war, who had a much more difficult period in which to adjust themselves. If economic conditions improve and social improvements continue, the veterans' problem will not reach the magnitude it did following the first world war, but I give the figures to illustrate the continuing problem that faces the department.

There is another subject I wish to raise, but I shall not do so now because it is entirely different from what I have been talking about and I see I have almost exhausted my specified allotment of time. However, I conclude by urging the minister to give us a definite statement with regard to what he intends to do concerning disability pensions, war veterans allowances and the Hong Kong veterans, whose case has been ably presented by various members. Also I urge him to give us an up to date report on medical services and veterans hospitals.

Mr. Lambert: I had not intended to speak on these estimates, but having read what was said yesterday I agree with my colleague from Winnipeg South Centre on the paucity of the minister's remarks. In fact his statement as recorded in the transcript of evidence given before the standing committee on veterans affairs was just about the same length as the statement he made yesterday and which is recorded in *Hansard*. For that reason he deserves the strictures uttered this afternoon by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre with regard to the limited nature of his remarks as official spokesman for the department.

I too would like to have seen a definite statement. I know the estimates could have gone to the committee a lot sooner, and privately I indicated this to the minister. It is a charge I have levied against the government on other occasions, because the estimates of many other departments could also have been sent to committee. In some ways I differ from my colleague on the value of sending estimates to a committee, but it is true that even if a committee does the appropriate work, general principles may remain to be discussed in this chamber. This is the point involved here, and I am not surprised that we may now have to cover somewhat more ground than would have otherwise been the case.

Yesterday the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke, leading off for the opposition, referred to last year's lengthy recommendations of the veterans affairs committee. I believe we are entitled to a progress report on those recommendations, and I think it should have been given yesterday. I hope the minister will see fit to comment on those recommendations

in his closing remarks, because the veterans affairs committee is one which adopts a non-partisan attitude. Recommendations coming from it should receive careful consideration in this chamber. Not only that; the appearance of careful consideration should be given them by a report from the minister, following consideration of the recommendations by the departmental officials, the minister and the government.

Part of the problem which arose during the past year concerned veterans hospitals which, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, was something which was exercising the director of medical services, the senior departmental officials and the ministry at the time the present minister assumed office. Progress may have been made in the interim, but it has not been indicated. However, may I say the situation that boiled up in Edmonton has been dealt with and, providing the provincial authorities are able to go forward as outlined on page 12 of the evidence before the committee, we shall be satisfied if that progress is made as rapidly as possible.

I was most gratified to note the reactions of the various service organizations and veterans generally in the Edmonton area as a result of the arrangement that was made. I hope it will serve as a blueprint for other areas. Once again, we shall have to be guided by the experience of how it works out over the years, but certainly the negotiation of the agreement should serve as a pattern for similar situations. Having said that, I must add that I do not know whether the same circumstances will arise again. I do not know whether any provincial government will be almost aching to death to get hold of certain departmental properties for projects of its own, but I think with the pattern established we will come out of this with a better deal. The director of medical services is to be commended on what he has done in this regard.

Although the department has not published its report for the past year, there is some information in a publication I received today which may be even more up to date than that contained in the department's report. The publication is called "National Finance" and is issued by the Canadian tax foundation. Before dealing with it, however, I wish to add to the representations made at the committee hearings concerning war veterans allowances, because one serious difficulty has arisen as a result of the 1961 amendment dealing with the requirement of one year's residence in Canada. I know there would be problems for the department with veterans living, say, in the United States. In fact if this requirement were waived claims would come in from all over, and people might move south to warmer climes; but I am concerned over one particular group which is large in number, the Canadian veterans living in the United Kingdom where, for a variety of reasons, they settled after the war. Many of them married girls living in Britain and they have continued to live there ever since.

An hon. Member: Eighteen thousand.

Mr. Lambert: One of my colleagues suggests that the number is 18,000. A number of these men have now fallen victim to those circumstances which would normally entitle them to war veterans allowance, and they cannot claim it; they simply cannot afford to come to Canada, live here for a year and then go back to the United Kingdom in order to qualify for war veterans allowance. But, Mr. Chairman, there was another amendment at about the same time which permitted special allowances to be paid to members of the allied forces living in Canada, after a specific period of years of residence. So that a Canadian living abroad who has not come back to Canada is not entitled to war veterans allowance, but a member of an allied force who has settled in Canada is so entitled.

I think we are building up a body of Canadians—fortunately it is not too great a number; it is not a number that will increase but it will be a steadily declining number, or potentially so—who must depend upon social welfare in another country; yet they are entitled, by reason of their service in the Canadian armed forces during world war II or world war I, to the same consideration that we give to our veterans under the War Veterans Allowance Act. I would urge upon the minister a very careful examination of this matter to see whether he could not take care of these people. They are very deserving cases.

I know there has always been this difficulty about those living in continental North America outside the Canadian borders, but I do not believe that for this reason we should disentitle those living in the United Kingdom or in Europe, if there happened to be some there, because the man who is living in the United States can motor back up to Canada—it is not impossible for him to come here—whereas the man living over in Europe is naturally faced with an almost insurmount-

able obstacle. Those are the matters I would like to bring to the minister's attention with regard to the War Veterans Allowance Act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words with regard to the estimates generally. Disregarding the minor supplementary estimates and supplementary estimates A, the amounts contained in the estimates for 1964-65 with regard to disability and death pensions total some $171 million, of which $109 million are estimated to be in respect of world war II and some $57 million in respect of world war I. Then we have some other items such as peacetime defence forces, $2.3 million; Korean forces, about $1.6 million; civilians, world war II, $590,000; burial grants, $350,000. Then there are smaller amounts for the Newfoundland special awards, flying accidents compensation, and the northwest field force, etc.

In so far as civilians are concerned, I think the parliamentary secretary to the minister should take considerable credit for his persistent representations in regard to merchant seamen and others who are entitled to these civilian awards. In the compilation of the national finances there are a number of tables that are really very instructive. I have not made a copy of them because I have not had the time, but I would like to have them appear in *Hansard*. Perhaps with the consent of the committee I could furnish the *Hansard* office with the tables I have before me and they could be printed in *Hansard*. Incidentally, they are tables taken out of the Canada Year Book, from dominion bureau of statistics sources, so they come from an official source. I would appreciate it, Mr. Chairman, if hon. members would permit me to do this and then I could make certain references to them.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Cameron, High Park): Does the hon. member have the consent of the committee?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that as far as we are concerned we would gladly give consent. I would like at the outset perhaps a little clearer identification of the individual tables so we may look at the information.

[*Editor's note: The tables above referred to are as follows:*]

TABLE 46

WORLD WAR I PENSIONS

For selected fiscal years 1920 to 1964

Fiscal year	For disability		To dependants		Total	
	Number of pensions	Annual liability ($ million)	Number of pensions	Annual liability ($ million)	Number of pensions	Annual liability[a] ($ million)
1920	69,203	14.3	17,823	10.8	87,026	25.2
1925	44,598	19.8[b]	20,015[c]	11.8[b]	64,613	31.6[b]
1930	56,996	27.1	19,644	10.7	76,640	37.8
1935	78,404	30.4	18,241	10.4	96,645	40.8
1940	80,133[c]	29.8	18,177	10.6	98,310[c]	40.5
1945	73,863	26.5	17,221	10.6	91,084	37.1
1946	72,396	26.5	16,982	10.6	89,378	37.1
1950	67,387	31.2	16,414	13.2	83,801	44.4
1955	58,548	38.0	15,323	17.0	73,871	54.9
1960	47,845	37.5	14,812	19.6	62,657	57.0
1961	45,588	41.9	14,714	23.2	60,302	65.2
1962	43,143	40.5	14,552	23.2	57,695	63.7
1963	40,879	38.3	14,455	23.1	55,334	61.4
1964	38,493	35.9	14,321	22.9	52,814	58.8

[a] Does not necessarily add due to rounding of figures.

[b] Reflects the increase in the basic rate of pensions.

[c] Peak year for number of pensions.

SOURCES: *Canada Year Books; Annual Reports of Department of Veterans' Affairs;* Canadian Pension Commission.

TABLE 47

WORLD WAR II PENSIONS

For selected fiscal years 1941 to 1964

Fiscal year	For disability		To dependants		Total	
	Number of pensions	Annual liability ($ million)	Number of pensions	Annual liability ($ million)	Number of pensions	Annual liability[a] ($ million)
1941	319	.1	319	.3	638	.3
1945	15,506	5.4	11,419	8.3	26,925	13.7
1946	36,454	11.4	16,839	12.0	53,293	23.4
1950	94,117	36.6	17,989	13.0	112,106	49.6
1955	100,256	54.3	18,250	16.9	118,506	71.2
1960	104,911	68.5	17,546	19.3	122,457	87.9
1961	105,338	81.9	17,301	22.1	122,639	103.9
1962	105,951	84.8	17,088	23.1	123,039	107.8
1963	106,437	85.1	16,805	22.9	123,242	108.1
1964	106,628	85.2	16,581	22.7	123,209	107.9

[a] Does not necessarily add due to rounding of figures.
[b] Reflects the increase in the basic rate of pensions.

SOURCES: *Canada Year Books; Annual Reports of Department of Veterans' Affairs;* Canadian Pension Commission.

TABLE 48

TOTAL WAR PENSIONS

For selected fiscal years 1940 to 1964

Fiscal year	World Wars I and II		Korean Forces		Total	
	Number of pensions	Annual liability ($ million)	Number of pensions	Annual liability ($ million)	Number of pensions	Annual liability[a] ($ million)
1940	98,310	40.5	—	—	98,310	40.5
1945	118,009	50.8	—	—	118,009	50.8
1946	108,850	60.5	—	—	108,850	60.5
1950	195,907	94.0	—	—	195,907	94.0
1955	192,377	127.0	1,273	.7	193,650	126.8
1958	188,597	146.6	1,638	1.0	190,235	147.6
1959	187,015	146.1	1,722	1.1	188,737	147.1
1960	185,114	144.9	1,776	1.1	186,890	146.0
1961	182,941	169.1	1,820	1.3	184,761	170.4
1962	180,734	171.5	1,874	1.5	182,608	173.0
1963	178,576	169.4	1,926	1.5	180,502	170.9
1964	176,023	166.7	1,962	1.5	177,985	168.2

[a] Does not necessarily add due to rounding.

SOURCES: *Canada Year Books; Annual Reports of Department of Veterans' Affairs;* Canadian Pension Commission.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, one table is entitled, "World war I pensions for selected fiscal years 1920 to 1964". These tables give the number of pensions paid, the annual liability for disability, and then the number of pensions paid to dependants and the amount. Then the total amount is given for the two categories. There is also a second table for the years 1941 to 1964 in regard to world war II pensions. This table is on the same basis. Then there is a third table which is, shall we say, a synopsis of the first two tables. This table is entitled, "Total war pensions for selected fiscal years 1940 to 1964".

The conclusions we may draw are that the annual financial liability for pensions increased for nearly two decades following

world war I, rising from $25 million in 1920 to nearly $41 million in 1940. With the granting of pensions for disability or death during service in world war II and with the increase in the basic rate of pension, the annual financial liability since world war II rose from $60 million in 1946 to a peak of almost $148 million in 1958. In 1959 and 1960 a slight decrease occurred as the number of pensioners declined, but the 1961 increase in rates raised the annual liability by $24 million. Then there was a new peak of $173 million in 1962. With regard to 1964, the estimated cost is $168 million. The peak number of pension recipients reached a maximum of 195,900 in 1950 but has been declining ever since. There are now about 177,000 pensioners, of whom 10,000 live outside Canada.

With regard to the first world war I will take some selective figures. It is interesting to note that the peak in the number of disability pensioners for world war I was in 1940, when there were just over 80,000, and there were some 18,000 dependants, for a total of 98,310, with an annual liability of about $40.5 million. By 1945 this figure had declined to 91,000 pensioners, with a liability of $37 million. In 1960 there were only 48,000 pensioners, with some 15,000 dependants, and with an increase in rates the pension liability was some $57 million. On March 31, 1964 there were 38,493 disability pensioners and 14,321 dependant pensioners, for a total liability of $58.8 million. That is with regard to world war I.

So far as world war II is concerned, in 1945 there were 15,506 pensioners and 11,419 dependant pensions for a total liability of $13.7 million. In 1955 there were 100,000 odd disability pensioners with some 18,000 dependant pensioners for a total liability of $71.2 million. In 1960 there were 104,911 disability pensioners and 17,546 dependant pensioners for a total liability of $87.9 million. In 1964 —this is still world war II—there were 106,628 disability pensioners and 16,581 dependant pensioners for a total liability of $107.9 million.

Just as a last recap, according to the tabular information before me, in 1964 there were 176,023 pensioners, including dependants, who served in world wars I and II, for a total annual liability of $166.7 million. As for the Korean forces there were 1,962 pensioners for a total liability of $1.5 million. As soon as I have completed my references to some more statistical information, Mr. Chairman, I will give this information to *Hansard*.

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Chairman, I trust that in agreeing to this, these tables to be printed in *Hansard* are relatively short?

Mr. Lambert: Yes, they are short tables and will occupy less than one page, I think.

I did speak of war veterans allowance. According to the information I have there were about 54,000 under this head. We know that indigent overseas veterans may also receive free treatment services and other veterans may obtain treatment at cost. I think this information with regard to veterans benefits which has been published by the tax foundation is of considerable interest, and as my hon. friend for Winnipeg South Centre indicated it would be interesting if the minister when he replies could give us a projection forward of the number of disability pensioners including dependants who might be expected by his departmental officials over the next five or ten years. Also some indication of the hospital care required would be enlightening. I remember that the director of medical services indicated there was quite a change in the treatment pattern regarding world war I veterans. There were fewer and fewer active treatment patients with disability ailments or pensionable disabilities, but there was a greater incidence of patients requiring chronic and domiciliary care. None of us is getting any younger and I am sure that the incidence of world war II veterans in the latter two categories has now become quite noticeable both as regards war veterans allowance and chronic and domiciliary care. Certainly men who in the early 1940's were in their forties are today well over the sixties and certainly their presence is now being felt in the patient stream, and over the next 20 or 25 years I think we are going to see the bulk of them.

It is true that much more extensive hospital facilities are available to the population in general through the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act, and there may be a lightened load on the Department of Veterans Affairs. Certainly in provinces such as Alberta where there are some very fine senior citizens homes we are going to get much less requirement for domiciliary care. Also auxiliary hospitals are being built in the province in fairly large numbers and this is going to reduce the incidence of chronically ill patients who are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

This pattern is not general throughout the country. It is unfortunate but there it is. I think we should get some sort of forecast from the minister for the next five to ten

years—I think it is asking too much to forecast over the next 20 to 25 years.

Another area concerning which I have had quite a conversation with the minister and in which I know he is very interested is this: Could he give the committee some idea of the thinking of his officials in connection with dealing with those men who must leave our regular forces as a result of incurring injury while in service? For example, they may have lost an arm or a leg or an eye or sustained a back injury. Are these men who are injured in the course of duty or while in service in our regular forces to be cast on some sort of scrap heap? They do not come under any workmen's compensation legislation. They are not covered by a pension and disability plan with a private concern such as might be the case in industry. What are we going to do with them? This is something with which a man is concerned when he enlists, and if we want to continue to get the right type of people in our regular forces we must concern ourselves with this matter.

I do not know whether the present legislation is broad enough to deal with this matter. I suggest that if it has not already been done —I know the minister is thinking about this —a full study should be made to bring this matter into the ambit of another act. It certainly does not come under veterans benefits because these men are not war veterans. The matter does not come under war veterans allowance. I think there should be some other head of legislation to cover these persons because I am certain more and more cases are going to arise. After all, it is now ten years since 1954 when our regular forces were constituted at the level of 120,000. There must be a rather imposing total of these cases, each one becoming harder and harder to deal with. One feels that there should be adequate compensation, but there does not appear to be adequate legislation to cover this situation.

With those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the minister that he give us a full statement when he does reply in respect of the points which have been raised by various members of this house, because I think we would then be in a better position to deal with these estimates. Unfortunately many of these things were not fully considered by the committee.

Mr. Tucker: Mr. Chairman, while I have no intention of making a lengthy speech I do feel that I must speak for a few minutes during our consideration of the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs, because of their importance to so many Newfoundlanders. I am appealing primarily on behalf of the Newfoundland foresters who served during the last world war. I am sure it is the wish of all members of parliament on all sides of the house, as well as of all the people of Canada, that our veterans and their families receive adequate compensation for their services.

[Mr. Lambert.]

At a result of the speeches which have been made in the house in the last two days during the consideration of the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs, it can be seen that veterans have the sympathy and support of us all. I should like to express my appreciation to the minister, and particularly to his parliamentary secretary and the officers of the department, for their co-operation and many acts of courtesy in assisting me in dealing with matters which I have had to refer to them from time to time.

I must again bring to the attention of the minister the need to bring the status of Newfoundland veterans in line with that of Canadian veterans, and request that the government take into consideration the services given by the forestry units of world war II, as well as the merchant navy and the rescue tug service. All who served in these bodies should and must be brought under the veterans charter. There is scarcely a week during which I do not have to refer matters relating to Newfoundlanders who served in the Newfoundland overseas forestry unit to the Department of Veterans Affairs here in Ottawa.

During the second world war many Newfoundlanders were asked to serve with the Newfoundland overseas forestry unit and they were told that by serving in this unit they would be performing duties as important as any other branches of the services. Hundreds of Newfoundlanders answered the call to duty and served side by side with the Canadian forestry corps in a manner that reflected credit on them and their province. They were exposed to the same hazards and dangers from invasions and bombings, and for a longer time they were active in the front line of battle, as evidenced by Captain A. C. Hanely for the director of territorial army and army cadet force.

I have heard it said that the commission of government of Newfoundland did not recognize any obligation towards the forestry unit. Surely, Mr. Chairman, this does not mean that the obligation does not exist. The time is long past for the Newfoundlanders who served with the forestry units to receive the

same recognition as other Canadians who served in similar capacities.

I am very well acquainted with many of these foresters because it was my duty to purchase the clothing they used, on behalf of the then Newfoundland commission of government, before they left to take up their duties overseas. These foresters have never been recognized as veterans, as far as I can understand, because they did not wear uniforms.

I should like to quote from a brief prepared on behalf of the Newfoundland overseas forestry unit. At page 10 of that brief the following is stated:

> Why did the Newfoundland unit not have a uniform? It is submitted that the only reason is because the United Kingdom government wanted loggers and wanted them badly and fast. There was no time to provide the first contingent with uniforms. It was much less expensive for the government to send them in their own civilian clothes and in fact the men could, most likely, work with greater ease and more comfort in these clothes than in uniform. Two thousand Newfoundland overseas forestry unit men were in Britain by February 1940 whereas the first contingent of Canadian forestry unit men did not arrive there until late 1941 and early 1942.

They were not recruited in the same manner as the other fighting forces, but they did exactly the same work, and for a longer period, as the members of the Canadian forestry corps. I feel that the time is long past when this wrong should be rectified, and I hope that the minister will find some way to overcome this technicality, thus treating the Newfoundland foresters in the same manner as other Canadians.

It has been said that Newfoundland foresters did not sign for the duration of the war. This fault in many cases did not lie with the foresters themselves. They were asked to sign up for six months, and this was done, and then many of them signed for another six month period. However, on March 31, 1960, a brief was submitted to the then minister of veterans affairs. In this brief it was pointed out in section 3, clause B, that the contract was altered in June, 1940, when each individual had to sign a formal agreement that he would not and could not be transferred to any other unit or to any of His Majesty's armed forces, and had to sign for the duration of the emergency.

This, Mr. Chairman, shows how important the work of our Newfoundland overseas forestry unit was, and I strongly appeal to the minister, not to show any particular preference to our Newfoundland overseas foresters, but to see that they are treated in the same manner as other veterans.

I strongly urge the minister and his officials to give serious consideration to the submission made on behalf of the Newfoundland forestry unit. The brief from which I quoted explains in detail why the Newfoundland foresters did not have uniforms. In spite of that fact, they were told that they were doing as important work as the other branches of the services. If the minister will give consideration to the brief which was submitted, I am sure that the members of our Newfoundland overseas forestry unit will be treated as veterans, and I submit they should be treated in that manner.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Chairman, as regards the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs, I should like to direct but a few questions to the minister, so as to clarify the matter of the pension granted to the veterans and that of paid holidays. I should like to know to what extent the Department of Veterans Affairs is responsible as far as the veterans' protection and welfare are concerned. Exactly where does this responsibility end in the case of war casualties? What kind of supervision can the minister exercise in the case of the veterans' hospitals such as the Queen Mary hospital, in Montreal, and the Ste. Foy hospital in Quebec and also in the case of a veteran's death?

Mr. Chairman, a rather sad case comes to mind. Without belabouring the point, I would like to say a few words about it, in the hope of sparing people the agony which I saw this veteran suffer. This young man had enlisted in the air force, and was sent to Germany. During his stay in Germany, while on leave—probably on a paid leave, because I am not too familiar with the military regulations—he was a victim of a very serious accident and had to be hospitalized in Germany. The next day, he was transferred to a British hospital where he was very well taken care of. During his stay in that British hospital, a telegram was sent to his family, stating his condition. After approximately ten days, when the patient was well enough to be moved—apparently, one or two discs in his spinal column were fractured—the British physicians, in the best interests of the patient, decided to remove him to the Montreal veterans' hospital, after having informed him that he would undergo an operation in that institution and that in two or three months, his condition would be normal once more.

His family was most surprised when they learned that this Montreal hospital no longer recognized those servicemen who came from England but has a French Canadian name. It was in that hospital that this patient endured agony. Month after month, his operation was postponed, and finally it was no longer mentioned. He was termed a "cry-baby". After a whole month, and many investigations, the government of the day was informed about the conditions prevailing at the hospital; it ordered an investigation and as a result thereof, two matrons, who came directly from England, and who were the supreme authorities at the hospital, were probably sent back to England. As for our patient, at the end of three months he could not stand it any longer, probably because his wound was getting more infected every day and prevented him from sleeping. He spent his time yelling his head off. So it was decided to put him in a cast from neck to toe. There he remained for three weeks and, when his yells got too loud, they put him in a dark room so they could not hear him shout. Their patience at an end, his relatives went to the hospital. And when they saw the condition he was in, they had the cast removed and had him sent to the hospital in Quebec city. This is where it was found that the flesh was in a state of decay and it was too late to do anything.

Mr. Chairman, the pain that patient had to endure was such that twice he tried to kill himself by cutting his veins open. When he yelled too loudly, they told him: "You go over there in the corner, you dirty Canadian."

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Chairman, I went to the hospital myself but I must say that at that time the government took the situation in hand and made a thorough cleanup. Now, I am not blaming the department, which did its duty; my sole purpose is to tell you about this case. After two years in the Quebec hospital, that serviceman died.

It is strange that he received only $7 a week during his stay at the hospital. That is the point I especially want to stress before the committee. For three years he only received $7 a week and his family had to send him $10 a week for petty expenses. He died three years later. Upon his death his family was granted $200 and not a penny more. This is worth noting. The family was unable to obtain one penny more. They made various representations, consulted Quebec lawyers, one of whom was asking $2,000 saying "I will fix this for you". I wonder if the committee and the minister would take this case into consideration, and I ask the minister if the army is still responsible for soldiers on leave with pay.

If the army, through the Department of Veterans Affairs, pays more than $7 a week to a veteran who is ill, why does it only pay $7 per week to a veteran who was hospitalized and unable to do anything since he remained three years lying on his back in hospital?

I have been unable to understand this attitude. I went with his relatives to try to clear up the matter and recover at least the expenses which they had incurred, but we were unable to obtain more than $200 after the death of that veteran.

I know that the government of that day assumed its responsibilities when the veteran was in the Montreal hospital. As a matter of fact, the department, at its own expense, took him over to the Quebec hospital, where he received the care he needed but too late unfortunately, according to the doctors themselves at the Quebec hospital. In fact, they admitted that a surgical operation would have been required at least two months earlier.

This is why I am speaking now in order to let the officials of the minister's department know about the abuses in the army and military hospitals. I am sure that the minister, instead of laughing as some may do, will consider the matter more seriously and see the human side of such an appalling case.

[*Text*]

Mr. Millar: I have no intention of delaying the committee this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, but perhaps if I am allowed to put my question the minister can answer all questions at the same time. I should like first of all to ask the minister whether or not any consideration is being given to increasing the amount of money available to veterans under the Veterans Land Act. I believe that at the moment the maximum amount available is $12,000. At a recent meeting of the veterans affairs committee, we heard evidence to the effect that the cost of the average house to the veteran is something like $12,500. I am referring only to the construction cost. In addition to this the veteran has to pay something like $2,000 for the land required. This means that his cash outlay is considerably higher than it was previously when a house could be built for $10,000. I believe some consideration should be given to these facts, especially in view of the fact the government has

seen fit to increase the amount of the loan available from the Farm Credit Corporation, the farm improvement loans, and under this machinery syndicate measure which was passed a short time ago.

I have had complaints from veterans who find it difficult to raise this larger amount of cash necessary for a down payment resulting from these increased costs. It has been said that less than 1 per cent of the loans outstanding under the Veterans Land Act are in arrears. This is a very good record and compares favourably with the record of the Farm Credit Corporation. This is really the only point I should like to bring to the attention of the minister. However, while I am on my feet I should like to add my voice to those who have already spoken in support of consideration for increased pensions. Here again I think the government itself has provided the best evidence of the necessity for this move. They have raised the pay of practically all the categories of civil servants as a result of the increased cost of living. This increased cost of living applies to everybody. If it applies to the civil servants, certainly it would apply to the veteran who is trying to exist, in a good many cases, on a limited pension.

I have nothing further to add, Mr. Chairman, except that I believe the fact the minister has received little criticism in this committee indicates that his department is doing a fairly satisfactory job. I should like to say that my own personal experience has been that I have received full co-operation from the minister and the officers of his department.

Mr. McLean (Charlotte): Mr. Chairman, I believe that hon. members have the interests of veterans at heart and the minister should understand this. I fully endorse the plea for increased pensions for veterans because we all know that the purchasing value of the dollar has gone down. War veterans should have a greater allowance.

I want to stress one point and that is that the benefit of the doubt now seems to be interpreted by the pension commission in the wrong way. The pension commission seems to think they have to doubt the veteran. I think they have it backwards, and my experience has been that the doubt has not been given to the veteran by the pension commission. I want to bring to the attention of the committee the case of a friend of mine who served in the first world war, and in whose welfare I have a particular interest. He is retired now and is in his late sixties. He never was sick so far as I am aware, and he never asked for a pension. He did not ask for anything. He was always under the impression that when a veteran was old he could go to a veterans hospital and get fixed up. He went to a veterans hospital and the government of New Brunswick paid for his room, but he had to pay the surgeon $75. This man wanted a hearing aid and I will give you the reason he wanted this hearing aid. He says this:

> While serving with the 26th battalion C.E.F. in Belgium in the fall of 1917—

I want to say that this man spent his entire service while he was in his teens.

> —while the battle of Passchendaele was being fought in which my battalion suffered heavy casualties, my company went in the line with 145 men and four officers; 16 returned and no officers came out. I was one of the 16 that came out safe. We were forced to hold the line for 48 hours due to relief trouble, with no rations other than for the one day; we were very hungry and tired when relieved.

Then he goes on to say that he was very happy to get out alive, but his happiness was short lived. He says:

> I was detailed to go back up the line to carry out the wounded. It was during this trip in that I had the misfortune to have my hearing affected. The time was approximately 2300 hours, very dark; travelling in single file after leaving the main road at Ypres a 15 inch Howitzer fired a shell. This was unexpected and so near that the concussion was tremendous—

He turned around three or four times and fell to the ground, but got out. This incident was not reported. He was deaf from then on. I said to him, "Well it is strange this was not reported." He said, "There were a good many things in the first world war that were not reported." I should like to quote further from his letter:

> Only the day before this happened I had the pleasure to save another soldier's life, not one of our own battalion but of the 31st western troops that had been buried by shell fire early in the morning and when I came across him it was approximately 11 p.m. He could get air enough to breathe but only his feet were out, lying on his belly at that time. I heard his shoes clicking together, with approximately three feet of earth over him, saved only by the metal covering the Germans used to make their flunk holes.

He took his trenching tool, dug the man out and saved his life. He goes on further:

> I had a bag of Mills bombs on my back and the attachment on my rifle as I was in that section in my platoon. I started to drop the bombs over approximately 75 yards. I sent about six bombs in that area and waited for approximately one hour as they had stopped firing soon after I had started. I was alone at the time, but the machine section of my platoon was nearby so I joined them and told them what I had just done, and the N.C.O.

in charge there suggested to have a look and see what had taken place. We made around this mound and found a German machine gun and five dead Germans. We brought the machine back with some ammunition but were unable to make it work so we buried it in the mud—

This man is an upright citizen, he is retired, and he cannot even get a hearing aid. I have taken this matter up with the pension board. I know the minister and his parliamentary secretary have done their best but nothing has happened, and so I am mentioning the case in this chamber.

This man deserves something, and as an example, I refer to another case in which a father wrote to me about his son. He told me his son was a cadet, that he had been hurt in a football game, had suffered a shoulder injury, and he eventually got 10 per cent disability pension. This was a young fellow in his teens. But on the other hand, this old soldier who went through the war, and who never asked for anything, cannot get anything from the pension commission. I believe the benefit of the doubt provision must be changed. In fact I would eliminate it. If a good, honest veteran makes an affidavit his word should be accepted. I know the minister has plans for the veterans, for increasing pensions, etc., but I urge him to remove this benefit of the doubt—

Mr. Winkler: Does the hon. member make with authority that statement in regard to the increases?

Mr. McLean (Charlotte): I beg your pardon.

Mr. Winkler: Does the hon. member make with authority that statement with regard to increases in pensions?

Mr. McLean (Charlotte): It is on my authority; that is what I understand.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, I am as disappointed as some other hon. members with the brevity of the minister's introductory remarks yesterday. I wish to say something about a point made by the hon. member for Charlotte with reference to the benefit of the doubt provision, and I hope the minister will take note of what his own members are saying.

I cannot thoroughly agree with my colleague on this side who said he felt the minister was doing a good job. The minister has been in office for almost two years and during that time not one piece of veterans legislation has been brought before parliament. When you compare that with what was brought before the house while the Conservatives were in power—

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIntosh: I will have something to say to you fellows in just a few moments. When you compare that record of performance with what the Conservatives introduced I wonder why any veteran would vote for the party that forms the government.

We had a right to anticipate that the minister would make some reference to the legislation he says he proposes introducing, and I say that more forcefully than some other hon. members because I have been a member of the veterans affairs committee ever since it was established. We have had a very happy committee, and so far as I know no partisan politics have been played in it. We all work for the advantage of the veterans, and my main disappointment is that the minister made no reference whatsoever to the recommendations of that committee. As a matter of fact I am extremely doubtful he will take recognition of those recommendations upon which we in the committee worked so hard and so long.

I ask myself, what is the use of serving on a committee like that, digging into the facts for the minister, if he is not going to take recognition of them? I am not asking him to take recognition of all the recommendations. It is not likely any minister would do that, but we members of the committee have a right to know why the minister would not accept our recommendations. He must have a reason but, as I have said many times before in this chamber, some ministers are captive of their officials. I ask, if he is not going to take the recommendations of the committee, then whose recommendations is he taking? We are entitled to know that.

Why is it that veterans legislation has not been introduced? If the minister had given us some indication of the legislation he intends to put before parliament I am quite sure he would realize he would not have been held up this long in getting his estimates passed, because the estimates were thoroughly gone over in the standing committee. We had no intention of holding up the estimates, and I do not accept the fact that we are holding them up now. What we are trying to do is to get some information on behalf of the veterans we represent.

The minister has been vague and evasive, and I refer to the remarks he made in the standing committee on veterans affairs. When I heard him at the time I did not realize he

was so evasive, but when asked about legislation being introduced this is what he said:

> Well, as I indicated in the house, I would still hope to have this before the house during the coming month. This is not a definite commitment but I will do my best to try to get it into the house before the end of October. This is my objective. It may be that it might run into November, but it will be done in the not too distant future. It will be done before the end of the year.

As members can see, he was just going on and on, and that is why I say he was evasive. Because of the few weeks left between now and Christmas, I ask even if he does introduce legislation on behalf of the veterans, does he believe for one moment that any action can be taken on it this year? So far as his department and the veterans are concerned there will be no action this year on pension increases. No action will be taken on war veterans allowances or on any of the things veterans have been writing to us about, because it will be impossible for the house to deal with the legislation which the Prime Minister said he is going to put on the order paper between now and Christmas.

What does the minister intend to do about the committee's recommendations? Someone has said our recommendations contain 14 paragraphs, but the first one dealing with anything except platitudes is paragraph six, which I wish to read. But before doing so I remind members that the veterans affairs committee is made up of members from all parties, the majority of them from the government side. There was unanimous agreement on this recommendation which reads:

> With respect to the subject matter of Bill C-13, it was unanimously agreed that more effective steps should be taken to observe November 11th as a national holiday and a solemn day of remembrance in all parts of Canada.

I do not believe the minister had any intention of taking notice of this recommendation. Some few weeks ago the hon. member for Kindersley rose on a question of privilege with regard to a labour bill which was before the house, and said he thought it deplorable Canada did not recognize Remembrance day as a national holiday. Just a few days ago the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre moved an amendment to that labour bill, calling for the recognition of Remembrance day as a holiday, but not one of the members on the government side voted for it. I remind hon. members again that the majority of members on the standing committee—

The Chairman: The hon. member knows that under the rules of the house he cannot reflect on a vote already taken.

Mr. McIntosh: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Walker: Apology accepted.

Mr. McIntosh: All right. I will call it five o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Order. In order that the house may proceed with the consideration of private members' business, it is my duty to leave the chair.

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 private bills; notices of motions, papers; public bills.

PRIVATE BILLS

BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF CANADA

The house resumed from Thursday, October 8, consideration in committee of Bill No. S-27, respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada—Mr. Brown—Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

On clause 1—*Number of directors.*

The Chairman: When the committee rose on October 8 last clause 1 of the bill, with an amendment proposed thereto by the hon. member for Timiskaming and an amendment to the amendment by the hon. member for Lapointe, was being considered. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, this measure has been useful in calling the attention of the public to some of the operations of this very large and very powerful corporation which controls virtually all the means of communication between the people of Ontario and Quebec. I am not sure whether it has called sufficient attention to some of their operations, indicating that the amendment presented here has some real substance, and the necessity of having some sort of watchdog over the operations of this company. I propose this afternoon to quote from two extremely interesting articles which appeared a couple of weeks ago in the Toronto *Star*, written by a Mr. Haggart, on the operations of the Bell Telephone Company and what he describes as its sibling company, the New York Telephone Company. These articles refer to the method by which this company disguises some of its charges to the public and the price people are asked

to pay for what is termed "local service and equipment". I recall that I paid my telephone bill today and this question occurred to my mind: just what is meant by "local service and equipment"? I know that it cost me quite a bit of money, but the telephone bill did not explain what I was paying for. Apparently in New York there is a public spirited gentleman called Levine who is making it his business to act as spokesman for the subscribers to the New York Telephone Company, exposing some of these charges that are made by the company without explanation. This article says:

> Levine is the director and guiding spirit of an outfit called the American telephone consumer's council, which plans to join in court actions, appear before regulatory commissions, and generally raise hob with the phone company on behalf of its customers.

As most of us are customers, and few of us are shareholders, I am sure we will all cheer Mr. Levine on in his efforts:

> In his current campaign against the cute concealment of extra charges on the phone bill under "local service and equipment", Levine is trying to whet the appetite of the consumer frauds branch of the New York attorney general's department.
>
> Levine's petition laid out the complaint this way: "Undoubtedly, the New York Telephone Co. fears that if the charges were brought to the customer's attention by being itemized, the customer might cancel the luxury rentals.
>
> "We demand an immediate investigation by the bureau of consumer frauds into this attempt by the New York Telephone Co. to mislead us as consumers"—
>
> The charge in Toronto—

I should perhaps include this:

> Levine's complaint about the concealment of monthly rental charges (he likes to call them "forever charges")—

I think that is a very nice term:

> —is as true in Toronto as in New York.
>
> The charge in Toronto for installing a princess phone—

And I am sure we would all love to have a princess phone:

> —is $6.

Whether that is because you have some special connection with royalty, I do not know; or whether when you pick it up you get a princess at the other end, as when you pick up the telephone to send a telegram—

An hon. Member: You are just dreaming.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Oh, I was afraid I would not get a princess for $6; but still I can hope. This article continues:

> It also costs an extra 85 cents a month forever, and if the Princess is an extension the 85 cents is an addition to the extension charges of $1.25 a month.
>
> A Princess extension, therefore, costs $31.20 the first year, and $25.20 for every year thereafter. In ten years, a Princess extension phone will cost the customer $258. New York dealers sell the same phone for $35 cash.

The Chairman: Order. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but I wonder whether he would enlighten the Chair and indicate how the comments he has been making are related either to the subamendment, the amendment or the bill.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I would be delighted to do so, Mr. Chairman. I am only surprised that I am required to do so; I thought it would have been self-evident. The object of this amendment is to place on the board of directors of the Bell Telephone Company individuals who will represent the people of Canada, the government of Canada and the customers of this company. I am merely advancing evidence to show how sorely needed are such inquisitors, such observers, in the operations of this company.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Would you like to hear something, sir, about coloured phones. The article continues in this way:

> Regulatory commissions which are supposed to be the public watchdogs of monopoly public utilities seldom pay much attention to such charges, although they loom large both in the customer's phone bill and in the receipts of the phone companies. The single exception seems to be the state of New Jersey, where the public utilities commission recently ordered the charge for a coloured phone to be reduced to $4, and the monthly rental for an extension reduced to 90 cents. Across the river in New York, a coloured phone is $10; in Toronto it's $9. Any extension in Toronto, coloured or black, costs $1.25 a month, forever.

I suggest that this report indicates—and I presume it would not be published by the *Star* if it was not verified—the urgent need of some more permanent observation and surveillance of the operations of this company than can be provided by the board of transport commissioners. Hon. members will recall that in the original presentation of this bill it was stressed again and again that this is a purely Canadian company, a Canadian-owned company, with only a really minute smidgen of stock held by a non-Canadian. Of course, it is quite a small percentage; only some 2.6 per cent of the stock

is owned by a non-Canadian. But this happens to be the largest single block of stock owned by any shareholder.

Curiously enough it is owned by American Telephone & Telegraph Company, an organization which has its special contract agreement also with the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, which provides quite a little bit for the revenues of this company.

> Among the interesting facts not disclosed in the propaganda pamphlet—and facts which the Bell company has no reason to be embarrassed about—is the involvement of American Telephone & Telegraph often called North America's largest company and the giant, paternal overseer of the Bell system.
>
> The largest single shareholder in Bell of Canada is A.T. & T., with 2.6 per cent of the shares, or a total of 749,992.
>
> This is two or three times as much Bell stock as anyone else owns.
>
> The Bell pamphlet sent to subscribers this month does not even mention the existence of A.T.& T. Yet A.T.& T. was entitled to $1,600,000 in dividends out of Bell of Canada last year, and was paid another $4,700,000 under the terms of management contract and patent pool. (A.T. & T. takes 1 per cent off the top of Bell's gross telephone revenue.)

I suggest that this indicates the need for a very careful surveillance of the operations of this company, of the charges it is making and of the impact it has on the Canadian economy.

Specifically this bill asks us to authorize the appointment of five more directors. We were not able to get any very conclusive or definite statement out of the officers of the company when we met as to who such people would be. If one looks at the present board of directors the reason is obvious, of course. This article continues:

> In fact, there is only one of these 11 directors who is not also a director of a bank. It's entirely likely that the bank just down your street is represented on the Bell board of directors—

Just as the Bell Company says that your neighbour down the street is probably a shareholder, that neighbour down the street in the form of a bank is probably represented on the board. According to this article the board of directors is composed of:

> —the Bank of Montreal, the Royal Bank, the Toronto-Dominion Bank, La Banque Canadienne Nationale each has one director on Bell; the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, has three. Montreal Trust and Royal Trust have two and three directors respectively on Bell. In addition, Sun Life, Crown Life, Norwich Union, Canada Life and Dominion Life are all represented on the Bell board of directors.
>
> If I were one of those neighbours down the street with Bell Telephone stock myself, I'd want to ask questions about the huge amounts of new stock Bell sells to its employees at bargain-counter prices.

That is another method by which the illusion is created of a popularly owned and controlled organization in our midst.

It may be that eventually this house will pass this bill and the Bell Telephone Company will appoint five more directors. It may also be the case that again they will be chosen from the ranks of bank directors and directors of trust companies. But I would hope, sir, that we shall not leave the position of this company in its present state. I trust we shall not even be satisfied with appointing the sort of watchdogs of which I have been speaking, but that we have a thoroughgoing investigation into the operations of this company, an investigation which cannot be undertaken by the present regulatory body because it lacks the power to do so. If we are going to pass this bill I suggest that it is the duty of the government to bring in legislation which will increase and broaden the powers of the board of transport commissioners so that they can make a real investigation of the operations of this company, and enable the Canadian people to decide whether or not the time has come to remove from private hands altogether this octopus on which the whole of our economy in central Canada depends and from whose decisions the ordinary Canadian citizen literally has no recourse at all.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Chairman, in discussing Bill No. S-27, let me say I am greatly surprised at the helplessness of the government. This bill has been coming back before the house every Thursday for several weeks, without the slightest amendment being brought to it, although that was what we requested of the mover of the bill himself.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder who is actually inciting the government not to take into account all the arguments we have submitted up to now.

Here, I wish to congratulate the hon. member who spoke previously for the fine statement he has just made. This is further proof that the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) was right in submitting an amendment to the house to refute the words of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Brown) who said, as reported on page 8638 of *Hansard*, that the mover of the amendment had good intentions. On the other hand, I doubt very much that either he or his supporters can seriously expect the Canadian parliament to pass this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that on reading such a subsection, opposition mem-

bers ask themselves many questions, and the people generally have not finished asking some more. Through the amendment brought forward by the hon. member for Lapointe, we are asking the government to make the Bell Telephone Company see to it that the five directors to be added to the board of directors are not shareholders, in order that various public bodies may have their say in such a powerful organization.

This trust is especially dangerous because it seems to find favour with this government as with the previous ones, probably because of its important contribution to the election funds of the old-line parties.

Mr. Chairman, we are in favour of private enterprise, but not in favour of almighty trusts which can give orders year after year to the government and this is why the Bell Telephone Company of Canada is constantly asking for rate increases. Today, under Bill S-27, it is asking to increase by five the number of its directors.

We are fully justified in wanting to know the reasons and in imposing conditions on the company, since it is authorized to tax the entire population at will. We are concerned, however, that old-line party members do not dare to reject those ever increasing demands of the company, probably because it is one of the reasons why trusts can overpower the voice of the people.

Its funds might have contributed to the election of governments up to now, which necessarily requires silence.

But whatever the reasons, it is the people who must pay. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the people now pay millions of dollars more for those small favours on election day. Those who were elected under this label must necessarily show their true colours by remaining the loyal servants of that company.

Am I right? Am I wrong? The facts are there to prove my statements.

Let us compare the rates charged the Bell Telephone Company of Canada's customers with those charged in other provinces. On the prairies the subscribers pay a rate of $3.90, and the rate is even lower in British Columbia, we pay more than $6.40 for the same service. And yet, in British Columbia, where there is a Social Credit government, companies' profits have increased by more than 100 per cent. Don't you think that the Bell Telephone Company of Canada can be an exception to that rule?

Therefore, I can see one reason only for increasing by five the number of the company's directors; it is to be able to deduct a few thousand dollars more from their income tax, depriving the government of revenues which it will have to take from the small wage earner who is unable to cheat because his income tax is deducted at the source.

I feel, then Mr. Chairman, that this is a fine opportunity for the government to take advantage of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada's request in order to require the company to choose the five new directors among the various social groups. Thus, the interests of the taxpayers will be protected.

If we grant full powers to this trust which is competition free—because, to my knowledge, the Bell Telephone Company of Canada is not faced with too much competition—the government must take every precaution to prevent the people from being frustrated of their right to fair democratic treatment.

Somebody will object saying that the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada is required to examine the balance sheet of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada. Indeed, it is that board which is responsible for representing the public in its relations with this company. But what can be done by that board, made up mostly of the mute members we find in this house, when they have been unable to stem the prohibitive prices we have now. Let us consider that, for calls from public booths, we have to pay 10 cents to unhook the receiver, instead of 5 cents as in the other provinces. That is a difference of 100 per cent, compared with other provinces, and it is the same for the whole schedule of telephone charges.

Some may say that it is because of the good service. They should ask people in the other provinces who are in a position to compare what the situation is. They will be the first ones to be disappointed by the inadequate service and the lack of control of charges to users. Indeed, if we do not check every day long-distance calls—and heaven knows how many we have—we will have to pay for the bill of those who used our name.

One may say that when a report is made to the office, they correct the mistake quickly, but when it goes unnoticed, they also hurry to make us pay.

For all those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), namely that five new directors should be appointed by municipalities, school boards, unions, chambers of commerce and employers and industrialists associations, to make sure that the majority of consumers will be represented in the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

Each of these new directors would be in a position to look into the administration of this company which, in fact, lives on the money paid to it by all the Canadian taxpayers.

If it is our duty to encourage private companies, it is also very urgent that we should protect the people against the danger of abuses from trusts that are too powerful for the government to lay down a policy for them.

The regulations must be complied with by the big fellows just like the small ones, and I am not aware that we have yet reached the stage of the law of the jungle.

That is why, to face up to some trusts, the government must assume its responsibilities and prescribe terms which, while enabling them to expand, will guarantee freedom in justice for all Canadian citizens.

[*Text*]

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make several remarks with reference to the amendments to this bill. I originally intended to make these remarks some weeks ago but the opportunity to do so did not present itself. I may on one or two occasions repeat comments which have been made earlier by other members in respect of this matter, but repetition has not been lacking during the discussion of this bill.

I should like to commence by indicating that I am opposed to the amendment and subamendment, but that does not necessarily mean I am happy with all the aspects of the present operation of the Bell Telephone Company. First of all I think the amendment and subamendment are not proper amendments. The bill now before this house calls for an additional five directors to be appointed to the board of directors of the Bell Telephone Company, changing the powers of that board to appoint 15 directors, and allowing them to appoint 20. I suggest that any amendment which gives this house the power to appoint members to the board of directors of that company, rather than the company having the right to appoint its directors, goes to the heart of the incorporation of the company and is improper.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the speaker a question?

Mr. Regan: You want to ask the Speaker a question?

Mr. Peters: You are the speaker in this case. In view of the fact that the original charter of the Bell Telephone Company was granted by the federal parliament, is the hon. member not of the opinion that when the company seeks to change their original incorporation the manner in which this is done and the results that will flow from such action involve the same kind of situation as when the company received its original charter from parliament?

Mr. Regan: No, I am not of that opinion. I respect the hon. member's opinion in the matter but I am of the opinion that to be a proper amendment it would have to deal strictly with what is involved in the bill, an increase in the number of directors. If the amendment dealt with that I think it would be proper, but when you start to deal with who is going to make these appointments I do not consider it to be a proper amendment. However, I am not prepared to enter into a legal discussion of the matter—

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Regan: I do not believe there is a point of order.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Lapointe on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

We are now considering an amendment and a sub-amendment which have been accepted by the Chair. At the beginning of the sitting at five o'clock you said yourself there were some amendments.

And now an hon. member is protesting against your ruling and states that an amendment would not be in order, whereas it already has been accepted by the Chair.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) should withdraw his words which I consider an offence to you, since the said amendment has been declared in order by Your Honour.

If a member wants to object to such a ruling, it is up to him to do it at the proper time but not after several weeks have elapsed.

I am therefore asking the hon. member for Halifax to show greater respect to the chairman of this assembly.

The Chairman: I can assure the hon. member that the chairman appreciates very much his concern but he must remind him that a point of order may be raised at any time, even at the resolution stage.

Should the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) or any other member wish to rise on a

point of order at this stage, such a point could be considered, but I do not think this is the point made by the hon. member who has the floor.

[*Text*]

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I was about to attempt to ask the hon. member a question, and in view of the fact that this point has been raised I think the hon. member should at least clarify the matter by saying whether he considers the form or the subject matter of the amendment to be improper.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to make my own speech and not have hon. members, as much as I appreciate their concern, assist me to such a great degree. I will move along from what I have said to give some other reasons why I feel the amendment and subamendment should not be supported by members of the house. My next point is that I do not think the Bell Telephone Company, as one of a number of utilities and monopolies operating in this country, should be singled out to have a person appointed by the government sitting on the board of directors of the company. I believe there is some precedent in Europe for such action, but if there is merit in this policy and if it is ever to be adopted in this country it should be adopted by government decision as government policy and apply to all utilities that fall under the jurisdiction of this house. I do not think it would be fair at all to single out the Bell Telephone Company in this regard and to introduce such a policy in this manner.

My next point with regard to the amendment is that if there is something wrong from the point of view of lack of supervision or the way in which the Bell Telephone Company is being directed by the board of transport commissioners, I do not think what has been suggested would effect a remedy. As a matter of fact, I think it is remarkably naïve on the part of those who have proposed the amendment to suggest that one director, or indeed three directors appointed by the government would be in a position to know what was going on inside a large company. If they were appointed they would be, as a friend of mine said, little more than lobbyists with a fairly good connection.

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: The hon. member for Lapointe.

[The Chairman.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

I think the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) is now in the process of insulting the Canadian civil service, by declaring that if the government appoints civil servants to act as directors of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, these civil servants would not be competent and would act, according to the expression he used, only as "lobbyists".

In my opinion, this is an insult to the civil servants of the Canadian government, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw his statement.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Lapointe has raised a point of order. Would he kindly enlighten the chairman by telling him on what particular rule he is basing his point of order.

[*Text*]

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, as I might well have anticipated, the hon. member did not understand what I was saying. I never suggested that civil servants were to be appointed and I do not believe that is in the amendment. Anyone could be appointed. When I said they would act as lobbyists I meant they would act as lobbyists for the interests of the government or parliament or the taxpayers. However, they would not be effective if the company wanted to freeze them out because, as anyone who has any knowledge of corporate operations knows, a single director or a very small group of directors within a larger group of 20 would not be able to be effective for this purpose.

Let us go on to the next objection that I see to the amendment. As I understand the rules of the house with regard to a bill of this sort, if the amendment were passed the Bell Telephone Company at that stage would be in the position of being able to withdraw the legislation and therefore nothing would be accomplished and additional directors would not be appointed. Therefore I think that the question whether the Bell Telephone Company should have five additional directors to be appointed by the company should be considered by the house on the merits of whether or not more directors are needed.

Mind you, because of the size of the Bell Telephone Company, with which I will deal in a moment or two, and because the house does not have the opportunity to deal with the affairs of this company very often, I agree that those occasions when they do come to

the house seeking amendments to their charter are legitimate occasions to review their operations in a reasonable manner. I do not believe in a prolonged filibuster on the subject but I believe there should be a reasonable review. On these occasions members of the house, the elected representatives of the people, should be able to express their views and concerns with reference to the magnitude of the Bell Telephone Company and some of its practices. I think this would be very worth while. I hope the company will take note of the fact that members from all parts of the house have spoken on this bill and that this must reflect a certain concern throughout the country with regard to some of their operations. I am thinking specifically about their ownership of Northern Electric and the competition of that company with other private companies in the same field.

There is another matter on which I should like to say a word or two. I think most of the members of the house are believers in free enterprise. Sometimes the press indicates that one who criticizes such a utility or company may not support free enterprise, but I hasten to say that ever since I can remember it has been my impression that the essence of free enterprise is competition. Competition in any field makes for free enterprise that is healthy and guarantees the people of the country good service.

I remember when I had an opportunity to visit Moscow at the time of the world's ice hockey championships in 1957 I found the service in the restaurant in the hotel to be absolutely terrible. I waited for three quarters of an hour to be served because there was not another restaurant across the street to which I could go. I think this is an example of something that happens when there is no competition, and of the fact that competition is of the essence of free enterprise.

Unfortunately some enterprises must be run as monopolies. The Bell Telephone Company has become a very large monopoly. I think all members will agree that you cannot have half a dozen telephone companies stringing wires along the streets. You would be in a position of attempting to call someone and finding he was served by another company, and you would have a very complicated process to go through in order to reach him. As a consequence, a telephone company is one operation which, to be effectively run, has to be run as a monopoly. Under such circumstances there is a necessity for the government to intervene, to some extent, in the operation of the business because free enterprise as such does not exist wherever there is a monopoly of this type.

A long time ago, it was established that the board of transport commissioners would be the body which would oversee the operations of the telephone company. They have certain terms of reference for doing that job. Now I suggest, and I think a good case could be made out, that the present powers of the board of transport commissioners are not sufficiently strong to enable them to do as efficient a job of overseeing this particular monopoly. I suggest that rather than introduce amendments which would add one or more directors appointed by the government or by parliament to the Bell Telephone Company, the proper way to deal with the question is to beef up the board of transport commissioners. If the personnel of the board are not strong enough, if more personnel is needed to do the amount of work necessary or if the powers of the board are insufficient to do the job, and I do not know this because I have not had experience with it, then let us act in that direction. I would certainly conclude from the experience I have had that the board of transport commissioners does not have sufficient power to oversee the operations of the Bell Telephone, particularly in relationship to the ownership of Northern Electric by that company. The remedy therefore lies in legislation to change the position of the board of transport commissioners and give them the power to carry out this function.

I spoke earlier for a moment, Mr. Chairman, about the ownership of Northern Electric by the Bell Telephone Company. We want to remember that we are not talking simply about a telephone company, we are talking about an empire. We are talking about an organization that had a gross income of $471 million for a year. This company has become so big that it is bigger than many governments that exist in the world today. It is a company which, even with a very strong board of transport commissioners or some other public utilities body, will need to be watched carefully at all times. In so far as the ownership of Northern Electric is concerned, other members have reviewed the fact that Bell owns all the shares of Northern Electric by virtue of the interpretation of a clause giving the company power to hold shares of or make arrangements with other companies involved in telephone business. The fact that Northern Electric owns a telephone line which stretches a short distance in the city of Montreal has been used

as the back door for Bell Telephone to acquire ownership of this giant Northern Electric, which provides Bell Telephone with all its wire, cable and other such supplies.

I do not necessarily argue over the question that the Bell Telephone Company is manufacturing wire and cable for its own use. Let us remember also that Northern Electric are not content with supplying the big market offered by the Bell Telephone monopoly, but all Bell's customers have no opportunity to go anywhere else. Bell then uses its subsidiary, Northern Electric, to supply its requirements for this vast market and then Northern turns around and competes in the ordinary market with the smaller companies that exist in Canada which are manufacturing wire, cable and so on. I suggest that they have little chance of being able to compete with Northern in those circumstances.

I questioned the officials of the Bell Telephone Company on this matter during the hearings before the committee. They were quick to make the point that Bell Telephone bought all their supplies from Northern Electric at a rate that was much lower than the market cost, and therefore the public interest was being served. However, Mr. Chairman, the representatives of the other companies in Canada quickly made the point that this was not true. They said that, certainly, the rate that was being paid for these goods would appear to be lower than the market price, but when you consider the quantity discount other companies might offer, this may not be the case. They never had the opportunity of competing for these supplies to Bell Telephone. They say, give us a chance to compete for Bell's supplies along with Northern Electric and we will quote a price on these goods that will be lower than that which the Bell Telephone Company is presently paying Northern Electric. These companies make what appears to me to be a very valid point. Therefore Bell is paying an artificially high rate for these supplies to Northern Electric. Since the rate for telephones is set on the basis of allowing the company a reasonable profit after costs this means, in effect, that the telephone subscribers of this country are, to a substantial extent, helping Northern Electric provide unfair competition to companies that are operating the same type of business as Northern Electric in this country today. It is to this aspect of the matter that I object.

[Mr. Regan.]

I feel that any court examination, and there has not been any, of the power of the Bell Telephone to own Northern Electric would result in a finding that such ownership was ultra vires of the powers of Bell Telephone. I would strongly urge, Mr. Chairman, that the only way this matter can get before the Supreme Court of Canada is by a reference. I feel it is in the public interest that the government should refer to the supreme court the question of whether or not the ownership of Northern Electric is proper, when it depends upon the ownership by Northern of this one wire. In my opinion, it may well turn out that Bell Telephone would be required to divest itself of its interest in Northern Electric, as has been done in other nations under similar circumstances. If Bell Telephone wanted to retain Northern Electric to do their manufacturing of their supplies, they could quite legally do that and not enter the competitive field with other companies manufacturing the same line of goods. It seems to me, and I will admit that I may be wrong, that only the Supreme Court of Canada is in a position to say—

The Chairman: Order. I must interrupt the hon. member as his time has expired.

Mr. Regan: There were quite a number of interruptions, Mr. Chairman, and I wonder if I might be permitted two minutes to finish.

The Chairman: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Regan: I am not exactly sure where I was.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Regan: But I was saying that the ownership of the vast Northern Electric Company surely cannot be valid on this pretext. I would join with many other people who suggest it is in the national interest, and for the sake of the protection of the small companies in the same business, and the protection of the telephone subscribers, that the government make a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada to determine the validity of this ownership.

Just before concluding I would like to comment on one or two practices of Bell Telephone Company. In the past it had a practice of charging extra for coloured telephones. I gather this is not the case now, but it charges a monthly fee for putting a light in your telephone, and has other charges of this type. I feel these charges should be one time

charges, covered by an amount paid when a phone is installed—

The Chairman: Order. Would the hon. member be kind enough to relate this particular point to the subamendment and the bill before us?

Mr. Regan: That would be extremely difficult, Mr. Chairman, so I shall leave it. I conclude my remarks by saying that for the reasons I have outlined I think the committee should vote down both the subamendment and the amendment. I think the bill should be passed giving Bell Telephone their five extra directors, or else it should be refused on a vote on the basis that the company does not need them. I believe the bill should be considered on its merits, and that every consideration should be given in the future to changing the method of checking the operations of Bell Telephone so that this can be done more efficiently.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to make any prolonged remarks. I have not heard all the debate but I was most impressed with the remarks made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan). His proposal that at the instance of the government a reference be made to the Supreme Court of Canada would clear up a problem which has been concerning us through the course of this rather protracted debate.

I have had the advantage of reading about 400 pages of the evidence on this matter when it came before the board of transport commissioners. I must say I found that material very interesting, but I thought a serious legal question arose as to the right of the Bell Telephone Company to hold the shares of Northern Electric. It is a very important question that affects the whole basis of this company's operation. It is a question which has many complicated problems of law and fact. It is one which I feel should be reviewed, not by the board of transport commissioners, who may be highly expert in their own field, but by the highest court in the land. I wish to commend the suggestion made by the hon. member.

As I recall, this issue of the connection between these two companies was raised in the hearings before the committee on private bills. It was also raised earlier in this debate, and I must say I think a solution to the problem could only be secured in the manner suggested by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan).

Having made that observation I must add I am greatly interested in the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Lapointe. I thought the original amendment had tremendous merit, but the subamendment seems to improve on it. It suggests an even broader representation of the public interest, enabling the government to appoint representatives of consumers, of labour, and of other groups in the community who are deeply interested in the operations of this company. I feel the subamendment has a great deal of merit and I hope it will commend itself to the committee.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, in rising to take part in the discussion on the increase in the number of directors of the Bell Telephone Company I would point out that I have spoken on this subject in the past. In my first remarks I commented on a situation involving the C.B.C., in which they gave a contract for the sound carried for 195 radio stations in Canada to the Bell Telephone Company, which had submitted a tender 25 per cent below that submitted by the joint operation of the C.P.R. and C.N.R. telecommunications system.

I pointed out at that time that the C.P.R. and the C.N.R. had 30 years experience in the operation of this radio sound system, yet an outsider came in and undercut them by 25 per cent, and the C.B.C. granted a ten year contract. At that time the two railroads sent a joint letter to the government, signed by President Donald Gordon of the C.N.R. and the then executive assistant to the president of the C.P.R. but now president, Mr. Emerson, pointing out that they did not think it was fair one company should be able to adjust its rates higher and higher in certain fields of endeavour, while at the same time undercutting other organizations in the competitive rates field.

I have in my hand a clipping from the Quebec city *Chronicle-Telegraph* of May 22 last—

The Chairman: Order. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business has expired.

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 question to be raised at ten o'clock this evening is the following:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise; rain making in northwestern Quebec and the Saguenay region.

[*Text*]

The house will now resume the business interrupted at five o'clock.

SUPPLY

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

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

1. Departmental administration, $6,491,400.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, prior to the private members' hour I was making reference to recommendations that the committee on veterans affairs had made to the minister of the department. I had almost completed my remarks in regard to the first recommendation; that is, in regard to Remembrance day. I would say to the minister at this time that I regret finding myself in the position where I must state my mind, on behalf of the people whom I represent and particularly on behalf of the veterans whom I represent, in regard to the inaction, I might say, of the minister of this department. In saying that I would also like to remind the minister that if he would put himself in my position, being a member of that standing committee and having the feeling that the recommendations on which we spent so many hours are going to be disregarded altogether by him and his department, he would understand my resentment, if he wishes to take it that way.

I now come to the second recommendation made by the committee, which was in regard to amendments to the Pension Act. I am of the opinion that several sections of that act should be reviewed with a view to changing them. I admit that perhaps up to the present time they have been necessary, and were necessary particularly in the years immediately after world war II. I refer to section 5 (5) in which full power with regard to the interpretation of the act is given to the commission. This is an extraordinary type of act in Canadian justice. I believe there are very few other acts that have been passed by this parliament and our predecessors that are not subject to interpretation and decision by the courts. This act happens to be one exception. As many hon. members have informed the minister in this debate on his estimates, we believe it is now time this act was reviewed. I refer to one hon. member who spoke in the house yesterday afternoon and who is in fact a non-veteran; therefore I compliment him for saying this. I have reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, who said:

> What we are really seeking is not a basic change in much of that legislation, but rather the kind of improvement which will meet the situation existing today.

I think that is all the members of the veterans affairs committee were trying to do when we asked the minister to review section 70, which is commonly known as the benefit of the doubt section. Any review of *Hansard* will show that from time to time members of parliament have tried to change the interpretation which the Canadian pension commission has been putting on this particular section. Another section we have been trying to change is 13 (2). In this regard I would point out that there has been one change that I know of in regard to the phrase "arising out of and directly connected with". The word "and" in that section has been changed to "or", and it now reads, "arising out of or directly connected with".

I maintain that this is significant, in that prior to the change from "and" to "or" the pension commission felt they had to be satisfied that the applicant qualified in regard to both those terms. It was the intent of parliament that he only had to qualify under one. We maintain that the members of the pension commission do not recognize this, or so it seems to us who are fighting these cases. I do not say this just as a member of the opposition, because hon. members opposite have made reference to this particular section, as well as to section 70. In this connection I would refer to the problem the British government had in regard to this particular type of act. I could say some very harsh words about the Canadian pension commission, and perhaps I have already said some very harsh words about that body; but I hope those on that commission as well as the officials of the department realize that I must attack all officials rather than perhaps one or two who are responsible for the block, if I may call it that, which apparently exists between what members of parliament are trying to do—the intent of parliament, if you want to put it that way—and the way in

which they are actually administering the act.

As the hon. member for Comox-Alberni said, we believe we must keep up to date; and if the minister has not brought in or is not going to bring in any changes to this act, I think it is high time he considered changing some of its sections. I repeat again, Mr. Chairman, that section 5 (5) should be reviewed, section 13 (2) should be reviewed, section 63 (5) should be reviewed and section 70 should be reviewed.

I mentioned that I would say something about what happened in the United Kingdom. During the committee discussion on section 70 and section 13 (2) I had something to say because at that time I believe I had a bill dealing with this very matter referred to the committee on veterans affairs for investigation. At that time the most convincing argument that I think was put forward was in connection with the maiden speech of Lord Denning in the United Kingdom House of Lords. I should like to put part of that speech on the record, not only for the minister's benefit but for the benefit of the veterans who will read the contents of *Hansard*. Lord Denning said at that time:

My Lords, it has been my lot as a judge to review the decisions of many tribunals, and may I say how welcome it is that this important report should be accepted by all parties in the state, because it contains and reaffirms a constitutional principle of the first importance—namely that these tribunals are not part of the administrative machinery of government under the control of departments; they are part of the judicial system of the land under the rule of law. This report shows how that principle should be put into practice. These tribunals should, whenever appropriate, give reasons for their decisions, and their decisions should be subject to appeal to the courts on points of law.

This is what I have always maintained, that the commission is not capable of determining points of law. It so happens that in my opinion a precedent is set by some decision of a member of the commission and that precedent is followed throughout in practically every case.

Then later on His Lordship said:

I will tell Your Lordships something about an appeal structure with which I had some connection—namely the pensions appeals tribunal. After the war the late Lord Jowitt, of honoured memory, appointed me as the nominated judge to hear all appeals from ex-servicemen. The machinery of appeal is this. The ministry look into a case, and say whether or not it is a proper case for a pension. If they reject it, there is an appeal to the high court on points of law. I was nominated as the judge to hear all these appeals.

See how the course of justice may unknowingly go wrong. I had not been sitting for two or three weeks, when I realized that the tribunals had been putting the burden of proof the wrong way—they were putting it on the service man to prove his disability was attributable to war service.

The hon. member for Charlotte mentioned this afternoon that the benefit of the doubt was put the wrong way by the commission. Parliament in Canada has been contending for a number of years that this is wrong, but no action has been taken by the minister's department to change the section of the act and to spell this out to the commission. It seems to me that the commissioners themselves pay no attention to what is the intent of parliament. We have tried in every possible manner, I would say, to impress upon these people that this is what we mean; but apparently there is someone on the commission who, in my opinion, has said that we do not know what we are talking about and that the present way is the way it is going to be.

Lord Denning went on to say this:

That had been the law before 1943; but in 1943 the royal warrant was amended to say that if a man was fit when he went into the service and disabled when he came out, there should be a presumption, and a compelling presumption, that his disablement was due to war service and that the burden was on the ministry, if they could, to prove the contrary. So far as I could see, despite the change in the royal warrant, the tribunals had gone on in the old way. They were saying in their reasons, "We cannot find sufficient ground for saying that this was attributable to war service". I hope I was right, but in every case I allowed the appeal.

Further than that, there arose the question of those people whose cases had been decided in the last two years on a wrong basis.

I would say that we have many such cases in Canada which have been decided on a wrong basis.

Application was made to extend the time limit for an appeal. The attorney general of the day argued that a judge had no power to give an extension of time. I held that an extension of time was permissible, and made it reasonably clear that in every case the time would be extended; whereupon the government of the day, very properly, set up a special review tribunal which reviewed all those cases. As a result, many men got the pensions to which they were entitled, and counsel for the British Legion, addressing me afterwards, told me how admirably the review tribunal had done their work.

I say it is time that we in Canada recognized what has happened in the United Kingdom and amended our act accordingly.

His Lordship goes on:

What I have said shows how, quite unconsciously and unmeaningly, a tribunal may slip into error and may need to be corrected. But that is not the only purpose of an appeal. Another purpose is to get uniform decisions. There were 14 or 15 tribunals operating all over the country, and one might come to a decision different from that of another. There

were difficult cases. Cancer, for example, is a very difficult and arguable case. On the one hand, doctors could not say what was the cause of cancer, so how could it be said that it was not due to war service? On the other hand, it was said that cancer is just as prevalent in civilian life as it is in the army, and that there is no possibility of its being due to war service. One tribunal would decide a case in one way and another tribunal would decide in quite a different way. How unfortunate for all the widows and other dependants. We arranged to have test cases in which the medical evidence and the legal position in a typical case of cancer could be settled and decided, so that that might act as a signpost for all other cases of that type. That was done in regard to cancer, leukaemia, varicose veins and other ailments which continually arose, so we achieved uniformity of decision. That, then, is the other value of an appeal.

I might say here that I personally in the past year have had a couple of cases of ex-servicemen who had developed multiple sclerosis, and in neither one was I successful in getting a settlement for the applicant, although I knew full well that others of my colleagues had had more success in getting these cases through the Canadian pension commission. I wonder why I was not successful. I think my cases were just as valid as any of the others. In fact the records of one case showed that the first symptoms of multiple sclerosis appeared while this serviceman was in the service, and as a result he was discharged. I understand from the medical profession that no one knows how multiple sclerosis starts. Therefore how can it be determined whether or not it was attributable to war service in this case? Similarly with cancer, and I think His Lordship said something about that in the course of his remarks. In some cases of cancer it has been found in later years that owing to a bump received a cyst or growth formed and turned out to be malignant. No one knows how cancer starts. No one knows how multiple sclerosis starts. Therefore how can the Canadian pension commission in their wisdom say that this sort of thing is not attributable to war service? That is my point. However, if a ruling were made that all multiple sclerosis cases were not to be considered for pension, perhaps I would accept it; but when the commission accepts one case and not another I wonder why.

His Lordship goes on to say:

As a result of this experience, I would ask that, if appeals are to be limited to points of law, a liberal interpretation should be given as to what constitutes a point of law. I would give Your Lordships one illustration. Gunner Lee had suffered a great deal from stomach trouble while in the army. He had reported to army doctors, and they had pooh-poohed him and put the case on one side. One suggested that he was malingering. When he went to a civilian hospital it was found that his condition was by then inoperable and he died. His widow brought the case which eventually came to me. She conducted it in person. The man's captain, his comrades and his wife herself proved how he had reported sick to the army doctors and not been given attention; and the tribunal had decided against him simply because nothing appeared in his medical history sheet in regard to his complaints. Medical history sheets, however, may be incomplete. Rightly or wrongly, I held that if a tribunal comes to an unreasonable conclusion, that is a point of law with which courts can interfere. I am glad to say that only a year ago this house, in its judicial capacity, held that if a tribunal comes to a conclusion to which no reasonable man could come, that is a point of law on which the courts can interfere. In passing, may I express the hope that in any structure which is made in future the jurisdiction of this house in its judicial capacity will be preserved. Those who remember the workmen's compensation cases which came to this house will recall the liberal interpretation then given by the house in its judicial capacity—that the burden should not be on the workman who is injured but on his employer.

I could present many cases in respect of this benefit of the doubt clause, although I do not think that is necessary. Perhaps I should just ask the minister to read the remarks of hon. members who have spoken during our consideration of his estimates yesterday and today, counting the number of times the benefit of the doubt clause has been mentioned. I do not refer to the comments of members of the opposition only, but also to those remarks made by members of his own party. Perhaps the minister will consider the many briefs he has received from the various veterans organizations in Canada and count the number of references in those briefs to this same clause.

In view of the number of times the benefit of the doubt aspect of veterans problems has been referred to one must come to the conclusion that there is something wrong in its interpretation. I feel that parliament has done almost everything possible to bring this situation to the attention of the minister and his department. I do not believe the commissioners are carrying out the intent of parliament. Perhaps we should take some action to change the type of commission we now have. Mr. Chairman, I have said some very harsh things about the pension commission, and I must warn the house that unless some change takes place in the interpretation of this clause by that commission, as long as I am a member of this house I will have to use similar terms.

In view of the experience we have gained over the past number of years in respect of veterans pensions, I think it is time we paid attention to what Lord Denning of the United

Kingdom, said in this regard. It is time this legislation was changed. We have tried to make a change but apparently the commission has seen fit not to accept or follow our suggestions.

Several other things mentioned by members of the veterans affairs committee are worthy of repetition. First, I should like to refer to that committee's recommendation in respect of Remembrance day. What happened to that recommendation? Second, I should like to refer again to the benefit of the doubt clause and the committee's recommendation in relation to it. I think enough has been said about that particular aspect of veterans affairs problems.

Paragraph 13 of the recommendations of the committee on veterans affairs is related to increases in pensions. The minister implied, or at least I am under this impression, that there may be something done in this regard in the near future. I had hoped the minister would be more specific in his statement, because he must have received many letters of the type we have received from veterans, complaining that their pensions as of two years ago are no longer adequate in view of the increased cost of living and the decreased purchasing value of the dollar. I feel there should be automatic adjustments in those pensions. This point has been raised by several members during our consideration of the minister's estimates. Perhaps every three years the officials of the minister's department should appraise the cost of living and adjust these pensions accordingly. It should not be necessary for members of parliament to take up the time of this house in an attempt to impress upon the minister that because of increasing costs pensions should be adjusted. Surely that was the intent of the Canadian people when, through their elected representatives, they offered these pensions to veterans, whether they be disability pensions or veterans allowances. The people of Canada have felt that Canadian veterans should be taken care of, and I think it is the minister's duty to see that that wish is carried out.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of parliament it is my duty to impress upon the minister of this department the merits of the many suggestions made by myself and by other members. I should like to say a word or two in respect of the clause in the War Veterans Allowances Act which refers to the 365 day duty period in the United Kingdom. I did sponsor a bill which embodied certain changes in that clause, but unfortunately that bill was talked out. Many members of this house will agree that the intention behind the bill was to eliminate discrimination by the Canadian government in respect of veterans receiving these allowances. Apparently we are not looking after our own veterans so far as pensions are concerned because of the application of the 365 day limit. At the same time we are recognizing individuals as veterans eligible for allowances who were veterans in allied forces. Any individual who was a member of the armed forces of any allied country such as Russia, Italy, Belgium, France and many others, who lived in Canada for a period of ten years, can qualify under the War Veterans Allowances Act. On the other hand, if one of our own Canadian veterans served in the United Kingdom for a period of only 364 days he cannot qualify. That is discrimination and I hope the minister will give some consideration to this situation.

As a result of reports I have received I understand that an announcement was made on the C.B.C. yesterday morning to the effect that the Sunnybrook hospital in Toronto is under new management. I have heard rumours to the effect that the Ste. Foy hospital in Quebec city is either now under new management or will be under new management very shortly. In fairness to members of parliament, announcements of this kind should be made in parliament rather than through the news media, availing members of parliament an opportunity of informing their constituents of these changes.

The minister made a commitment to the standing committee on veterans affairs that before changes, of the nature to which I have referred, took place there would be consultations with veterans organizations concerned with the changes. Whether that took place or not I am not in a position to know, because the first word I heard in this regard was in the form of a report about that C.B.C. broadcast.

The minister also said in his opening remarks that he would answer any reasonable question asked. I have one question to ask him. Will the minister tell the house what legislation he proposes to bring into this house before the end of this session in respect of veterans affairs?

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend hon. members for the very excellent suggestions and remarks they have made during the course of this debate. I think they have been most helpful. When I have

been chided reasonably I have not complained. Because of the nature of our parliamentary system it is for opposition members to press the government to take action at perhaps a faster rate than usual. As I have said earlier, I have been very gratified in this department by the temper and spirit of hon. members both in this committee and in the standing committee on veterans affairs. I think all hon. members, with little exception, have dealt with my estimates in a non-partisan manner, and I accept all the comments that have been made in that spirit.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to deal with a number of things to which reference has been made, and perhaps I should commence by outlining the main subjects referred to by hon. members yesterday and today. First is the question of the adjustments of rates of war veterans allowances and disability pensions, the adjustment of the Veterans Land Act lending ceiling, and the treatment accorded the Hong Kong veterans. Those are the four subjects to which most hon. members have directed their remarks.

As I outlined to the standing committee, and I repeat now, proposals in respect of war veterans allowances, disability pensions and the Veterans Land Act are in the offing. I am not in the position tonight, as I had hoped, to outline the definite proposals to be made, but I will reiterate what I said. I hope to bring these proposals forward at an early date. I know that will perhaps be a little disappointing to hon. members but I think they will also understand that my responsibilities require me to acquire certain authority to achieve certain things before I can make an announcement of policy to the house. However, I am not going back on the commitment I have made not only to the standing committee but also in response to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition a week or ten days ago.

Mr. Winkler: Myself too.

Mr. Teillet: And there were other hon. members. In the matter of the Hong Kong veterans, here again this question has been taken up as a result of the recommendations of the committee and other representations, and I think we did inform the house some time ago that an inquiry had been undertaken under the direction of Dr. Richardson. This inquiry has now been under way for some little time. I think one should appreciate some of the difficulties involved in gathering the kind of information which will put the treatment service branch in a position to make the kind of recommendation they feel will meet the circumstances of the Hong Kong veterans adequately.

Let it be said first of all that no Hong Kong veteran is ever refused the services of any of the departmental hospitals unless there is an absolutely clearcut situation where the illness or treatment requirement cannot possibly be connected with service or with imprisonment in Hong Kong. Generally speaking, and almost without exception, the doors of our treatment service centres or hospitals are open to our Hong Kong veterans. This is not new, and I certainly claim no personal credit for it because it has been going on for some time. I believe it is also correct that something in excess of 90 per cent of the Hong Kong veterans are now pensioned. An effort has been made in order to meet their special requirements, and I think hon. members will accept the fact that my immediate predecessor in this office and I, do have a very special sympathy for these people because we had a little bit of a taste of something which was considerably worse in their circumstances. We are looking forward to the report of this inquiry in order to make sure that we can adequately take care of the requirements of these veterans.

With regard to the question of the hospitals, on repeated occasions I have informed the house that it is extremely difficult to be able to forecast what will happen in any given situation in any given locality. I have tried to inform people of what has taken place. I also suggested that this was a long term development and that one step would be taken at a time. I was delighted to hear this afternoon the comments of the hon. member for Edmonton West about the arrangements in Edmonton, and I quite agree with him that this should be the kind of thing we should be working toward, the kind of objective that would solve our treatment difficulties and would ensure that we can carry out our responsibility to maintain that level and standard of treatment for our veterans which I am sure not only we, but all Canadians desire them to have.

I hope this arrangement, which appears very satisfactory to us, will work out. It consists in the main of two or three elements. One is that the operation of that hospital is in the hands of a university. They operate the hospital and we say what veterans are entitled to be admitted or discharged. In other words, we control that factor. We have adequate safeguards. In addition, plans are now under way to have adequate, modern facil-

ities for domiciliary care. I think that is of great importance. I think it must also be said, and in this regard I must agree again with the hon. member for Edmonton West, that at the moment Alberta is perhaps in a much better situation to meet these circumstances than is the case elsewhere, but that does not mean we should not do our best to achieve this kind of objective in other areas.

Sunnybrook and Ste. Foy were mentioned by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek. I can say to the hon. member that no arrangements have been concluded with respect to Sunnybrook or Ste. Foy and I can also say to him that wherever that press story originated I have no idea and no knowledge, but I am certain it did not come from this department.

I think it might be useful at this time to reiterate the undertaking I gave to the Royal Canadian Legion, and repeated to other veterans organizations, that I will consult with them. It may be helpful to the committee to know that at the moment an advisory veterans committee is being established by the Royal Canadian Legion and the national council of veterans in order that they may be in immediate contact with any developments that may take place.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, I cannot let pass the remarks made by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) before the six o'clock adjournment.

I understood that he was talking about a veteran, whom he called a martyr and who had a great deal of difficulties, but I could not understand whether the Department of National Defence or the Department of Veterans Affairs was involved in this case.

However, after the very serious charges he has brought forth, I would suggest that the hon. member should submit to me this information in writing and that he should substantiate his charges, with dates, names, etc., because I can assure the house and the hon. member that the Department of Veterans Affairs never allowed such reprehensible actions to be committed, and I am quite sure that the Department of National Defence never permitted that either.

I do not know what department is involved at present, but I would ask the hon. member to give me, as soon as possible, the necessary information so that I can clear up the situation, because this concerns the goodwill of officials, the good understanding and the good operation of veterans hospitals.

[*Text*]

I was very interested this afternoon in some of the suggestions made by the hon. member for Edmonton West with respect to the projections in regard to our disability pensioners, war veterans allowance recipients, veterans requiring treatment, and one other subject I will deal with in a moment. We do have some projections at the moment, and with regard to the figures he used this afternoon the experience of 20 years with first world war veterans involving a rising curve for about 20 years and then going down appears to be repeating itself with world war II veterans.

It seems to us that in the case of disability pensioners we have perhaps reached a plateau, with the tendency now being for the curve to go down, which is in effect a repetition of the previous experience. In the case of war veterans allowance recipients, if we use past experience to project a curve into the future it will probably be about 1985 when the top of the curve is reached when it will likely be at a considerably higher figure than anything projected in earlier years, in terms of numbers.

I think I must agree there, as well, that there are so many uncertain factors in this that the curve could be different from one which is constructed on past experience. There is a question, as the hon. member has suggested, of social security measures, better hospital facilities and perhaps a different attitude on the part of some men who may want to be looked after within their own communities. There are so many imponderables there, it is really difficult to project a curve.

In the case of treatment services, of course to some extent the same considerations apply. Our curve of active treatment patients is of course a downward one, while the chronic and domiciliary care of patients is still on the increase and is likely to continue. By the way, I do regret the delay in the printing of the annual report. I am now informed it was signed and presented to the printers in the normal fashion, in the normal time, but apparently there has been some difficulty which is attributed—this is hearsay—to the fact that this house has not recessed as it formerly did at this time of year. I am told it will be possible perhaps to have a projection for five or ten years for disability pensioners. In so far as such a curve can be established, and there are qualifications to it, perhaps we may be able to present it in the way we do the annual report. Certainly I

hope we may be able to supply this information for the use of hon. members who may desire it.

There is one last point, Mr. Chairman, and I am extremely interested in it. I refer to veterans, not in the legal sense we use that term, as referring to ex-combatants, but to people leaving the services as well as those who are taking part in the peace keeping operations on behalf of Canada. I refer to such circumstances as we now have in Cyprus. I think I must agree that a new concept has to be evolved here. I think we have to treat these people differently, perhaps, than we did the veterans of world wars I and II and the Korean war. The concept of that time, if I can recall the situation correctly, related to the question of rehabilitation of people perhaps in an economy that everyone really thought might present difficulties. There were large numbers of people, and the circumstances of their service certainly were very different, in terms of benefits, from the circumstances of today. I must agree that a new look must be taken at this situation. As the hon. member mentioned this afternoon, he and I have had at least one conversation about this matter. I have had some conversations with other members and with some officials in my own department, with a view to trying to assess this situation and assess what kind of policy may emerge from the situation. We hope that something useful will emerge. I believe we are moving into an era in which we have to think of these people in a different way than we have. We have been thinking about rehabilitation as it related to the masses who went forward under the banners of the army, navy and air force to do their part under extremely difficult circumstances, when there were many casualties, a great deal of suffering and a great requirement for rehabilitation afterwards. I think this is something which should be undertaken, and I must agree with that.

There have been a number of other points raised, Mr. Chairman, but I believe I have largely answered the main comments that have been made here. I do want to assure the members of the standing committee that their recommendations are taken very seriously and given serious consideration. As time develops I think you will find that most of them will have been accepted. As I said this afternoon, I agree that hon. members are entitled to have the recommendations accepted or reasons given for the refusal to accept them. Again I want to express my appreciation for the suggestions and remarks that have been made during the course of this debate. I think they have been most helpful. I am sure the officials of the department and myself will take careful note of the things that have been said this afternoon and yesterday in attempting to meet the wishes of parliament with regard to veterans legislation.

Mr. Lambert: I want to thank the minister for his remarks. There was one point overlooked and that was the specific point related to the potential responsibility for war veterans living in the United Kingdom. This is a difficulty I pointed out, and would the minister consider that?

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Chairman, I know we have had a number of discussions about this matter. There are, as you know, considerable difficulties in the way of this kind of thing. I am sure the hon. member is very familiar with those difficulties.

I have discussed the question of the benefit of doubt with a number of officers of the various veterans organizations. While I must accept the fact they are unanimous on one point, that something has to be done about it, the manner of doing it is not clear. I, frankly, voice a fear about changing that section without being absolutely certain what the result will be. At the same time I will say that I have checked quite a number of cases and I appreciate what hon. members have said so far. I believe those I have checked indicate that the benefit of doubt was given to the veteran. I know there are cases where that is not admitted. However, I feel that tinkering with that section, and perhaps making it more difficult—

Mr. McIntosh: It could not be.

Mr. Teillet: —than it is, would be extremely dangerous. I am still looking at it. I confess readily I have not reached a conclusion on it because I would not want to do anything here that would handicap the veteran in later years. I think hon. members will agree that everyone in the department, perhaps largely because they are still all veterans—has one objective in mind and that is to give the veteran every possible benefit of the law and the regulations passed by parliament. I think that is the intent. I suggest that perhaps where it has not been actually applied it has been the result of a misunderstanding of some kind. I agree with hon. gentlemen that there have been

cases that are difficult to understand. On the other hand I have investigated a large number of them and I would want to be very sure that if anything is done to that section we are going to improve the situation rather than make it more difficult.

I have not reached a conclusion on that and I would not like to leave members with the impression that we are going to amend it immediately. Perhaps I am not so astute as I might be in this, but though recognizing a desire to change the situation, the manner of doing so is by no means clear.

There is a problem in the matter of 365 days residence and this also is being examined. Hon. members will recall that not too long ago we did, in a relatively modest manner, assist Canadian veterans in receipt of assistance in the United Kingdom in order to bring their allowances a little closer to the level they would be if they were living in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, in order that it might be officially recorded in *Hansard*, I should like to complete the statement made this afternoon by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier). He is not in the house this evening. This afternoon he drew to the minister's attention a rather special case. The minister asked him for the name of the serviceman concerned as well as the service to which he belonged; he also implied that there was a possibility of exaggeration, and that it was a case of trying to make a martyr of the fellow.

It is true that the hon. member for Roberval did not mention any name this afternoon. However, may I say that the case did occur 20 years ago. A soldier was wounded in battle in Germany; he came back to Canada where he underwent an operation in a military hospital. There he was called a cry-baby, he always howled, and when his plaster cast was removed, it was discovered that his wound had become infected and that decomposition had set in to such an extent that his body was nothing but rotten flesh. This afternoon the hon. member for Roberval did not report everything which happened then, because he was too greatly affected by this case, and it was probably the first time he ever told about it.

I can now say to the minister that the serviceman who suffered this agony was the brother of the member for Roberval. He was present when this happened, and he has personal knowledge of the whole matter.

That is why the hon. member for Roberval did not want to mention any name. I am saying this for the benefit of the minister and to keep the record straight. The minister himself is not to blame because he was not then a minister. However, the hon. member for Roberval wanted to mention that case so that the responsible authorities should be more careful when dealing with specific cases.

Certain patients should not be considered as cry-babies when, upon removal of their casts, it is found that gangrene has set in.

I think it was a distressing and pitiful case. The hon. member for Roberval did not want to mention any name because the person in question was one of his brothers and because at that time the hon. member for Roberval was, in a sense, disgusted with the manner in which this wounded man had been treated.

I am making this statement in the absence of the hon. member for Roberval so that it may be printed in *Hansard* at the same time as the answer given by the minister.

[*Text*]

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I regret that owing to my having to attend two committees this afternoon and evening I was for some time absent during discussion of the minister's estimates. I do not intend to prolong the debate unnecessarily but I understand some hon. members, including the hon. member for Edmonton West, made representations with respect to the contents of the brief submitted by Canadian veterans living in the United Kingdom, with respect to the War Veterans Allowance Act and the necessity under its provisions for those veterans to return to Canada in order to qualify for war veterans allowances.

I fully appreciate the difficulties involved in remedying the situation, but I simply rise to ask the minister, when he is considering it that he consider it in the light of the fact that it does provide an opportunity for this parliament to recognize, almost in a symbolic way, the value of residence within the commonwealth.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, I was particularly interested in the minister's remarks with regard to section 70 of the Canada Pension Act, which is the benefit of doubt section. In the recommendations of the veterans affairs committee there was a paragraph dealing with this benefit of doubt section which said:

We suggest that the word "doubt" in the phrase "benefit of doubt" be interpreted to mean "a reasonable doubt" as might be expected to arise in the mind of a reasonable man in the street.

I come back to the classic example that we are always confronted with in decisions of the commission. I refer to the case that was brought up before the committee by one of the officials, who was asked how narrow are these decisions. He referred to a case where a serviceman was ordered by his commanding officer to go from the camp into a village and post a letter. The serviceman did so, but unfortunately coming out of the post office he stepped off the curb, was hit by a vehicle and killed. In the reasons which they gave for their ruling the commission said that if the man had been hit going into the post office before he delivered the letter he would have been pensionable, but as he had delivered the letter and was hit coming out, he was not pensionable.

I do not know how much narrower a decision could be, because a trained serviceman knows that if he is given an order he must go to the point he is directed to, and return, and he has not completed the order until he returns to camp. I could mention another classical case with which I am dealing at present, and in which the decision is just as narrow. However, as it is coming before another board I shall refrain from going into the details.

The representations which the minister has received with regard to section 70 must mean something to him. Where the minister gets his ideas I do not know; it must be from his officials. As parliamentarians it is our duty to change this; and it is the duty of the officials to administer, not make, policy. I am sorry the minister made that statement.

Mr. Teillet: In fairness, Mr. Chairman, I must say I am sorry I left the impression with the hon. gentleman that my mind is closed to this. It is not by any means. I fully admit the necessity of doing something in this regard and I accept that necessity. The only question I posed was about the method. There is no question in my mind that there is a need to make an adjustment of some sort, whether administrative or legislative. The method of making it is the one thing which is still open and I confess to the committee that I have reached no conclusions as yet.

I am very conscious of the recommendation made by the committee, and also of numerous other recommendations and of consultations and meetings with the officials of various veterans organizations.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

Mr. McIntosh: In reply may I just say that in a couple of cases I had which came under section 70 the applicants have since died. I hope the minister does not leave it too long, until all the applicants are dead, before he makes up his mind.

Item agreed to.

15. Other benefits including treatment and related allowances, burials and memorials, the training of certain pensioners under regulations approved by the governor in council and repayments under subsection (3) of section 12 of the Veterans Rehabilitation Act in such amounts as the Minister of Veterans Affairs determines, not exceeding the whole of amounts equivalent to the compensating adjustments or payments made under that act, where the persons who made the compensating adjustments or payments received no benefits under the Veterans Land Act, or where, having had financial assistance under the Veterans Land Act, are deemed by the minister on termination of their Veterans Land Act contracts or agreements to have derived thereunder either no benefits or benefits that are less than the amounts of the compensating adjustments or payments, $5,340,100.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I refrained from rising at the conclusion of the minister's comments. All I will say is that I was unimpressed. I had reserved some remarks with regard to vote No. 15. The details of this vote are shown on page 503 of the blue book and at the bottom of the page there are some apparently minor items which seldom receive any attention. They deal with such things as books of remembrance, battlefields memorials, and over the page you find maintenance of departmental cemeteries and plots, and commonwealth war graves commission. I think it is the function of the Department of Veterans Affairs to acquaint the people of Canada with the work of the commonwealth war graves commission and some of the other things I have mentioned, so that the people will realize the sacrifice that was involved in the various wars.

The extent of the work of the commonwealth war graves commission is not generally known. I asked the officials of the department, when they published the report of 1961 and the one in the following year, to pay some attention to that matter and list the number of areas in which our Canadian dead of both world wars are buried. It is a very large figure; 137 cemeteries scattered around the world, but chiefly in northwest Europe. There are three outstanding memorials of world war I and three of world war II in countries overseas, where the names of the missing have been engraved. Canada's prestige in countries that were liberated in world wars I and II stands very high, and the memorials are there for the people of those coun-

tries to see, in France, Belgium and Holland in particular. The people of those countries participate in ceremonies each year at some of the cemeteries in which Canadians are buried and at the memorials where the names of the missing are engraved.

Unfortunately the Canadian people seldom, unless they travel overseas, see these memorials or the cemeteries. It is a very depressing visit to motor through that strip of Belgium and Holland where so many people died and were buried in both world wars, and I think it should not be carried too far. On the other hand, I think it is important that the war graves commission should continue its work; it is important that these memorials should be maintained and it is important that some of these battlefields should be kept in a state whereby they are available for visiting Canadians. The Department of Veterans Affairs, with the co-operation of the national film board, had produced a film called "The Fields of Sacrifice" in order to bring to the Canadian people pictures of these memorials, some of the cemeteries and the areas in which Canadians fought and died, so their relatives who cannot travel overseas will at least have some idea of where their loved ones served. I hoped the minister would say something about that film. It is not a possession of the Department of Veterans Affairs but the idea originated with that department. I would like to know—and the minister can answer later—how many of those films have been made available and have been taken up by Legion branches and educational institutions across this country. It is now October 22. The film was designed to prepare the way for Remembrance day, which should be a day of dedication and memory for Canadian citizens. I would like to know how useful this film has been. Last year there were displays in some of the theatres in Ottawa and some of the major cities across the country. In the 16 millimetre version this film was to be made available in very large numbers. I would like to know what the facts are in this regard.

I would also like to know what the department is doing with regard to a project which was started when I had some responsibility for the Department of Veterans Affairs. This was a project with regard to the Vimy Ridge battlefield in France, an area of 250 acres given by France to Canada; it is Canadian soil. I suggest that plans be made to put that battlefield area in somewhat better condition, and that this should be done after the fashion of the field of Gettysburg in the United States, which has been restored to the appearance it had 100 years ago and which is visited by about 1½ million tourists every year. In 1967 we will have the anniversary of the battle of Vimy Ridge; that year is the year in which we will be celebrating confederation. I took some tentative steps toward having work done at Vimy Ridge, looking forward to 1967. I hope the minister can give us a report on that project.

The last I heard about it, we had photographs taken over there by the Canadian army, with the co-operation of the air force, a model was constructed here in Ottawa and various plans were undertaken to improve the roads there. I suggested that the commonwealth war graves commission be asked to improve the general area, which has been covered with a forest of trees and does not resemble the area as it was 50 years ago. I suggested that a great many of those trees should be cut down and that steps should be taken to beautify more than has been done up to the present, although a great deal has been done, the general area around the Vimy memorial itself, the approaches to it, and so on. I suggested that the seven craters, which are the only surviving craters of the first world war as far as I know, should all be marked, because they had names at the time of the battle of Vimy Ridge.

The front line trench system of years ago was cemented in and is a great attraction to tourists. I suggested that one of the communications trenches be restored as a reminder of the conditions under which people fought in that war. I would like to know what, if anything, has been done in this regard. At the battle area of Beaumont-Hamel a very excellent undertaking was completed, or virtually completed, one or two years ago. There at Beaumont-Hamel you can see the area over which the Royal Newfoundland regiment advanced from their front line trenches, the gaps in the wire through which they attempted to move and where they were mown down. I think that about 90 per cent of the regiment were either killed or wounded. These places are far away. Nevertheless 100,000 Canadians visit Europe each year and if they were aware of these memorials I think being tourists and being proud to be Canadians, they would visit them. There is Beaumont-Hamel, Vimy Ridge, the Menin gate, the monument at Saint-Julien recalling the first gas attack in the history of the world where the Canadians gained great distinction; these places have a special significance for Canada

and should be more thoroughly known. Then of course there are memorials and cemeteries in other parts of the world. I should like the minister to tell us something about this matter.

I should like to take another minute or two to go to another subject. There is no government department keenly interested in a military museum. We have, of course, a military museum in Ottawa which I described years ago as the smallest museum in the world, and plans are under way to erect other buildings which will give Canadians some idea of their past history. I should like to know from the minister whether representatives of the Department of Veterans Affairs are sitting in with the planners of the other museums which are going to be constructed in Ottawa over the years, and are they going to see that the military history of Canada is adequately presented? Somebody has to take an interest in this. It cannot be left to the Department of National Defence, although their historical section will give co-operation. I think the Department of Veterans Affairs is the one to take the lead in influencing those who will have some responsibility for the portraying of Canada's military history. We have a military history going back for over 300 years. It is a fascinating history. But it has been played down to a great extent in Canada and I think it should be emphasized. Other countries take note of their military history; they have military museums as well as the preservation of battlefield areas. I hope the minister can tell us something about this also.

One other project I had hoped to advance which I think would be a good confederation celebration project is the publication of the military history of Canada from the earliest times to the present. I do not know whether the two years remaining are sufficient for this to be done, but here again the Department of Veterans Affairs, in addition to its duties about which we have been talking tonight, could play a leading part on behalf of Canadian veterans and their relatives. It is a great story. It is the story of Canada's military history, and I hazard the guess that if someone would undertake to write the story of the land settlement of Canada it would be a story of settlement of this country very largely by veterans. In the Atlantic provinces, the province of Quebec, the province of Ontario and particularly British Columbia the opening up of the country and the settlement of the land was done I think very largely by veterans. There is a story which should be told and which should be incorporated in our history books. Out in the prairie provinces once again you will find that a great deal of the opening up of that territory was done by veterans. Land grants were made. People on discharge made their contribution in days of peace toward opening up this country.

I have drawn the committee's attention to these matters, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to prolong the discussion but I should like to have a comment from the minister if he has information on these subjects.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, coming from a province that gave an impressive number of war heroes, I cannot but seize the opportunity of the discussion on the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs to make a few remarks.

First I want to recall that I had opportunity, in 1959, to go to Europe with the parliamentary secretary of the minister (Mr. Carter) to participate in a NATO conference. At that time, accompanied by the Canadian delegation, we visited some cemeteries where the remains of our compatriots are interred.

Accompanied by the parliamentary secretary of the minister, I bowed before the tomb of those who gave their lives so that we, on this side of the ocean, might enjoy the peace and freedom which exist on the North American continent.

The hon. member for Burin-Burgeo and myself noted that perhaps we do not have for those who gave their lives in order to protect our freedom, all the respect due to veterans.

And even if it is somewhat against the rules, Mr. Chairman, I take the opportunity to ask the minister (Mr. Teillet) to study carefully and with kindness the problems which veterans and their representatives submit to him.

Since my election as a member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot, I had the opportunity to submit to the proper authorities the views and recommendations of veterans who felt their case had not been properly considered when it was first referred to the authorities.

I remember in particular one of my countrymen who had been refused admittance to the medical unit of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this matter has been fully discussed at the beginning. Could we not limit ourselves to the item under discussion?

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, if the minister is unwilling to listen to the complaints of former servicemen from St. Hyacinthe-Bagot, I shall resume my seat, but I feel duty bound to act as spokesman in the House of Commons for those who fought for our freedom.

However, if the hon. minister is unwilling to entertain this complaint, I shall resume my seat because at the beginning of my remarks I said that I certainly believed that I was out of order, but due to the fact that previous duties prevented me from being present when item No. 1 was called, I hoped that the hon. minister would be kind enough to listen to the claims I wished to put forward on behalf of the veterans in my riding.

Once more, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. minister is unwilling to listen to what the veterans—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Ricard: —from St. Hyacinthe-Bagot wish to express, then I will resume my seat.

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Chairman, I call upon you to bring the hon. member back to order.

I do not intend to gag him any more than any other member, but this matter was discussed extensively yesterday afternoon, this afternoon and tonight. On the other hand, he may submit his complaints later, when another item is examined.

It is altogether unfair to say that I am unwilling to entertain the complaints from veterans of his riding.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I have no alternative but to accept the decision of the hon. minister to the effect that he does not wish to hear what—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Teillet: Order, please.

Mr. Ricard: —the veterans wish to say.

[*Text*]

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that we would be able to hear the remarks of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot. I am sure we all understand that he is serving as a member on a committee which is sitting three times a day, and on reflection it would have been easier to allow him to complete his remarks. It is rather sharp on the part of hon. members to call him to order, because I felt the minister was quite prepared to allow him to continue. If other members were working as assiduously as that hon. gentleman they would perhaps be a little more careful in calling him to order.

I should like to express my appreciation to the minister for the pleasure of accompanying him during the past summer to Normandy, Belgium and Holland, to observe the fine work done by the commonwealth graves commission. I was much impressed by what has been done by our representatives there during the past year in honour of Canadians who died during the wars.

For the benefit of hon. members who have not seen these memorials at Vimy, Ypres and Saint-Julien, I urge them to make a pilgrimage to these areas because they are so soul stirring, and we can be very proud of them. These memorials were erected in memory of the sacrifices of a generation that preceded me. I hope that each successive generation will not find it necessary to make a pilgrimage to visit the graves of soldiers of each preceding generation.

Perhaps the minister will be able to outline specifically some of the proposals he has in mind in regard to the Vimy memorial. In this connection I should like to pay tribute to a man who has devoted a lifetime to this Canadian memorial. This individual is now retired, and I am sure that many members will have seen his name in an article which appeared in a recent *Week End* magazine. Usually I do not mention individuals by name in this chamber, but I think I should depart from that practice and refer specifically to Mr. Paul Piroson, whose devotion to the development of the Vimy memorial is epic. Canadians owe this man a great debt of gratitude. I personally was very pleased to be his guest for a short period of time this summer.

Again I should like to echo the remarks of my colleague from Winnipeg South Centre about the film "Fields of Sacrifice". I hope that private distribution of this film is now possible, following the restrictions placed on its distribution by commercial outlets. This film is an extremely commendable production by the national film board and officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs. I congratulate them for their efforts.

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that many hon. members could wax eloquently about the memorials at Vimy, at Saint-Julien as well as others, and I certainly want to add my tribute to those people who have made them possible.

If I have not done so before in this chamber, and I may say I have done so in public, I should like to compliment my predecessors in office for the tremendous job in respect of the production of the film "Fields of Sacrifice". I should also like to commend the officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the national film board for this really outstanding film which won a prize at the Toronto festival last summer as a documentary. The film has been extremely well prepared and is a tremendous production. I am sure it is the kind of thing that the veterans in Canada want to see created to remind the people of this country of the sacrifices made by those who lost their lives during the wars.

Since the beginning of June a 16 millimetre film has been available for distribution. Seventy prints are in existence for distribution by the national film board throughout Canada. I have been given to understand that its distribution throughout Canada is extensive, and the comment of members of various branches of the Royal Canadian Legion who have seen the film have been favourable. So it is receiving very wide distribution. I think I should also add that a little while ago Colonel Wood began the task of preparation for publication of a book on the memorials and cemeteries in Europe, and the battles surrounding these memorials. I also thank my hon. friend for the very kind comments about the trip to Europe. Perhaps I too should express my gratitude and thanks for the very kind and effective co-operation I received from him in representing Canada. I think he will also agree with me that this might be a good occasion to pay tribute to General Simonds who did a very effective job of representing Canada on some of these occasions and also to Senator Power who, as you know, is a veteran who took part in the battle of Ypres. I should like to have the time to dwell on this visit.

Mention was made of the memorial at Saint Julien. I do not think there is a sculpture anywhere in the world that is as impressive. I think all will agree that the commonwealth war graves commission is doing the kind of job that makes us very proud when we visit the cemeteries in Europe. I think this might be a good occasion to pay tribute to the Royal Canadian Legion on the organization of their maple leaf tour this summer which gave us the opportunity to take part in a pilgrimage to the battlefields and last resting places of our comrades. If I were to attempt to develop any one of these topics I could say so much that I think it is better for me not to attempt to go beyond what I have said and try to make my remarks general.

Mention was made of the Vimy memorial. This is probably one of the greatest memorials in Europe. There is some damage to the memorial and research is being done on how to correct it. It is suspected at the moment that the damage has been caused by chemicals drifting through the air toward the monument. It is a most impressive sight and I want to add my words of tribute to Mr. Paul Piroson who has done such a magnificent job and who will be retiring shortly. There is a great deal of work to be done at Vimy. As was mentioned, a plan was developed a little while ago which involves arranging for the relocation of a road, some fencing and I think some general landscaping. In that regard I think we will need an expert to give advice on how that should be done. There is so much that needs to be done there.

Again, one could spend a great deal of time in talking about the memorial and the communication trenches. Some of these have been completed within the last two or three years but the galleries, the underground areas, are not fully reconstructed. The damage of the war of 1939-45 has not been completely corrected and a lot of work needs to be done. There is a story to be told about Vimy and anyone with any degree of eloquence could spend hours talking about the underground passages. We know so little about these things in Canada and I heartily agree we must make every effort to make sure that the Canadian people know what is there. We must organize things in such a way that Vimy will serve as a place of honour, a show window for Canada. I could not agree more and I can only say that I pledge myself to undertake to the best of my ability, with the full co-operation of the department, I am sure, to continue this work to make of Vimy that which we all hope it will be. Whether we can complete the whole project by 1967 is a little difficult to say. I do not know whether such a target can be reached but at least the work certainly will go forward.

Item agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: This completes the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Chairman, may I again express my very heartfelt thanks for the co-operation, the suggestions, commendations

and criticisms I have received yesterday and today. I accept them in the spirit in which they were offered and I am sure that if we go forward in that same spirit the veterans of Canada will receive their justly due. I wish to express my gratitude to the committee.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The committee will now discuss the estimates of the Department of Defence Production and subsidiary agencies. Vote No. 20.

Mr. Churchill: What page is that?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of members of the committee may I say we will be looking at page 86 of the estimates, section 8, emergency measures organization. Hon. members will recall that consideration and approval were given to sections A and C of the Department of Defence Production but section B, emergency measures organization, was allowed to stand.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE PRODUCTION

Emergency measures organization—
20. Administration and operation, $2,600,000.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, as minister responsible for the emergency measures organization I would recall to hon. members that evidence was given to the special parliamentary committee on defence both by myself and the staff of the emergency measures organization on July 18 and again on July 23 at which times the program of the emergency measures organization was outlined and an indication was given of the intentions with regard to emergency measures and also as to the priorities which would be observed in the implementation of this program.

The objectives of the civil emergency planning program remain the same as disclosed to the committee, namely to make preparations to help ensure maximum survival of the Canadian population and resources in a nuclear or conventional war, and to assist the provincial governments and through them the municipalities in coping not only with a war emergency but also with peacetime disasters whenever requested to do so and when the damage is beyond the capabilities of these local governments. We would like to encourage local civil defence organizations to publicize their preparedness and availability for any type of disaster. We hope that nuclear war will never occur, but there is no guarantee that the present international climate will not degenerate into cold war or actual conflict. Also we know that peacetime disasters do occur periodically and in either context civil emergency planning is a good insurance policy. We believe that as long as military defence is required so too will civil defence be required.

Civil defence planning is still being actively pursued in the United Kingdom and the United States and other NATO countries, and there is continued close consultation between the NATO countries, including Canada, on this matter.

I believe that adequate progress is being made in civil emergency planning in Canada. Vote 20 covers the administrative costs of the emergency measures organization, including the civil defence college at Arnprior. The total staff remains modest in size, numbering approximately 90, including the staff of the 10 regional offices, and 96 at the civil defence college. Vote 25 includes the program for the provision of radiac instruments to provinces on a cost sharing basis, the provinces reimbursing 25 per cent of the cost. These instruments would be used for the detection and measuring of radioactive fallout. Again good progress has been made, with six provinces having agreed to participate in the new program.

Vote 30, which provides for financial assistance programs to the provinces and from them to the municipalities, indicates a slight increase over last year. I believe that the provinces are progressing satisfactorily in this field. I may say we are pleased to note that there is a greater tendency in the provinces to group municipalities into larger county organizations, which the federal emergency organization encourages as it provides for a more efficient and economic organization.

To ensure the continued adequacy and effectiveness of civil defence preparations, the emergency measures organization and national defence have reviewed the effective decision to increase the emphasis on purely military training in relation to the militia. It will be recalled that the regular army will have as its second role responsibility for preparing for civil defence operation. As stated in the terms of reference of the Suttie committee, and I quote:

> It must be recognized that in the event of an all-out nuclear war, all military forces would be employed on survival operations. Therefore, the militia, with all available regulars, would be required to provide a framework for the conduct of survival operations, using a large number of civilians.

The terms of reference also state that the militia will assist in fulfilling the army's national survival responsibilities. On the basis of the latest assumptions and require-

ments, national defence will continue to maintain or improve:

(i) the warning system against possible enemy attacks;

(ii) the system for the location of nuclear detonations in likely target areas and the forecasting and determining of fallout and warning to the public;

(iii) its plans for re-entry operations into damaged areas or areas of serious fallout;

(iv) the emergency government communications network, which is part of the peacetime Canadian army signal system. A survey will be carried out in the near future, under the direction of the emergency measures organization, to prepare plans for the provision of regional emergency government headquarters in the four provinces where these are not already available, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland. The completion of these headquarters will then permit the installation of the communications equipment, most of which has already been acquired.

The Canadian army, through its command and area headquarters, will maintain emergency readiness plans up to date, so that all units of the regular army and militia would be capable of carrying out survival operations on short notice. It is intended to include the necessary funds to continue the implementation of such a program in the national defence five year budgetary estimates.

The fourth report of the special committee on defence, I am pleased to see, contains chapter 3 which has been devoted entirely to civil emergency planning. We have noted the recommendations of the committee. I should like to review briefly these recommendations. I would agree generally with the three aims stated for the emergency measures organization by the committee in paragraph 30, that is, to help insure continuity of civilian government, the identification and allocation of resources after an attack, and that the civilian population be informed and able to make use of any existing protective facilities.

I concur with the statement in paragraph 31 to the effect that a fundamental task is to ensure the availability of an effective communications system across the country in the event of an emergency. To ensure such communications in protected facilities in all provinces, we are considering the completion of the regional headquarters network in the remaining four provinces of New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland. Also discussions are being continued with all communications companies to ensure maximum utilization of all networks in an emergency.

Although, as stated in paragraph 32 of the report, it would be desirable to have a civil defence organization in all municipalities, I am not satisfied that we should consider it a priority. The important aspect at this time is to provide a capability in and around larger populated areas, making maximum use of the funds available through the financial assistance program. Such larger municipalities could provide assistance to smaller ones as required, whether in peacetime or wartime disasters. Also, it is our belief that planning is more effective and economical if smaller municipalities are grouped into county organizations.

As stated in paragraph 33 of the report, and I quote:

> It is important that the responsibilities and the authorities at each level of government be defined under these varying conditions.

With regard to peacetime disasters, and in respect of this definition of responsibility, a very careful study was initiated some time ago and we are now consulting informally with the provinces and comparing notes with the United States. Specific recommendations can be expected to emerge from these discussions.

With regard to wartime responsibilities, the emergency measures organization has had under discussion with all departments and all provinces for some time, a specific outline of division of responsibilities. Work in this direction will continue.

With reference to the further observation in the report of the committee that there has not been a meeting of the federal-provincial conference on emergency measures since December, 1962, I must say this statement is correct. Now that the government has reviewed its policy and prepared a program on a basis of priorities, it is our belief that the time is opportune to hold a federal-provincial conference. I am proposing that such a conference be held in mid February of 1965. It is my belief that with adequate preparation made prior to the conference, it should be the best and most successful yet held.

It was observed also that there has been no national exercise for a number of years. It is true that the last national exercise was held in November, 1961. Preparations were made for a TOCSIN exercise in 1963, but it was not actually held. However, all studies made for the exercise, preparations and reporting, were carried through as if there had

been an exercise. A thorough review was made of the results obtained. We are satisfied that the main aims of the exercise were met, that is, a compilation of the resources remaining at 48 hours after an attack, a review of war books and a review of emergency legislation and other similar objectives. Furthermore, studies by the provinces or by the federal emergency measures organization, in close collaboration with the provinces, are carried on on a continuing basis. As a matter of fact, we believe that the time has come to establish a cycle of exercises, starting at the municipal level, through to regional or provincial and finally the central level. This allows for a much better identification and analysis of problems at each level, especially those requiring decision at the national level.

With respect to the statement in the report that this lack of continuing liaison and exercise with the provinces has seriously impaired the validity of the planning, I regret to say that I cannot entirely agree. There has been during the period a close and continuing collaboration with the provinces although there has, as I mentioned earlier, been no formal federal-provincial conference. There has, however, been no lack of continuing discussion, dialogue and liaison. This indeed has been sufficiently successful to warrant the holding of the proposed federal-provincial conference next February.

Reference was made to the fact that the home shelter program has not been successful. Members of the committee will recall that this was a view put forward by the emergency measures organization itself. However, although the invitation to construct home shelters at individual expense has not been taken up by the general public, we do not believe that the government should discontinue to make available C.M.H.C. loans to those individuals who may wish to build a home shelter for their families. These, I would remind the committee, are only loans.

No effort will be made in the future to stimulate such a program, but I believe we should make literature available to those who request it. This can be done at very little cost to the government. Already the E.M.O. has made available, in its literature, the necessary information to provide home protection quickly with materials at hand. A pamphlet called "Simpler Shelter" is ready for distribution if the situation so warrants and the public interest demands. I believe it would be wise to continue a modest research program in this field.

However, the answer to the fallout problem appears to be the provision of public fallout shelters in existing buildings. Although we cannot yet evaluate the costs of modifications to buildings, on the basis of a survey completed in Alberta we can estimate that it would cost approximately 5 cents per head of the population to carry out a national fallout shelter survey across Canada, for a total of approximately $800,000.

All federal buildings have already been surveyed and over one million spaces have been identified. We are hopeful that a national survey of all large buildings will identify enough spaces to provide protection to a good percentage of the population, and this at a reasonable cost. However, before initiating such a national survey the conclusions of the Alberta survey will be very carefuly considered.

As recommended in paragraph 37, expenditures in civil emergency planning should be limited generally to priorities outlined to the special committee on defence for communications, warning system, central planning function, field co-ordinating agencies, and research on fallout and blast protection and, as stated above, fallout protection for the public if this is found to be relatively inexpensive. I can, therefore, state with confidence that the E.M.O. is in general agreement with the special committee on defence.

The staff of the organization and I were pleased to appear before the committee and would like to express our appreciation to its members for the time they devoted to this difficult but important program. I would recommend to hon. members that the estimates for E.M.O. be approved so that civil emergency planning may be adequately carried out in Canada.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, there is very little time remaining this evening but I will try to condense my remarks into the period between now and ten o'clock. It seems the minister concentrated his remarks on the observations of the special committee on defence which devoted a considerable amount of time and a rather difficult chapter of its report to the difficult—because it is rather nebulous —proposition of civil defence. I say nebulous because there seems to be a lack of public consciousness of the vital necessity for civil defence.

This reminds me that during wartime there was never anything but an actual air raid, which brought air raid drill to function efficiently among units in the field, where

one went through the experience, and all the practice you had tried to instil into yourself and your men came to the fore and they saw the value of it. The general public have a tendency to sweep the requirements of civil defence under the rug.

Several years ago when national programs of civil emergency planning were launched one of the pamphlets issued was "Eleven Steps to Survival." At that time there was a great consciousness of the necessity for civil defence, and I believe there is much to be said in favour of reviving national exercises.

I participated as a regional commissioner in both the national exercises that were held. At the beginning we were groping in the dark, with the exception of certain people involved, but by the time the second exercise was held most of the people involved had some idea what they were doing, and facilities were being prepared for them. I thought TOCSIN II accomplished a great deal, but it was held back in 1961, and a lot of the personnel involved have changed since. I would like an indication that another TOCSIN exercise will be held.

Some of the siren systems installed in certain communities seem to have been left dormant. I know other communities test their sirens every week or two at a specified time, which overcomes the nonsensical situation that occurred in Ottawa a little while ago. In fact I thought the minister should have said something to clear up that comic opera situation, when no one was home and no one could find anyone to determine why the sirens were sounding.

Mr. Grégoire: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Lambert: I would also like the minister to tell us how many persons are brought down to Arnprior for training, because Arnprior is a good college. The municipal officials brought there have always expressed their satisfaction.

Mr. Grégoire: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Lambert: It is too bad the hon. member for Lapointe can't be put through Arnprior; he might learn a few manners. When the minister continues his remarks at some indeterminate date in the future I hope he will tell us more about the training at Arnprior.

The Chairman: Shall the vote carry?

Mr. Lambert: No. I am calling it ten o'clock.

Item stands.

Resolutions adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

[Mr. Lambert.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: May I inquire with regard to the business tomorrow and the early part of next week?

Mr. MacNaught: The first item of business tomorrow will be consideration of interim supply. It is the intention of the government to ask for two months supply. Then we will take up the estimates relating to the Department of Industry, and the balance of the estimates of trade and commerce, citizenship and immigration and public works.

Mr. Churchill: What about Monday?

Mr. MacNaught: I cannot give any outline at this time for Monday.

Mr. Churchill: The government has rather sprung interim supply on us. It is too bad we could not have more notice and it is regrettable we cannot hear something about Monday and Tuesday.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

AGRICULTURE—QUEBEC—FEDERAL PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RAINMAKING OPERATIONS

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I directed a question to the right hon. Prime Minister in order to find out if licences had been issued to the Weather Engineering Corporation of Canada, in Montreal for rainmaking over a given area.

I hope that tonight the Prime Minister or his representative will be in a position to tell us if individuals can take it upon themselves to throw the whole economy of an area out of gear in order to favour one sector, while we do not know on what authority they are acting and for whom.

I want this information, Mr. Speaker, because I have received numerous complaints from farmers in my constituency and in Témiscamingue and also in the light of an investigation carried out by a citizen of Rouyn, echoed in the local press, and after reading in the newspaper *La Terre de Chez Nous* that the Saguenay region was also being affected and that the Catholic farmers' union of that area was threatening to take legal action to protect farmers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had a year of very bad weather in northwestern Quebec

where it rained a total of 112 days, 69 of them consecutively.

Everybody knows that agriculture is in the doldrums in eastern Canada but, in that region where normal weather conditions are not at their best, I think we should let Providence look after rainfall.

Mr. Speaker, according to some reports more than 130 of those "rainmaking machines" have been distributed across northwestern Quebec with the result that farmers in that area have been in an extremely difficult situation since the end of July. In fact, several of them will have to forsake the land unless they receive some compensation for the losses incurred as a result of rains this year.

Last year part of my region was devastated by a hurricane, a natural phenomenon; this year it was rainmaking. This doubtless, might help the forest industry by eliminating the threat of forest fires, and be of benefit to some other companies, but it is very harmful for the farmer, ever the victim.

Last year I asked for help. Nothing was granted, for Quebec did not deem it advisable to request assistance from Ottawa.

Yesterday I asked if the government would take the necessary steps to help the farmers whose crops were a failure this year, and whose lowlands, especially, have been damaged for many years to come. They did not even bother to reply.

It is easy to see that the present federal government is not the least bit interested in the welfare of eastern farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I should like the secretary to the Prime Minister to tell us, this evening, if the Weather Engineering Corporation of Canada in Montreal, operates under a federal government permit. If not, I should like the government to have an inquiry made to determine who pays that corporation and on whose behalf it is carrying out this work.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the areas affected are entitled to know what is happening.

[*Text*]

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for bringing this important matter to the attention of the house. I regret my inability to reply in his native tongue, but I am sure he will understand. There are two points I wish to make in connection with the remarks of the hon. member. One was with regard to licensing. I think if anyone is licensed to operate these machines which are alleged to be operating in that particular area this would be a matter for provincial jurisdiction.

Second, with regard to the question of relief for farmers who have been flooded or affected by excessive rains, this again is a provincial matter and would have to be brought by the provincial authorities to the federal government, who I am sure would be glad to assist if there is need in excess of the ability of the province to meet that need. As regards the matter of the corporation the hon. member has mentioned, I am unable to provide him with any authentic information as to whether or not this does or does not exist. I am in possession of the copy of *Le Devoir* from which he quoted and I am familiar with the article. I note from the article that there is no confirmation that these machines are in the area. I can only assure the hon. member that this matter will receive immediate attention and that an inquiry will be made.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.09 p.m.

[The following items were passed in committee of supply this day]:

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

1. Departmental administration, $6,491,400.

1a. Departmental administration, $42,000.

Welfare services, allowances and other benefits—

5. Administration, including the expenses of the war veterans allowance board, and grants as detailed in the estimates, $4,097,200.

10. War veterans allowances, civilian war allowances and assistance in accordance with the provisions of the assistance fund (war veterans allowances) regulations, $88,975,000.

15. Other benefits including treatment and related allowances, burials and memorials, the training of certain pensioners under regulations approved by the governor in council and repayments under subsection (3) of section 12 of the Veterans' Rehabilitation Act in such amounts as the Minister of Veterans Affairs determines, not exceeding the whole of amounts equivalent to the compensating adjustments or payments made under that act, where the persons who made the compensating adjustment or payments received no benefits under the Veterans' Land Act, or where, having had financial assistance under the Veterans' Land Act, are deemed by the minister on termination of their Veterans' Land Act contracts or agreements to have derived thereunder either no benefits or benefits that are less than the amounts of the compensating adjustments or payments, $5,340,100.

15a. Other benefits including treatment and related allowances, burials and memorials, the training of certain pensioners under regulations approved by the governor in council and repayments under subsection (3) of section 12 of the Veterans' Rehabilitation Act, $45,000.

Pensions—

20. Administration, $2,634,300.

25. Pensions for disability and death, including pensions granted under the authority of the civilian governement employees (war) compensation order, P.C. 45/8848 of November 22, 144, which shall be subject to the Pension Act; Newfoundland special awards, and gallantry awards (world war II and special force), $170,826,000.

Treatment services—

30. Operation and maintenance including authority notwithstanding the Financial Administration Act, to spend revenue received during the year for hospital, prosthetic and related services, $44,223,900.

35. Hospital construction, improvements, equipment and acquisition of land, $3,294,000.

Soldier settlement and Veterans' Land Act—

40. Administration of Veterans' Land Act: Soldier settlement and British family settlement; upkeep of property, Veterans' Land Act, including engineering and other investigational planning expenses that do not add tangible value to real property, taxes, insurance and maintenance of public utilities; and to authorize, subject to the approval of the governor in council, necessary remedial work on properties constructed under individual firm price contracts and sold under the Veterans' Land Act and to correct defects for which neither the veteran nor the contractor can be held financially responsible, and for such other work on other properties as may be required to protect the interest of the director therein, $4,330,600.

45. Grants to veterans settled on provincial lands in accordance with agreements with provincial governments under section 38 of the Veterans' Land Act, grants to veterans settled on Dominion lands in accordance with an agreement with the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources under section 38 of the Veterans' Land Act and grants to Indian veterans settled on Indian reserve lands under section 39 of the Veterans' Land Act, $150,000.

Loans, investments and advances—

Veterans Affairs—

Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act—

L55. Purchase of land and permanent improvements; cost of permanent improvements to be effected; removal of encumbrances; stock and equipment; and protection of security under the Soldier Settlement Act and the Veterans' Land Act, $38,400,000.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 23, 1964

The house met at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF ITALIAN SETTLEMENT IN CANADA

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I crave the indulgence of the house to recognize and do honour to the one hundredth anniversary of Italian settlement in Canada. Tomorrow evening, October 24, in many communities across Canada celebrations will be held to mark the many contributions the Italian people have made to Canada. Indeed, they are the second largest group of people who have emigrated to Canada. Canadians of Italian origin have played a very important part in the development of our country, and as one who has the honour to represent many Italian Canadians I am pleased to recognize this century of their contribution to the economic and social life of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

CONCURRENCE IN REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON SALARY REVISIONS

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That the report of the joint committee of both houses on the library of parliament, concerning a revision in salary rates of clerical classes in the library, presented to this house by Mr. Speaker on Thursday, October 15, 1964, be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

STATEMENT ON SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS FOR ROYAL VISIT

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make the following statement as a result of questions put to me on October 15, 16 and 21 by the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) and the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas).

The prime responsibility of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police was for the safety of Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh. A secondary responsibility would have been to furnish assistance to municipal and provincial police in the event that in the maintenance of law and order those forces required assistance from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

So far as the visit to the city of Quebec is concerned, it should be pointed out that for a considerable period prior to the royal visit threats of demonstrations, civil disturbances and violence had been made publicly from anonymous sources.

Several demonstrations occurred, the first one of any consequence being in front of the provincial legislature while Her Majesty was inside the building. These and other demonstrations in the city of Quebec were dealt with by the Quebec city police. The solicitor general of the province of Quebec has issued a statement on these matters.

During the day a number of persons were arrested by the various forces, of whom eight were arrested by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in rendering assistance to the local authorities.

Le Soleil of Quebec city subsequently published a part of the orders issued to members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who were on duty in Quebec city during the royal visit. Individual copies of these orders were issued to all members of the force on duty, and the copy which came into the possession of *Le Soleil* was not secured from any official source. It has not been possible to ascertain how this particular copy, out of the many that had to be issued, reached the newspaper; but while the document was confidential and for the information of members of the force, there is nothing in it of a secret nature or of a nature affecting security. In fact it exemplifies the care which was taken to see that members of the force were properly instructed. In the circumstances I do not believe that any investigation beyond the ordinary service inquiry is necessary.

The security arrangements provided by all the police forces which were involved in the royal visit were effective and successful and,

in spite of several demonstrations, at no time during the royal visit in any of the provinces that were visited by the Queen was there any attempt to molest Her Majesty, His Royal Highness or any member of the federal or provincial governments.

Neither I nor the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police have received any complaints whatsoever regarding the security arrangements or the conduct of or action taken by any member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. On the contrary, the press and the public generally have commended the R.C.M.P. In these circumstances I am sure hon. members will agree that there is no occasion for me to direct an investigation.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF RUN-THROUGHS—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Melville, the adjournment of the house under standing order 26 for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely the pending changes at Sunday midnight, October 25, by the C.N.R. management which will establish run-throughs at the divisional points of Nakina and Wainwright, thus creating a great likelihood of a tie-up of the transcontinental line and tremendous hardship on the communities and railroaders affected.

In making the case for urgency I would point out that as you may have noted, Mr. Speaker, this matter was raised yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition, and several days before by the hon. member for Edmonton West. I have not made it an issue in terms of questions because delegations have come to Ottawa and we have been working through the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Transport on the assumption that this was the channel through which advice and representations should be passed to Mr. Gordon and the management of the C.N.R.

It is obvious that despite our representations and our efforts, Canadian National Railway officials have not seen fit to change their plans or to accept the request for postponement. The change is going to be introduced on Sunday night and, as I have expressed in the motion, there is every likelihood that this will create a situation that can tie up the transcontinental line of the C.N.R., and it may have even further ramifications. I do not need to point out that such a situation has always been considered, in the Canadian political scene, as one of the most serious things that could happen.

I am making the point in addition, Mr. Speaker, that this move by Canadian National Railways, particularly as it affects Nakina and Wainwright, according to the contention of some of the men in the unions involved is a violation of an agreement entered into in 1926 between the Canadian National and the unions. This gives all the more reason for our feeling that a debate should take place on this matter, in order to bring to the attention of the Canadian National Railway and its president the need for, at the very least, a postponement of this decision for six weeks in view of the protests that may follow.

You will not mind if I point out, Mr. Speaker, that there is a motion for interim supply to follow which undoubtedly will give an opportunity to me and other members who are interested to speak on this problem. However, I want to put it to you that if, as I believe, this matter is of urgent importance, it deserves the significance of having the house accept this motion to give it the effect that I think it needs in order to put over to this crown agency, which has taken this action despite the representations that have been made, that to go ahead would involve consequences which I do not think I over estimate in presenting this motion to the house.

Mr. J. N. Ormiston (Melville): In seconding the motion moved by the hon. member for Port Arthur, Mr. Speaker, I am activated by the same concern for the railway employees which he indicated in sponsoring this motion. The situation regarding this proposed run-through operation is most controversial, and the railway employees feel that unilateral action has been taken by management to impose this change on the railway employees concerned. The railway employees feel that the urge by the railway companies to economize by instituting the new run-through system should not be acted upon without due consideration for its effect on the employees and their families, and on the economies of the local communities involved. Surely, with new railway legislation pending, there is a logical reason for a reappraisal of this whole program.

What the hon. member for Port Arthur has mentioned with regard to Wainwright and Nakina, which are isolated instances, will be

felt all over Canada and particularly in my own city of Melville, because there will be this change in pattern. It is for this reason, and because of the threatened deterioration of our system, that I urge some consideration be given to this matter.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, while the matter raised by the hon. member is undoubtedly one of considerable importance, particularly in the two areas concerned, the point at issue here as I see it relates to the urgency of debate on this matter, and as to whether the matter is one coming under the administrative responsibility of the government. The purpose of rule 26, I respectfully submit, is to permit the discussion of a matter that is, by its nature, of such urgency that debate is required, taking precedence over all other opportunities in the house for discussing the matter and interrupting the ordinary business of the house for that purpose. It is a very extraordinary remedy and must be limited under the circumstances. In addition it is, of course, quite clear that it must be something related to the administrative responsibilities of the government.

As to the first point, the urgency of debate, I would draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that at the conclusion of the business of the house last night the item of business indicated for today was interim supply, when it is possible for an hon. member to raise a grievance against the government in the area of the government's administration. Therefore if the matter is indeed one that comes under the responsibility of the government administratively, it is properly discussable on interim supply which will come in a few minutes, I hope, when we reach orders of the day. Of course if it is not one within the administrative responsibility of the government then it is not something upon which a motion under standing order 26 can be raised.

I would like to direct Your Honour's attention to the first sentence in citation 100 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which says:

> The definite matter of urgent public importance for the discussion of which a member may ask leave to move the adjournment of the house under standing order 26 must involve the administrative responsibility of the government.

I want to point out that while this question of run-throughs may properly be of great concern to all hon. members, it is a matter for the administration of the Canadian National Railways, a statutory corporation created by statute of parliament; that parliament has divested the government of responsibility for the operation of the railway and has seen fit to give that administrative responsibility to the Canadian National Railways by statute.

In support of that proposition I would refer Your Honour to an attempt made on March 13, 1961, by a former minister of transport to move the adjournment of the house under standing order 26. On that occasion the matter had to do with a rather substantial proposed lay-off of men in the Montreal region. When the then hon. member for Laurier presented his motion he was advised by Mr. Speaker as follows, and I quote from page 2903 of *Hansard* for that date:

> I shall be glad to hear the hon. member. I assume that it is a matter of importance, but the urgency that is involved is urgency of debate. I think I should like to hear the hon. member on the question of whether or not this is one of the administrative responsibilities of the ministry. It seems to me that the point may be well taken that it is a decision of the Canadian National Railways on its own authority.

That was very early in the attempt made by the hon. member to move the adjournment, and after considerable discussion, as recorded at page 2907 of *Hansard*, in giving his ruling Mr. Speaker went on to say:

> The problem of their employment is, of course, an important matter to them at least and of significance to the Montreal area. However, parliament has given to the Canadian National Railways the responsibility for administering the railway and included in administration is the responsibility for all labour policy. It is true that parliament can change the legislation but it is not true, as I see it, that the government can intervene to direct Canadian National Railways to do something different.

At a later point he said:

> It would be necessary for parliament to amend its Canadian National Railways legislation, if an enforceable decision is to be made or an effective remedy applied.
>
> That may not appeal to all hon. members as a correct summary of the situation, but in addition to that point I think that lay-offs of this kind, whether isolated or part of a pattern, are a continuing problem of employees of the government owned railway which will be coming before the house from time to time when it is sitting, and should be dealt with on the occasions on which it is possible to debate the administrative policies of the Canadian National Railways and the control of these policies by parliament.
>
> I therefore regretfully have to refuse the hon. member leave.

I suggest that the motion proposed today is directly parallel to the type of situation faced in 1961, and that leave should be refused for the reasons stated by the Speaker on that date.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words with respect to the question of urgency of debate. The President of the

Privy Council relied heavily on his contention that matters raised under standing order 26 must be matters within the administrative responsibility of the government. May I point out, however, that standing order 26 does not impose any such limitation; it is drawn to make possible discussion of questions of urgent public importance, and nowhere is discussion limited to matters which come under the administrative responsibility of the government. I would point out that only recently this house passed a provisional amendment to standing order 26, which implies that we have reviewed this standing order, and we did not feel it necessary to put in language of the kind the President of the Privy Council has just used.

The hon. gentleman quoted from citation 100 of Beauchesne's fourth edition. Of course he is a lawyer and I am not; therefore we have different views about precedents. But the citation he quoted is taken from a ruling given by Mr. Speaker Bowman in the House of Commons on May 22, 1935. All it amounted to was a ruling of the Speaker on that occasion. Anyone would agree, I think, that we should look at what was placed before Mr. Speaker Bowman on that occasion. In fact it was a motion to adjourn the house to discuss a certain matter, namely the presence of a large number of men from unemployment relief camps in the city of Vancouver. The contention put forward by those who opposed that motion—the contention accepted by Mr. Speaker Bowman—was that this was a matter which came within the responsibility of the provincial and municipal authorities.

I suggest the conclusion that it could not be brought before the house because it did not come within the administrative responsibility of the government was in the nature of an *obiter dictum*. All that Mr. Speaker said on that date was that this was a matter which came under the jurisdiction of the province of British Columbia or the city of Vancouver. I suggest, therefore, that it is improper to take that sentence out of Mr. Speaker Bowman's ruling and make it part of standing order 26, which it is not.

Standing order 26 provides for the discussion of a matter which is of urgent public importance. There is a limitation that it must be a matter on which debate is urgent. But we in parliament may feel that there are matters beyond those within direct governmental responsibility which should be discussed in this national forum and I submit, therefore, that this particular argument

of the President of the Privy Council falls to the ground.

I submit also that the hon. gentleman's contention that there is a parallel between what was proposed by Mr. Chevrier a few years ago and what is asked for today by my hon. friend from Port Arthur does not stand up. These are totally different matters. The concern then was the employment of a certain group of people. The concern now is a policy, the putting of which into effect could result in tying up the Canadian National main line right across this country. I suggest there is a difference, and that the case established for the urgency of debate is a prima facie case.

The only other point made by the President of the Privy Council is that interim supply has been listed as an item for debate today. My hon. friend from Port Arthur has already referred to this, and in my view he has a valid case in suggesting that this subject is in itself so important that it should be discussed now, not when anything else can intervene or at a time when it could only be sandwiched in among various speeches on other subjects on the motion for interim supply.

For these reasons I think Your Honour should recognize that the subject raised is one which meets the urgency of debate requirement.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, there is just one matter I should like to add. The President of the Privy Council made the point that today we would be taking up interim supply. He also mentioned that the question before us was not one of government responsibility or one which should be discussed in parliament.

Mr. McIlraith: No, I did not say that.

Mr. Aiken: The fallacy of this argument is that if we can discuss it on interim supply surely it is a matter which can be discussed in parliament. I suggest that this would bring it under standing order 26. The President of the Privy Council cannot have it both ways.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, there is a point here; I am sure the hon. member does not wish to misrepresent what I said. I did not for one moment suggest that this was a subject matter which could not be raised for debate in parliament. It is a subject matter which can be raised for debate in parliament. My point was that it is not a subject matter that warrants the usage of standing order 26, because standing order 26 can only

be made applicable to those matters which come under the direct administrative responsibility of the government. Therefore it must be debated in other areas of debate available in parliament. So the two points are quite separate. I never for one moment suggested that this was not a subject matter which should be debated in parliament.

Mr. Aiken: Just one word in reply to that. Standing order 26 refers to a definite matter of urgent public importance and I am sure does not limit itself in the way suggested by the President of the Privy Council. If it is a definite matter of urgent public importance, then it can be discussed under standing order 26. If it is not, then his argument about discussing it on interim supply today is not valid.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other members who wish to help the Chair? If not, then first of all I should like to thank all hon. members who have contributed to the discussion and have been very helpful.

In my view there is no doubt about the importance here. Anything affecting the lives or the livelihood of seven or eight hundred people is certainly important. There is no doubt about the urgency of the matter, but in the view of Beauchesne in citation 100 (3), urgency means:

> "Urgency" within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but it means "urgency of debate", when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the house do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately

I may say in passing that in my view standing order 26 could apply to any public matter within the powers of the federal parliament.

As to the question of opportunity, Mr. Speaker Black on March 31, as reported at page 50 of the *Journals* for that day, said:

> The reason for allowing such a motion—
>
> —obviously under standing order 26.
>
> —for the adjournment is to afford members an opportunity of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance which they could do in no other way—

So we have these two citations; that "urgency" means urgency of debate, and the decision of Mr. Speaker Black in 1931 concerning giving members an opportunity of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance which they could do in no other way.

In view of the fact that interim supply was announced last night and that there will be almost immediate opportunity to discuss this matter, it does seem to the Chair that there will be every opportunity of discussing this matter within a matter of minutes. Therefore I regret that, in my opinion, consent to adjourn the house under standing order 26 should not be granted at this time.

PROPOSED RUN-THROUGH CHANGES—COMMUNICATIONS WITH COMPANY

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would now direct a question to the Acting Minister of Transport in connection with the action being taken by the Canadian National Railways. I asked him a question on this matter yesterday, and he said he would communicate with the C.N.R.

I would also ask whether, having regard to the very serious repercussions which could follow such action, which is almost peremptory in its nature, and the effect this action would have on the railway employees who have always given of their best, and on the general economy of the country, would the minister say whether he suggested to the president or to other executives of the C.N.R. that, under all the circumstances, the public interest demands a postponement of this action?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): Well, Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman's question was rather lengthy, and he made certain statements about the nature of the action proposed to be taken. For example, he used such phrases as "almost peremptory" and so on. In a difference of this importance between the management of the railway, which parliament has charged with the operation thereof, and the employees I would not want to have any remarks of mine interpreted in such a way as to indicate that I was taking one side or other in the difference which exists.

Having said that, I want to go on to say this. I do not know whether it is proper to refer to the *Hansard* blues, but as quickly as the blues could be obtained yesterday the actual text in connection with this matter was immediately communicated to the railway management. There was no instruction given, or—I have forgotten the word the right hon. gentleman used—

Mr. Diefenbaker: I think a good word would be "recommendation" from the minister.

Mr. McIlraith: There was no recommendation on the part of the acting minister as to what action should be taken by the railways,

because I do not know whether that would be welcomed; I suspect it might not. In any event, I did not see fit to go beyond the authority granted to the minister under the legislation by taking this action. Perhaps I will have to leave my answer in that way.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I did not quite get the answer, Mr. Speaker, so I am rather uncertain about this. Was this suggestion met by silence on the part of the officials and the head of the C.N.R., or was it just disregarded? Because somehow the minister's answer seemed to die away.

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the answer died away because I do not know that it is proper for me to discuss the details of the conversations that have taken place. A great many discussions on this subject have gone on in the last week with the responsible officials in the railway company, and I do not think it is appropriate or proper for me to give the details of those conversations, other than to say this. Each representation, whether made in the house or made outside the house, by delegations either from communities or from unions, was communicated very promptly to the railway management, and there has been a great deal of responsible consideration given to this subject.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Then would the minister say, as to this question which was raised yesterday and which is of such importance, it having been placed before the president of the C.N.R., whether he gave an audible answer?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the president of the C.N.R. is always audible.

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether he actually got a negative reply, not to any persuasions he may have attempted but to representations. In other words, has the C.N.R. told him they are not going to postpone it but are going ahead?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I have received no firm negative reply.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether he has consulted with the Minister of Labour and his officials about this particular problem, and whether they have brought forward any suggestions that might be useful in clearing up this situation.

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have consulted with him to a great extent on this matter. We have had discussions about possible methods of dealing with the problems posed by the railwaymen in relation to the possible effect run-throughs might have.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question. Would the minister inform the house whether he has received an unfirm negative reply from the railway officials?

Mr. McIlraith: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Have the minister and the Minister of Labour been in touch with the employees concerned to ascertain whether we are going to have a stoppage on the transcontinental line next week?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I do not think any of the employees have taken that position. In respect of all these disputes there is a great deal of talk, rumour and so on. I do not think it is fair for me to guess as to what action will be taken by the railway employees or by management in this difficult situation.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

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

Could he ask members of the other place to stop taking holidays all the time and to sit a little more often, so as to pass the bills being studied by their committees, including the one relating to the establishment of the bank of British Columbia?

Mr. Speaker: May I point out that this question is out of order.

[*Text*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INDIA—INQUIRY AS TO INCREASED FOOD SHIPMENTS FROM CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I am not sure whether I should address this question to him, to the Minister of Agriculture or to the Minister of External Affairs, but in view of the fact he is the minister present I will direct it to him. In view of

the critical food situation in India, is any special action being taken under any of our food aid programs?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the government is well aware of the very critical situation facing India at the present time because of the shortage of food. We have made known to the government of India our willingness to assist in the provision of wheat, in particular, and other foods if they are useful to them. We have had no request for aid.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question. Has there been any communication between the government and the administration of the world food program or the FAO?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have been in continuing communication with the world food program, and we have received no request from the FAO to provide assistance to the food aid program to India.

AGRICULTURE

TURKEYS—ANNOUNCEMENT OF REFERENCE TO TARIFF BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, October 15 the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale directed a question to me, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, concerning the tariff on live turkeys.

Further to my answer of that day, I am pleased to be able to inform the hon. member that the Minister of Finance has referred the question of the tariff on live turkeys to the tariff board for study and report, with the request that the board deal with this matter as promptly as possible. It is expected that the board will shortly be issuing the notice of hearings on this matter.

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question of the parliamentary secretary. In view of the fact that this study and report will take some time and will not be of any material help to producers at this stage, is any consideration being given to a reimposition of import controls?

Mr. Beer: Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the minister will be in consultation with the federation of turkey producers on Monday of next week, and any announcement will be made by the minister.

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Would it be possible, until the tariff board makes a decision, to put the tariff back on, or fix quotas?

Mr. Beer: Mr. Speaker, that would be a matter of government policy, and I am sure any announcement will be made at the appropriate time.

QUEBEC—REQUEST FOR INCREASED MILK SUBSIDY

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture—and it seems one must preface questions at all times with that remark—may I direct a question to the acting minister, or the Minister of Forestry.

Miss LaMarsh: Look at your front benches.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They are not ministers with the responsibilities of the ministers of the crown, and that is something which you over there should learn. In view of ministerial absences we are unable to obtain answers. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but it was the intrusion of a completely improper remark that caused me to say that.

I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry, because he is responsible for many of these things. Has l'union catholique des cultivateurs been in touch with the government regarding the serious dairy industry situation in Quebec? Is consideration now being given by the government to that union's request that the subsidy of 30 cents a hundred pounds of milk for industrial purposes be raised to 40 cents?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the house that there will be meetings among the Minister of Agriculture, the Quebec government and representatives of l'union catholique des cultivateurs in coming weeks for that purpose.

RAPESEED—ANNOUNCEMENT OF INCREASE IN QUOTAS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I answered a question asked by the hon. member for Rosthern about quotas on rapeseed. I said the indications were that the quotas could be increased in the near future. Indeed, the quotas were increased almost as soon as the

words were out of my mouth, so I thought perhaps I ought to inform the house that the wheat board has just announced an increase, effective October 26, for flaxseed and rapeseed quotas as follows. For flaxseed the quota was increased from 5 to 10 bushels per seeded acre of flaxseed for all stations in western Canada or 400 bushels, whichever is the larger; for rapeseed, in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, the quota was increased from 5 to 10 bushels per seeded acre of rapeseed or 400 bushels, whichever is the larger; for Alberta, the quota was increased from 5 to 8 bushels per seeded acre of rapeseed or 325 bushels, whichever is the larger.

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): This information is very helpful to the rapeseed producers, but quite often at this time of year the wheat board removes the quotas altogether for some areas. Will the minister not make representations to the Canadian wheat board to follow the usual practice of removing the quotas?

Mr. Sharp: As I said yesterday, the quotas on rapeseed are related to the market requirements. As the hon. member knows, stocks are more than ample at the present time.

PENITENTIARIES

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL—REQUEST FOR TOUR BY MEMBERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. In view of a press story which appeared this morning in the Toronto *Globe and Mail*, which indicated that the minister intends to make a personal inspection of St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary in Montreal, accompanied by the Minister of Public Works, will the minister make arrangements so that as many members of parliament as may wish may participate in this visit?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to arrange for a visit by members of parliament, but one must bear in mind the various factors and circumstances involved in such a visit, including such things as the necessary precautions to be taken and limits to the number of persons visiting penitentiaries at any one time. I wish the hon. member had given me notice of his question so I might have consulted with the commissioner of penitentiaries and other authorities. We know that the visit which has been planned will take place under circumstances fully consistent with the operation of a penitentiary. I should be very pleased to arrange for a visit by hon. members if given due time to properly consider what relevant factors exist in this respect.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question. Has the minister forgotten that I asked him about a week ago whether he would arrange such a tour, and his answer to the effect that he would give it consideration?

Mr. Favreau: Of course I said I would give that request consideration, and I am considering it. The hon. member should not complain within ten days of making that request. One visit has been arranged for him and a group, and another visit has been authorized. I do not think anything can be said that would make it appear there is any reluctance on the part of the Department of Justice to organize such a visit in order that members of parliament may see what is taking place in penitentiaries. More will be said about that in the very near future. What I said was that rather than refer in the house to a newspaper article which appeared this morning and which I have had no occasion to read as yet, the hon. member could have notified me in advance.

Mr. Peters: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I agree there is some displacement when these visits take place, but because of the nature of the visit outlined in the minister's press statement would it not be more advantageous from the point of view of the operation of the penitentiary for the whole visit to take place at the same time as the visit by the large number of press people you have already invited, when a certain amount of dislocation of operations is going to occur anyway?

Mr. Favreau: Of course, Mr. Speaker, the reason I gave the answer I did is precisely that I should like to have the opportunity to discuss the matter fully with the officers of the penitentiary commission. All I can say for the moment is that this visit has been arranged, and it is consistent with the proper operation of the penitentiary. This is why I should like to have the opportunity to consider further the matter of a visit by members of parliament, as it might well be that doubling the number of visitors would have serious consequences.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister say how many newspapermen are going to accompany him on this crusade?

Mr. Favreau: I have not made the arrangements personally, Mr. Speaker, but I have asked that the proper measures be taken so that the penitentiary will be properly operated.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Chapleau.

Mr. Scott: A supplementary question. Does the minister's announcement mean—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has recognized the hon. member for Chapleau. There have already been three or four supplementaries, and perhaps we could give the hon. member for Chapleau the opportunity to ask his question. If the hon. member has a question on this subject he might return to it later.

Mr. Scott: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit with respect that surely the practice of the house has been that supplementaries are permitted, in a great many cases endlessly, and as this is an important subject—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fisher: Listen to the angry roar over there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair did not deny the hon. member the right to ask a question. He will have an opportunity to do so within a very few minutes.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL—INQUIRY AS TO NEW CONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works regarding his pending visit on Monday next to St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary and the proposed press conference at 4.30 that afternoon at the Leclair institute. Has the minister any plans to announce at that press conference regarding the building of a new penitentiary?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, after the visit to this building by the Minister of Justice and myself, it is proposed to have a press conference to answer questions. At this time I cannot say whether we have any definite plans for St. Vincent de Paul.

Inquiries of the Ministry

SUGAR

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON INQUIRY INTO PRICE INCREASES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice, but not along the same lines. Can the minister tell the house whether, following last year's excessive increase in the price of sugar, an investigation was held by the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission under the Combines Investigation Act and, if so, what are the results?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May I suggest to the hon. member that he put his question on the order paper?

Mr. Grégoire: Why?

[*Text*]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

RATE OF PAYMENT FOR EXTRA CHRISTMAS STAFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General. In view of the questions raised by the Ontario department of labour, is the government considering paying Christmas postal staff less than the minimum Ontario wage and less than the proposed federal minimum wage?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, a brief answer would be no. Actually I think the hon. member's question arises out of a discussion that took place at the annual meeting of the Canadian postmasters association held here earlier this week. I took advantage of the presence of the postmasters in Ottawa to discuss certain things that were taking place, and I announced on that occasion that in semi-staff and revenue post offices a rate of 95 cents per hour would be payable to Christmas help.

This is not less than the minimum rate There is legislation in the province of British Columbia fixing a minimum rate of $1, but for inexperienced help you can go as low as 85 cents. Similar legislation exists in Ontario, where the minimum rate is $1 but there is a leeway of 10 per cent for beginners or inexperienced help. The people, who are taken on in revenue post offices and semi-staff offices, not in the staff offices which are in the cities, are frequently high school students and others who are relatively in-

experienced. Therefore in trying to establish what would be fair on a national basis we have picked 95 cents per hour, which is the highest provincial minimum established by statute in any of the 10 provinces.

Mr. Aiken: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Without wishing to be facetious, is this the spirit that the government is going to adopt in connection with its minimum wage of $1.25 an hour?

Mr. Nicholson: No, Mr. Speaker, it is in line with the spirit of the legislation. If the hon. member has read the bill introduced by the government, he will have seen that the objective of $1.25 is to be reached by July 1, 1966; and when we at this time move in the post office field from rates as low as 60 cents in some of the provinces to 95 cents, we are moving progressively in the direction envisaged by the proposed legislation.

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): A supplementary question on this point. In view of the fact that most of these temporary workers are repeaters who have done the work from year to year for a considerable number of years, would the minister not agree that these are experienced people, and that the action of the department does violate the spirit of the Ontario minimum wage act?

Mr. Nicholson: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I will agree with the hon. gentleman that in cities of any size in Canada many of the Christmas helpers are experienced. In the case of the cities however, we do pay a minimum of $1 in all staff offices, as distinguished from semi-staff or revenue offices. The minimum is $1, and for heavy work the minimum is $1.25.

Mr. Aiken: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Post Office Department now giving general reconsideration to the question of postal contracts, which was raised in connection with the Minister of Labour's bill? Is general reconsideration being given to all postal contract rates in relation to that bill?

Mr. Nicholson: The answer is yes. The matter is under consideration, and officials of my department have discussed it at length with officials of the Department of Labour.

INQUIRY AS TO BOARD OF REVIEW ON "HATE" LITERATURE DISTRIBUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): I should like to direct a question to the Postmaster General. I wonder if he is in a position to advise the house when the review board in connection with the distribution of hate literature will be holding meetings, and whether the public will be admitted?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): I am glad to be able to inform the hon. gentleman and other members of the house that I have nominated the three men whom I would like to see act on a board of review. They were to be approached either yesterday or today, and if all three accept I hope to be able to announce at the beginning of the week the composition of the board of review and the place and date of the hearing. They have to get together and agree upon a date. I consider the matter of this board of review one of great urgency, because there has been a splurge of literature and at recent public meetings this has been referred to. Items appearing in the press suggest that box No. 11 in one of the Toronto postal stations is still being used by individuals engaged in the distribution of this type of offensive literature.

I should like to clarify that situation. This box No. 11 was one of the boxes that I closed last spring because it was rented by a person who I learned had been engaged in the distribution of this literature. I exercised the power which I had under the act and closed it. After the box was closed it was entirely removed from any association with this type of activity. Subsequently it was rented to a person for normal, legitimate purposes. I am assured it is not used in connection with any activities that might be associated with the distribution of hate literature. In other words the statements on this subject that have been appearing in Toronto and other newspapers are erroneous.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MENTAL RETARDATION—FUNDS FOR RESEARCH AND CARE

On the orders of the day:

Mrs. Eloise Jones (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the serious lack of funds for adequate research and care of the mentally retarded, and since this is an urgent Canada-wide problem as revealed at the dominion-provincial conference which has just terminated, will the minister recommend to the government the setting aside of a special fund to meet this pressing need, over and above the present inadequate matching grants?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I would have appreciated the hon. member giving me notice. As she knows, this conference, the first of its type ever called in Canada, ended only yesterday. Reports were prepared by all the experts who were in attendance, and these reports have not yet found their way to my desk.

I cannot agree with what the hon. lady says about the inadequacy of the health grants, in that there has not been a request heretofore for an increase in the grants for this purpose. The hon. lady may not yet know that at this time of year all departments begin the preparation of their estimates for the coming year and this is one matter, of course, which will receive particular attention.

However, she probably will know, as will many members of the public, that the chief recommendations given publicity to date have not been for an increase in grants of money but for co-ordination and assistance in assuring that the four or five provincial departments which deal with the matter of retardation do so in a co-ordinated way.

UNITED NATIONS

UNESCO—VOTE OF CANADIAN DELEGATION ON ADMISSION OF CHINA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Prime Minister has an answer to the question I asked yesterday concerning how the Canadian delegation at the UNESCO conference voted on the admission of mainland China.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to talk to the Secretary of State for External Affairs about this matter, as he has been in touch with our delegation in Paris, but he is out of town today on official business. However, although this may not be a complete answer to my hon. friend's question—and if not it can be supplemented next week—I have learned that there was no vote at the UNESCO conference on admitting communist China. This incident arose over the challenging in the credentials committee of the credentials of the nationalist Chinese delegate. Canada was not represented on that committee. The validity of those credentials was upheld. The plenary assembly did vote on a resolution put forward in the same sense as that on which the credentials committee had ruled, namely the validity of the credentials of the Chinese delegate, and his credentials were upheld. Canada, at the plenary assembly, voted with the majority.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

POINT EDWARD NAVAL BASE—CONSIDERATION OF SENIORITY AND VETERANS PREFERENCE IN LAY-OFFS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): Yesterday the hon. member for Cape Breton South asked the following question which I took as notice:

> Does the trade testing of qualified employees at the Point Edward naval base, and the proposed lay-off of tradesmen without right to seniority or veterans preference, represent government policy?

Well, Mr. Speaker, there was a suggestion that certain categories of employees at the Point Edward naval base should be trade tested in order to determine their qualifications for continuing employment, but it is not proposed to proceed with this trade testing program. As hon. members know, the Department of National Defence has for many years used a point system for determining the order of release when it becomes necessary to reduce the staff of hourly rated employees at any defence establishment. This system gives points for seniority, for wartime overseas service with the armed forces and for efficiency. This system has been used to determine which qualified employees were to be retained when it became necessary to reduce staff at the Point Edward naval base in the past, and will continue to be used in the future.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—INQUIRY AS TO REPORT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I have a question for the Minister of Justice. In view of the imminent report on juvenile delinquency, has the minister yet decided whether this report will be made public when it is received by him?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): This is one thing which I have yet to consider finally, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

IMMIGRATION

TORONTO—STATUS OF PERSONS CONCERNED WITH NEWSPAPER STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): I should like to ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration whether he has yet completed his study of the reference to him concerning the newspaper strike in Toronto, and particularly the six individuals who are here without status. If so, can he give a report to the house this morning?

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. member for the delay in obtaining the information he requested from my parliamentary secretary concerning the six persons who were admitted at Toronto and who do not yet have any status. I will do everything possible in order to obtain this information and give it to the hon. member Monday or Tuesday next, because I deem that it is important for him to obtain it.

[*Text*]

Mr. Scott: May I ask a supplementary question. Can the minister give us any reasonable explanation as to why it is taking so long to get this information? Surely the information is available by picking up the telephone and talking to the officials in Toronto.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I requested this information, but as everyone knows, due to the various levels of government, communications must be effected at every level until they reach the Toronto authorities.

This information related to particulars concerning the trade and various types of work being performed at present at Toronto by those persons, and I believe that this matter requires several days of investigation.

However, I will do my best to give this information as soon as I shall receive it.

[*Text*]

INDUCEMENTS TO ENCOURAGE ENTRANCE OF DOCTORS, NURSES, ETC.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East): I should like to ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration whether he has anything to report on his endeavours to influence doctors, nurses and technicians from the United Kingdom to come to Canada?

[Mr. Favreau.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I suggest that perhaps this is a question that might be put on the order paper. I wonder if in view of the time that has been spent on these questions, we should not proceed to orders of the day?

Mr. Rynard: I have just this to say on that point. This question was asked some weeks ago, and I think the minister probably has an answer.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I had already answered the hon. member when he asked his question.

[*Text*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO SETTING UP OF COURT OF CLAIMS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I should like to ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration if he is yet in a position to announce the time or date of the introduction into the house of a bill respecting the Indian claims commission.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No, Mr. Speaker, this bill, as amended, is part of the total legislative program of the government, and this is announced by the house leader on behalf of the government, as parliament proceeds with its work.

I will tell the hon. member that at present we are actively engaged in revising this bill and that it should soon be introduced.

[*Text*]

INDUSTRY

SUGGESTED REMOVAL OF TAX ON PRODUCTION MACHINERY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Fred F. Stenson (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. It arises from the statement he made in Toronto yesterday to the effect that the federal government is considering direct financial aid to private industry for new projects designed to develop better products. The minister said Canada was lagging behind in this field and my question is, does he not feel that the tax on production machinery should be removed immediately? I feel this would be a start in the development of projects of this type.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I suggest this is a question for the order paper.

SUPPLY

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

INTERIM SUPPLY

Mr. McIlraith moved:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $740,710,-974.77, being the aggregate of

(a) two twelfths of the total of all of the items to be voted in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965, as reduced, except finance item 15, mines and technical surveys item 25, national research council item 10, and transport items 15 and 25 for which the proportion is one twelfth and atomic energy item 5, external affairs item 20, forestry item 25 and legislation item 20 for which no proportion is being released, $651,-829,576.84;

(b) an additional two twelfths of the amount of public works item 70 (schedule A), of the said main estimates, $666,666.67;

(c) an additional one twelfth of the amount of fisheries items 5 and 10, legislation item 5, mines and technical surveys item 70, post office item 1 and public works item 40 (schedule B), of the said main estimates, $20,263,800.00;

(d) two twelfths of all of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (A), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, except national defence item 56a and loans, investments and advances items L12a, L17a and L37a for which no proportion is being released, $20,612,-522.50;

(e) an additional two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103a (Schedule C), of the said supplementary estimates (A), $872,966.67;

(f) nine twelfths of the total of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (B), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, $46,215,108.75;

(g) two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103b (schedule D), of the said supplementary estimates (B), $250,333.34,

be granted to Her Majesty on account of the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965.

Mr. Ormiston: Mr. Chairman, the discussion of interim supply gives us an opportunity to accept the suggestion kindly put forward by the President of the Privy Council, the Acting Minister of Transport, to debate some of the matters concerning the management of Canadian National Railways and the implementation of some of the run-through systems which it is anticipated will be coming into effect in the next few days.

The hon. member for Port Arthur outlined the situation in a clear and concise manner, and other hon. members primarily interested in this problem include the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, myself, and the other hon. member who spoke earlier this morning. The problem involved is not new. It has been with us for several years, and the situation is likely to deteriorate before it becomes any better.

The Acting Minister of Transport is well aware of the situation. In the past he has been very co-operative, as a matter of fact sympathetic, and I am sure he has made every effort to bring the representations of the railway employees to the attention of management. Evidently, however, these representations have fallen on deaf ears, and we believe the new run-through system will be introduced in some areas very shortly.

At a time when the economy is fairly buoyant it is unfortunate that some areas of our country will suffer as a result of the proposals of Canadian National Railways. Trainmen have lived in these areas for many years, building up comfortable communities, and now it is possible that in the near future the population of these areas will be depleted as a result of the adoption of the run-through system. The basic idea of this system is that trainmen will spend longer time over longer distances performing their duties in running trains. This means that the turnaround points will be too far away for return trips, and will cut down on the time train crews are able to spend at home.

This is an inconvenience to the trainmen and their families, and I believe their feelings and the impact of this on their morale should be taken into consideration by management, which on many occasions has expressed its concern for the welfare of the workers. It must be evident that when employees are antagonistic to a system being imposed on them, their work will suffer.

The employees realize automation is inevitable and that management is willing to make certain concessions, but up to the present very little consideration has been given to the reasonable requests of railwaymen who will be greatly inconvenienced by the new run-through system. Inevitably the population of some towns will be reduced, thus changing the economy of the areas around them.

Some consideration—and I do not mean just monetary consideration—must be given to employees who will be displaced. The run-through system may have some advantages. Possibly it will be more economical to the railway companies, but if the employees operating the trains are dissatisfied the railway operation in itself will suffer. Because of this we are asking the minister and the

government to give consideration to some of the representations which have been made, and I urge the minister, his departmental officials and the railway management to sit down and once more discuss and analyse the situation in so far as it applies to railway employees.

I suppose I am fortunate in that the system is not to be introduced immediately in my area, but I understand it will be soon effective in other areas, and many areas will be adversely affected by it.

I feel the management of the C.N.R. has a responsibility to sit down again with the unions and try to work out a reasonable solution to this problem, which has been a festering sore for the last couple of years. Those members of the house who are more directly interested in these questions will be able to corroborate the statements I have made regarding the inconvenience which will be caused to these employees of the C.N.R. particularly, and a great deal of inconvenience will probably be caused to the travelling public as well. As the hon. member for Port Arthur has told us, time is running short, but I should like the minister to do everything in his power to see whether some solution can be reached to this urgent problem.

Mr. Fisher: The step which the C.N.R. proposes to take on October 25 is another incident in what I have thought of all along as a long—and I am tempted to use the word "slimy"—series of incidents in which over the past decade the management of this railway has been following a policy amounting to "divide and rule". It has been a process of doing a little bit here and a little bit there; a process of changes and shifts, never coming out into the open with a clearcut plan. In the meantime they have managed to create an atmosphere in which you have a president of a railway who is probably as detested by a large group of people in Canada as anyone could possibly imagine.

It is not my purpose here to throw recriminations at Mr. Donald Gordon, but I wish to put this point before the committee. We are seeing the death arranged of communities in this country as a consequence of huge sums which this parliament has approved to allow the C.N.R. to make changes. We have approved the spending of billions of dollars to allow the C.N.R. to modernize, dieselize, introduce central traffic control and so on.

Members of this house who have served on the railway committee before which Mr. Gordon appears every year know that for a number of years I, in association with others in this house, have brought up this problem and tried to discuss the way in which the C.N.R. could make the adjustment. Only last July when Mr. Gordon was before the committee he was asked directly whether there were to be any more run-throughs in connection with the changes proposed as a result of dieselization. We also asked where these run-throughs would take place, if any were proposed.

We were fobbed off with the general answer that the C.N.R. was not yet in a position to reply. On September 15 it was announced to the local chairman at a divisional point that it had been decided to abandon the whole terminal of Nakina and run through. A parallel situation is that at Wainwright. There is no general plan. The C.N.R. refused to negotiate this question with the men's representatives in the unions at bargaining and contract time. Instead, they do a little here and a little there. They did it at Sioux Lookout; they did it at Belleville; they will never present a common problem.

I am sick of our approving expenditures for the Department of Labour to set up manpower consultative services, to study the effects of automation and how best to meet technological change. Here we have a prime example of technological change and its consequences. But are we prepared?

As the member most affected by the change to be introduced this Saturday, I have obviously played my hand incorrectly. This is a problem national in its scope. I thought the way to proceed was to make representations to the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Labour; to approach the problem quietly, with common sense and realism. Obviously an approach of this kind has not done any good. The Acting Minister of Transport by his remarks earlier today gave an indication that he sees himself, or his function, as simply a funnel or channel through which representations can be made. He regards himself as, in a sense, equivalent to a telegraph clerk or somebody who links up an intercom system. He did not seem to think he was in a position, in his relationship with the company, to add any force of persuasion at all.

In other words, in the representations we have made to the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Labour to the effect that there really is a good case for postponing this important move, we have not been able to carry conviction, or else the Acting Minister

of Transport feels he is in a strait-jacket because of the type of relationship which exists between the government and this crown agency and is unable to intervene in favour of this postponement.

One of the worst grey areas we have is this relationship between crown agencies and parliament. We know we are not administrators. We know we are not executives. But, somehow, the only way the spending of these agencies and the appointments to them can be legalized is by ourselves, acting in consort, doing something about it. We are on the scene; somehow or other we are in there. Yet we seem to be denied, perhaps properly so, any great influence; all we can do is talk about these things.

Well, talking is not very effective if one is talking to ministers who are not prepared to argue the case and take it to the head of the crown agency concerned, in this case the head of the C.N.R. I contend that the government should take a direct interest in this situation. For the first time a home terminal of the C.N.R. is being wiped out. A home terminal is a terminal from which railroaders operate. I contend that this is probably an illegal action, and I am prepared at this time to say I will go into my area and work with the railroaders there in meeting this problem by what is possibly another illegal action, namely by a refusal to give service when the date comes. I may be penalized, and so may these men, for refusing to offer services on Saturday night. It may be held that a crime is being committed under the Criminal Code, but this is the situation to which long-suffering employees are brought in the absence of a constructive approach by management to grave situations such as this.

Knowing the minister personally and the interest he has taken in this—the good Lord knows the hon. gentleman has listened to me and I have listened to him in the last few weeks—it occurs to me he may think I am exaggerating, dealing in hyperbole because I am speaking in a public forum and appealing beyond it. But I would point out to the hon. gentleman how little is being asked for. The C.N.R. decided in mid-September to introduce changes on October 25 which will lead to the death of a town. It decided that on such short notice as this it would change traffic arrangements which have been in effect for generations. Is it not reasonable to ask for a postponement?

We have before the house at the present time amendments to the Railway Act. We have all been told about the scope of this legislation based on the deliberations of a royal commission. Included in it are provisions dealing with section 182 of the Railway Act which has been a matter of contention for a decade. Only a couple of weeks ago the railway brotherhoods were in to see the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Transport about this particular section, whether it is not possible to give men better protection when railways go through with these grand changes that dislocate jobs. Surely the fact that the legislation is before us is worth advancing as a reason for the postponement.

I think the minister likes technical points, so I would mention this. The Railway Act is before the house for amendment. It is the right of everyone to move amendments, and I have already indicated that I am going to offer an amendment to section 182 of the act which, if accepted by the house, will have the effect of bringing situations such as those existing in Nakina or Wainwright under the purview of the act. And I think I have a good prospect of getting this amendment accepted, because I remind the minister that last year our railway committee approved the subject matter of a public bill which I brought before it. Among the recommendations made by the railway committee, which is the same committee which will be handling the Railway Act, there was a strong recommendation that this kind of situation be met by a change in legislation. Surely I am right in assuming that this situation may come under the Railway Act as amended, and it indicates that the door should be left open and this decision postponed. That is the Railway Act aspect of the matter.

I wonder how many hon. members noticed, Mr. Chairman, that recently the Canadian Pacific Railway announced that it would suspend passenger operations on its day-liner service between Peterborough and Toronto. Public opinion geared the newspapers to take the matter up, members of parliament were contacted, representations were made and the acting minister expressed concern. A few days ago, before it was announced in the house the Canadian Pacific Railway indicated that it was not going to go ahead with the withdrawal of this passenger service at this time. I mention that as an indication that there is nothing fundamental about postponing something. It is a very simple request.

Yet Canadian National Railways have given no information at all about this matter. I have information that it has alerted its officials, trainmasters and so on, so that in

the event there is a withdrawal of service the men who ordinarily move the transcontinental trains will be ready to move over for a period while the squeeze is put on the men. This information I have is reinforced by the fact that the C.N.R. has wired the people of Nakina to the effect that the offer made a couple of weeks ago—belatedly—to buy their homes still holds, which is surely an indication that there is some kind of conscience in this matter. Why would this offer be repeated if it was turned down by the men and by the community? It has been repeated because the company feels that this will be a sort of oyster for someone to reach for as the men begin to worry and to fear the power of this company if it does withdraw this service.

This is a power game, and the people who are under the power of this company are out along the periphery in small towns along the system without the resources of communications media which can really build up their case as the Peterborough case was built up. They do not have a couple of columnists in Toronto who were riding this dayliner and who built up the case in the newspapers. These people are exposed to the power of the major employer of the area, an employer who, in the main, has indicated that in matters like this it is prepared to be ruthless.

I have never liked the contention that the Minister of Transport is just a funnel through which you can drop something and it will get to the president of the Canadian National Railways. On the other hand, I am not one who believes that the Minister of Transport is at all times second guessing the president of the Canadian National Railways. Nevertheless we have to assume there is a relationship somewhere between the funnel and the Charlie McCarthy kind of act.

I suggest that the difference here is exposed in specific situations. Normally you leave the Canadian National Railways free from advice on minor matters, but when something major brews up it seems to me you have to have consultation and a rather full explanation of policy. One of the regrettable things, despite the questions which have been asked in the house, is that the minister has come into this place and given us no information at all on the Canadian National point of view. He could not even transmit a firm negative today. In other words the matter is still up in the air.

[Mr. Fisher.]

The situation roughly is this. Canadian National Railways, as a result of great expenditure, has to make changes in its arrangements. It feels it has to do this. It has not worked out any system of doing this. A lot of people say, why is it that Canadian National is in the van? Why is it that Donald Gordon always carries the ball and is the aggressor? Why is it not the Canadian Pacific Railway, the private enterprise outfit, which is in this position?

I will tell you why, Mr. Chairman, and it is very simple. The unions working under the Canadian Pacific Railway have protection because they have no big seniority districts, and no changes can be made in the working conditions of the contracts which affect them in any single one of the terminals. But the situation is different with the Canadian National. It is organized—and this has been very useful to the company over the years—in big seniority districts. In this way it can make a change which will wipe out Nakina and its railwaymen and will bump along all the way down through Capreol to Toronto, and so on, and there is no way the men can come at this as the railway interprets it.

There is an agreement in existence. There is a 1926 Montreal agreement entered into between the brotherhood of locomotive firemen and enginemen and the brotherhood of locomotive engineers and the C.N.R. Section 9 of that Montreal agreement sets out that no changes will be made in the set-up regarding home terminals without prior conference, arrangement and negotiation between the management and the unions. This agreement can only be rescinded on 30 days' notice. As far as I know this agreement still exists and is still in effect. The railway does not want to talk about it. It does not even want to give notice of rescission, because it knows that something will blow up. This brings a very large issue into some kind of arrangement for negotiation.

I do not think the Minister of Transport has really realized the way the C.N.R. has moved on this whole question of technological change. It has never given us any over-all policy. What they are doing in Wainwright is hitting the trainmen over the head with the club and leaving the firemen and engineers alone. At Nakina the situation is the opposite. They haggle and nip a piece off here and a piece off there and never give the railwaymen an opportunity of seeing what is the over-all plan or structure. I suppose that is good labour relations. It is good labour rela-

tions on the basis that the arrangement between management and labour is a war of some kind and that it is good to outsmart the opposition, but it really is not good enough in a situation where we have technological change of such scope.

What will this do to the town of Nakina; and it will bump others along the way? This is a town of 800 people. Approximately half of them are railroaders and dependants. In two years all will be gone. What are the consequences for a town which has a school, roads into it, a Legion and churches? In effect it means the end of the town. The town may have other prospects because of very large iron resources which happen to be nearby, but in effect it is a town created by Canadian National Railways, created by Sir Henry Thornton and killed by Donald Gordon. Surely there is a greater responsibility here than just making a decision like this. Nevertheless Mr. Gordon has decided to do it; and make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, this decision was not reached at the local level; this decision has come right out of Montreal. We are going to begin the ending of this town's existence. And this is only the first one. Biggar will be next. Wainwright is under the gun this time, of course.

Where is a policy to meet this situation? Are the Minister of Transport and his colleague the Minister of Labour going to keep on insisting that they can only transmit representations which are made, that they have no responsibility and that there is no onus on them to see that a better plan is forthcoming? This may be the new co-operative federalism, I do not know, but it certainly offers very little and makes hypocrisy of a great deal many of us have said here during our consideration of the estimates of the Department of Labour. I thought we were going to have some kind of reasoning and planning in this regard. The Minister of Labour is touting his doctrine of economic planning around the country, and we have created the new Department of Industry to do something about this whole question of planning and developing industry and regional co-ordination. I'll bet the Minister of Labour has never even heard of Nakina and Wainwright.

An hon. Member: And couldn't care less.

Mr. Fisher: That may be his Goldwater phase, but I do not know about that.

My point is that we have all these agencies and we have talked about our responsibilities in this situation, but when we get down to brass tacks we cannot even obtain a postponement. We cannot obtain any suggestions as to how these kind of changes should be made. I cannot go back to the people of Nakina and Wainwright and tell them that the saving of $40,000 or $50,000 of public money by the C.N.R. is worth the cost of social dislocation in those areas. This action on the part of that company is unilateral, and surely we have a greater responsibility to the people of these areas than has been indicated.

The premier of Ontario has made representations to the government in this respect. The minister of mines, who represents that area in Ontario, has made representations, the unions have made representations, and the communities have instructed their federal members here in parliament to make representations in this regard. The only answer to these representations we can obtain from the Minister of Transport is that he has passed them on. The Prime Minister has been approached in this regard. Women's associations in the area have approached the Minister of National Health and Welfare on the assumption that she, also being a woman, would be interested in their problem. I do not know what response she made. All I can say is that I hope consideration is being given to all aspects of the situation in which the people in this area find themselves.

Mr. Chairman, as I conclude my contribution to this debate I should like to refer to the seriousness of the political aspect of this situation. The thing that has galled me about the Liberal party ever since I was a small boy is their damnable arrogance as a total crew. I have always felt that Donald Gordon is sort of a perfect administrative instrument for that kind of arrogance that has been associated with the Liberal party and its record. It seems to me that one of the most galling things that can happen is for a minister of the crown, and the government, to assume that questions such as the one to which I have referred should be left to the administrative competence and decision of these crown agencies. That seems to me to be the core of Liberal party doctrine. Their doctrine seems to be that these questions should be left to be answered by those who know best, in this case the president of the C.N.R.

Mr. Chairman, we all know what happened to parliament under the Liberal regime up to 1957. It was falling away, and everything was being left to a group of administrative geniuses who supposedly knew how to do things. I want to inform the Acting Minister

of Transport, much as I have appreciated all the assistance he has given in the last week or two, that I cannot help but read into the general reaction of the government the feeling that they assume they are really a funnel through which representations pass. I have noticed that in almost every case. That is an example of the existence of that same old Liberal arrogance.

Mr. Chairman, there is a final irony to this whole situation. Most railroaders along the Canadian National Railways tend to vote Liberal. This is a long tradition which goes back to the ability of Mackenzie King to settle railway strikes at the time of the first world war. This tradition is related to the fact that this region of Canada was settled during a Liberal administration many years ago, and the railroaders have tended to look at that party with kindness. The final irony is that one of the hardest things I have had to do, as have the Conservatives, has been to convince these men that all their faith placed in the Liberal party for so many years has been proven repeatedly during the last generation to be absolute nonsense.

I do not want to dot the "i" too much in this regard, but I will always remember the people of Redditt, Kenora and Sioux Lookout coming to Ottawa in conection with the same kind of problem a few years ago, on which occasion they discovered that the Liberal representative for Kenora had difficulty even arranging a meeting for them, let alone carrying their case.

I can only come to the conclusion that one of the features of this whole situation is that we have a government which refuses to even go to the trouble of asking, with some firmness, that the railway officials postpone this decision for six or eight weeks, or until this parliament can consider appropriate legislation. I do not think that in these circumstances I can do anything else than carry back to my area, or anywhere else I go in the country, the feeling that we have here an indifferent regime with that kind of arrogance I have come to identify with the Liberal party. All I can do is say how much I regret that this is my conclusion about the attitude of this government regarding a problem which I feel should be aside and apart from any partisanship or politicking.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, when this item was called I was in the process of rising in my place for the purpose of making it clear that the usual undertaking was being given in connection with this interim supply motion,

[Mr. Fisher.]

that the passing of interim supply would not prejudice the position of hon. members. I want to make it clear now that this committee can assume that that undertaking has been given.

The question raised by the hon. member for Melville is an important one, and I think he presented an objective statement to this house about a problem which is of great concern to the House of Commons and to parliament generally. He referred to the difficult consequences of automation and its effect upon employees who will be dislocated because of changing procedures. He also mentioned the possible detrimental effect on communities involved.

I must contrast his method of presentation with that of the hon. member for Port Arthur, who raised two main points. Undoubtedly they are closely related, but I think he unnecessarily confused the two. He referred to the important problem of the dislocation of railway employees and the consequential effect on communities. He referred also to the immediate local difficulties at Nakina and related communities.

The hon. member for Port Arthur saw fit to commence his presentation by using some language with which I cannot associate myself. I do want to point out to the committee, though, that in my view at least this is not the method to approach a difficult problem like this if any appropriate solution is to be reached. It will be recalled that he started his remarks by referring to the management of Canadian National Railways as slimy.

Mr. Fisher: Just a minute. On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I intended to say and believe I said that there was a long history of a slimy trail in management-labour relations on the C.N.R. There is some difference.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I completely accept the hon. member's explanation of the difference, but I will let the record speak for itself. I respectfully suggest this is not the way to bring the facts before the committee, but that is his responsibility and not mine. I want to dissociate myself publicly from that kind of argument.

He then moved on in the next sentence or two to make a personal reference to the president. He did not say that his actions were in any way wrong, but he made a personal reference by speaking about the extent to which he said the president was

personally detested. Then he moved on to the acting minister and chose to refer to him as the equivalent of a telegraph operator. His opinion of the acting minister is, I am sure, of no concern to the committee. It certainly does not concern me in the least, because I think hon. members will make their own assessment in regard to these matters and I am content to leave it there. He referred later to the acting minister as a Charlie McCarthy.

Mr. Fisher: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, if the minister wants to take this line I hope he will listen a bit. What I suggested was that it seemed to me there were two possibilities for a minister of transport, and one to be more or less a funnel or telegraph operator or a Charlie McCarthy, the kind of arrangement where he would be standing at the shoulder of the president of the C.N.R. I do not mind the minister making these remarks, but I do not think he should get that far away from what I said.

Mr. McIlraith: If I may continue, Mr. Chairman, I did the hon. member the courtesy of not interrupting him at any point. Perhaps it is clear now that I should have done so as he went along, but in any event I did not. He then concluded his argument with a reference to the damnable arrogance of the Liberal party and proceeded to identify the president of the C.N.R. as the chosen instrument—I think that is the term he used—for expressing that attitude.

I want to invite the committee's attention to the fact that I think it would be quite impossible to find any arrogance or damnable arrogance in the treatment of this subject since it arose, and in my opinion the answers to questions on the orders of the day in the last number of days should have indicated that there is nothing but great concern over this matter.

Mr. Orlikow: What action?

Mr. McIlraith: If the hon. and impatient member for Winnipeg North could possess himself in patience and listen to other hon. members he might find it would be helpful to him in gaining knowledge about a great many subjects, including the standard of conduct expected of members of parliament. I do not mean to be severe with him, but surely a subject of this seriousness does not deserve interjections of that type.

In my opinion the matter at issue here involves a double barrelled problem. The system of railway divisional points approximately 125 miles apart was set up in the days of the coal burning engines. It has been thought fit by management to seek to change that system with the advent of diesel engines involving different methods of servicing and different requirements inherent in the technological improvements in the building of engines for hauling trains. I do not want to divert into a discussion of the matter at the moment, but I suppose it will be generally granted that there must be necessary changes arising from this development. Indeed, changes are desirable if the users of the railway services are to be properly served by this transportation medium.

Therefore the matter is one of making sure that the changes are brought about in a way that is not harmful but rather is beneficial to all the interests concerned, which in the final analysis really means the public throughout the country, rather than merely dealing with the problem from the point of view that there must be no change, period, and that anything that was established in the past must be left completely untouched. I would hope that would be common ground.

With regard to Nakina, when the initiation of the run-throughs was announced it was made clear by the railway company that it was proposed to introduce the run-throughs over a period of two years. That was made very clear, and it has always been clear. It was also made clear that the details of the method of introducing and bringing about the run-throughs were open for discussion. That was repeatedly made clear by the railway management both to the community representatives with whom they discussed this matter and to the railwaymen concerned. Again, because the situation did not seem to be fully appreciated, it was made clear to the men by letter of October 8 in the proper way through the appropriate union authorities. It was also requested in the letter that anyone who wished to make any proposals on this matter should put them forward.

I am only the acting minister. I regret that the minister is absent, although we are looking forward to his return in a very few days. However, when I first learned of the proposition that had been made by management to the men and to the community, and sensed from the delegation who came to see me that it had not been properly appreciated, I took the liberty of reiterating it to the delegation in, I think, rather clear fashion. This has always been the position of management, and so far no proposals or suggestions on this

point have been made. No advantage has been taken of the proposition put forward by the railway, either by the men or the community.

There is another facet about which I should speak. Very early in the course of events, as this difficulty was building up, the railway management put forward another proposition. It was that they would buy the homes of employees if these employees were moving from the town of Nakina. A method of valuation was established involving three valuators who would fix prices. One valuator was to be from the railway, one from the owners' group and an independent valuator was to be chosen by the other two. Hon. members will appreciate that the railway was going quite a long way, in that such a proposition is quite new. They put forward that proposition because of the particular nature or extent of the dependence of Nakina on the railway, and the history of the development of the town in relation to the railway. This has two consequences; it saves the individuals employed from any economic loss if they choose to move, and it also means that the community continues to receive its taxes on those houses.

Perhaps I should call it one o'clock.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose for the noon adjournment I had been explaining the proposal put forward by the management of the Canadian National Railways concerning the proposed run-through at Nakina. I indicated that the management had dealt with the individual employees of the railway company at Nakina, and had put forward a scheme for purchasing the homes of any of the employees who would wish to move from Nakina consequent upon the implementation of the run-through. Further, I indicated the basis of valuation, and said the company had also dealt with employees individually on arrangements regarding moving expenses.

I then went on to state that the company had indicated it was prepared to consider or discuss any counter-proposals which the men might have to advance, and that the plans for implementing the run-through were completely flexible, subject to one condition which apparently I did not mention before one o'clock, that the program of implementing the run-through be completed in two years, that is by the latter part of 1966.

I also indicated that the significance of these proposals and the invitation to put forward counter-proposals had not, in my view, been fully appreciated, and when I sensed this I made the point clear to the representatives of the community who attended as a delegation in Ottawa. The railway management also made this clear in a letter sent to the appropriate union officials involved, but as yet no counter-proposals have been made.

Mr. Churchill: A counter-proposal with regard to what?

Mr. McIlraith: A counter-proposal regarding the timing and the method of implementing the run-throughs; and there was one condition, namely that the run-throughs be fully implemented by two years from now.

Mr. Fisher: Surely the minister would acknowledge that a request was made for a six weeks postponement so that the matter could be discussed more fully?

Mr. McIlraith: I am coming to that point as I develop my remarks. No counter-proposal has yet been received in the context in which I have explained the invitation, and I think I have tried to make my remarks as accurate and precise as possible on this point. However, after the delegation attended in Ottawa last Friday, some time early this week a request was received from the community representatives asking for a postponement of the starting date of the implementation of the program.

A start was to be made on the program on October 25, just two days from now, but the community's request was limited to delaying the start of the program, and carried with it a plea that the whole matter be discussed. It did not carry with it any acquiescence in the whole program being implemented at the end of two years. Indeed the delegation made it quite clear they were completely opposed to the run-through, and that is where the matter stands now.

There are some other aspects of this matter on which I would like to speak for a moment or two. The hon. member for Port Arthur indicated to the committee—and I wish to draw the hon. member's attention specifically to this, so that I may not be accused of misinterpreting his remarks—that the action taken by the railway was probably, in his view, an illegal action, and he went on to tell the committee he would go into this area

and work with the railroaders there in meeting this problem by what would, possibly, be another illegal action, namely by a refusal to give service when the date comes. He went on to say that he might be penalized, and so might the men, for refusing to offer services on Saturday night and that it might be held a crime was being committed under the Criminal Code. Nevertheless, he observed, this was the situation to which long-suffering employees had been brought in the absence of a constructive approach by management to grave situations such as this.

I think I have accurately repeated what the hon. member said. I want now to draw his attention to this. He told us that in this difficult situation the approach by management had not been constructive. That is a legitimate argument and I have no objection whatever to such an argument being put forward. But here we have a member of the House of Commons indicating that he proposes to violate the law, and I want to ask him: What kind of constructive action is that? The people of this country have a representative in parliament who says he intends to act illegally and wilfully to break the law of this country. In other words he is not willing to use the methods which are open to him under the law but is asserting he will break the law. I would ask the hon. member to consider very carefully whether this is a helpful or constructive attitude to take in what is admittedly a difficult situation. Is this the kind of action which is likely to be helpful in bringing about a suitable solution to a problem of labour-management relations? Surely this is not the kind of example which should be given to employees of any company or to citizens of the country generally. I invite the hon. member to consider further what he said on this point and what his action should be.

Mr. Orlikow: Would the minister permit a question? I wonder if the hon. gentleman would consider suggesting to the C.N.R. that the company should live up to the spirit of section 182 of the Railway Act, which it has consistently violated over the years.

Mr. McIlraith: I do not agree that the railways have consistently, over the years, violated section 182 of the Railway Act. But I will deal with the points raised by the hon. member for Port Arthur—

Mr. Grégoire: They have violated the law in the province of Quebec, with their trucking system, and they are now before the courts; yet they continue their operations. The minister knows that.

Mr. McIlraith: I will deal with points arising out of section 182 of the Railway Act in a few moments to the extent I think it is proper to do so during a debate on interim supply. In any event, turning now to the Nakina aspect of this matter arising from the technological changes due to automation and so on, it would seem to me that this aspect is a matter for the management of the railroad—that this is something relating wholly to the operations of the company. It would seem that in dealings with particular employees—I have in mind now the more restricted aspect of the problem as it immediately affects the situation at Nakina—the railways, or management, have made responsible offers to the men—some might say they were generous—and that in this narrower aspect they have shown a most considerate attitude toward the human element. Having said this, I agree there is a larger aspect of the whole matter which was raised by the hon. member for Port Arthur, and I sought at the outset of my remarks to indicate that in my view there are two closely related, though none the less separate questions raised in his argument, one of them being the whole question of the consequences of automation as it affects railroad employees and communities consequent upon the implementation of run-throughs by railways. In this context the hon. member raised the possibility of amending section 182 of the Railway Act and he developed his argument by suggesting other means of dealing with this problem. This is a much larger and, I agree, a most important question. For my part I do not know whether it is appropriate for me in a debate on interim supply to seek to outline precisely what should be done with regard to this question. But I would point out to the committee that the Department of Labour has set up an advisory committee on technological changes composed of representatives of government and of labour and management, a committee which is now considering this type of problem in its broader aspect, and it must surely be apparent to all members that the subject matter which the hon. member had in mind is being dealt with.

There are several arguments one could make with regard to the precise method which might best be used for dealing with this problem. It has been suggested it should be dealt with under section 182 of the Railway Act. I must frankly say I am convinced this is not the best possible way of dealing with

it. Another suggestion is that general legislation should be enacted to deal with the whole question. Just how this would be done, I do not know. Another school of thought takes the view that this is a subject for negotiation and coverage by union agreements. In any event it is apparent one could develop various arguments about which method of dealing with this problem would be the most suitable. Since I am neither the Minister of Transport, who is directly responsible for railway matters, nor the Minister of Labour, I would consider it inappropriate, in an interim supply debate, to argue—and indeed I have some doubt at the moment as to my competence to argue—as to precisely which method should be followed.

It is clear—however—that the government is concerned with this problem and that a government advisory committee within one of the departments is dealing with it. I believe it is an able committee and it might well be it should concern itself more directly with this particular problem. I know it will be unsatisfactory to many hon. members if I say that the immediate aspect of the implementation of the run-through policy at Nakina is a matter for the management of the railway. I appreciate that this will be quite unsatisfactory. Yet I believe it would be less than fair to hon. members if I were to indicate otherwise.

That is the fact as I believe it to be. Goodness knows all concerned, notwithstanding the tremendous burden there is on the railways because of the restrictions we have placed on them, will agree they must be kept efficient. I believe all hon. members will agree that on aspects which are purely for management in the internal operations of the railways it is desirable that members do not interfere.

Unsatisfactory as that answer may appear superficially to be, I believe it is important that it be asserted, but at the same time that a solution be sought to the larger, major question. I assure hon. members that this subject matter has been receiving very careful consideration, although perhaps over too short a period of time. Every aspect of the matter debated today of direct concern to the railways was communicated immediately to them on every occasion. The other larger question is, of course, receiving continuing attention, as its nature warrants that it must.

Mr. Leboe: Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks I should like to make in connection with this important matter involving, as it does, the question of automation and technological advances. We cannot, of course, go into a lot of detail in this regard on a debate such as this, but it does seem to me that technological advances and automation are nothing new. However, government policy, particularly at the federal level, must be geared to take care of the circumstances that arise out of these technological changes and automation, and it seems to me we are lagging far behind in this regard.

I do not think we should be afraid of technological advances and automation. As a matter of fact we should welcome anything which will raise the standard of living of all our peoples. I am reminded of the speech made by the Minister of Labour, which was quite fully covered on a television program last night, in which he regretted that in many parts of Canada today people are in abject poverty. Here we find we are moving into a situation which will add to the distress of the people in the areas concerned because we have failed to go ahead with our plans to take care of situations which arise owing to technological advances and automation.

To the people who are affected this is a very serious matter. The minister has said that the railway company has agreed to buy the homes of these individuals. They might buy the houses of the individuals but they cannot buy the homes, because a home is more than just a place to live in. The association of a community is part of home life, and there is more to that than just buying the house of an individual or buying his assets. Surely this step should only take place under certain conditions, and there are a lot of ways in which this disagreeable move can be made less agonizing if the proper steps at the proper time are taken.

According to the minister, the over-all plan is to get these changes through by 1966. It would seem to me that with the moves which have been made to get some action on section 182 of the Railway Act over the years, certainly somebody has slipped up somewhere when there comes to light a situation where plans have been made to eliminate by 1966 many of these small places through action taken by the railways. I am one of those people who believe that we should never fear change or be afraid to move along; but at the same time where human beings and families are involved I think we should certainly take a much more serious look at the implications of such moves.

At this point I think I should say that I believe that a postponement of the railway's

plan is absolutely necessary. I think we must allow for further consideration of this particular case. There is no doubt at all in my mind that for the efficiency of the railroad these changes are good and I think they must come. It has been the practice of the railways over the years to make these changes at the same time as they make major changes in their time tables. Having this in mind it seems to me that there will be no great hardship in the offing either to the railroad or to anyone else if this proposed change was left over until next spring when the time tables of the railway companies are changed again. There are summer and winter schedules, and as I say it has been the practice of the railway companies to make most of their changes at the same time as they make the change from summer to winter schedules or winter to summer schedules.

I believe the management of the railway could easily bring about a discussion of this matter, such as we are having in this committee today, so as to bring the whole business into focus. I can understand that a businessman who is running a railway and having to deal with government, with parliament and with population, would demand that drastic action be taken where there is a lack of initiative on the part of the government. I suggest to hon. members that the railway company has been forced into taking this drastic action in order to focus attention on the problem. Certainly we have not received from the government any indication that the action necessary to forestall the inconvenience and hardship which is going to be caused the people affected will be taken. Therefore I would urge the government to take a very serious and hard look at this whole situation, to do what they can to influence the railways to postpone the action contemplated in these run-throughs and to find some real solution to the problem.

The minister says he is not certain whether section 182 should be changed. I agree that there are other types of business, occupations and operations facing the same problem with which we are confronted here, and perhaps section 182 of the Railway Act is not the place to make this sort of change. If this is not the place to make the changes let us move on and make changes where they should be made, so that this kind of thing can be taken care of whether it be in respect of mining, farming in dried out areas or railways and other services. Let us move in a direction which will lead to some permanent solution to the problem with which we are faced in respect of displaced persons as a result of automation and technological advances.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, while the minister was speaking before our luncheon adjournment he took exception to some interjections I made in his speech and in the speech of the hon. member for Port Arthur. Having heard the minister speak since lunch time I not only have no apology to make, but I wish my interjections had been made in a stronger vein.

I do not know why the minister took exception to the fact the hon. member for Port Arthur put the responsibility for what is taking place at Nakina directly on the shoulders of the president of the C.N.R. and the government. Surely the president of the C.N.R. must accept responsibility for everything the C.N.R. has done, whether he, a vice president or an official at Nakina issued the orders. Surely the president is responsible for the actions taken by the C.N.R., whether they are right or wrong. Certainly the hon. member for Port Arthur need not feel that he should explain or apologize for what he said about Mr. Gordon. If the actions contemplated by the C.N.R. this week end are wrong in principle and will adversely affect the people of Nakina, surely the government must accept responsibility.

We are not discussing this issue only because of the adverse effects it will have on a small town in northwestern Ontario, in spite of the fact that the town will be almost wiped out. We are discussing this situation because it is the first change of a series which undoubtedly the C.N.R. contemplate.

Let me make it clear that neither I, any other member of this party, nor perhaps any member of this house, objects to the C.N.R.'s actions and necessary steps to make it as efficient as possible, enabling it to move passenger and freight traffic as economically as possible to compete with other forms of transportation. On the other hand, we do have a right to expect the government and the C.N.R. to give some thought to the costs involved. Included in those costs must be considered the disruption of the lives of the many people who are not being asked to sacrifice only a few hundreds or thousands of dollars, but their whole way of life.

For the past two or three years members of the present government have been travelling from one end of Canada to the other talking about the importance of planning,

and suggesting that this country will not develop in full the use of its material and manpower resources without intelligent planning. The Minister of Labour was in Hamilton last night talking about the benefits of automation, and what automation could do for Canada if we only had the intelligence to use it properly. Not so many months ago the Minister of Forestry, at a conference in Toronto, attended by a number of members of parliament, referred to the benefits of planning and direction by the federal government in co-operation with provincial and municipal governments. Indeed that minister went so far as to refer to himself, and this is often considered to be a dirty word, as a socialist. I do not know how he fits in with the ideas expressed by the Minister of Transport, or that great exponent of free enterprise, the Minister of Industry. That is the kind of talk regarding planning we have heard from one end of Canada to the other.

The present situation provides a concrete test, rather than a test of theory, as far as efficiency of operation is concerned. Surely the C.N.R. is not a company that can exercise the rights of free enterprise, to run its business in any way it sees fit which will be only to the greatest advantage of its shareholders. This is a company owned and operated by and for the people of Canada. This company was not built to make money, but was built to meet a political situation in Canada, to provide coast to coast transportation. This is a company which has received and continues to receive massive subsidies from the people of Canada. These subsidies run in the neighbourhood of hundreds of millions of dollars. Every year this company comes to the parliament of Canada asking for millions of dollars to help meet its deficits. If we pass the railway legislation proposed ostensibly to implement the recommendations of the MacPherson report this company will receive further hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidies.

This company has decided that in order to be more efficient the workers of a small town in northwestern Ontario will have to be moved. What is this great planning about which the acting minister spoke so glowingly today? The company has indicated that it is willing to make contributions toward the purchase of the homes to be vacated by these people. I do not think the hon. member for Port Arthur was scathing enough in his remarks about the Liberal party, if the pending action by the C.N.R. is an example of its thinking on planning.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

The provincial department of education recently built a high school in the area of Nakina at a substantial cost, with the understanding that a number of students from Nakina would attend that school. The provincial government spent a substantial amount of money to build a paved highway into Nakina five or six years ago. All that money will be going down the drain because these services will be completely useless with the run-throughs which the C.N.R. has ordered go into effect next week end. That town will virtually become a ghost town.

All these facts have been ignored by the acting minister. I should not expect anything more because he is typical of the do nothing, stand pat, business as usual Liberals who really run the show. Why are we concerned in this regard? We are concerned because we realize this is only the first step. I had a telephone conversation with an individual in Winnipeg last evening as a result of which I am sure that the step to be taken at Nakina this week end is only a first step in a program of this kind. In the very near future major changes affecting the Winnipeg area will take place. Many workers in the past six years have been shifted from Sioux Lookout and Redditt to Winnipeg. Soon they will be shifted again from Winnipeg to areas further west, if the projected plans of the C.P.R. in respect of run-throughs are carried out. These individuals, who in the last six years were shifted from western Ontario to Winnipeg, will again have to move from Winnipeg to somewhere in Saskatchewan and work on services from Saskatchewan back to Winnipeg. I do not know whether the C.N.R. will think them important enough to compensate them for their homes in Winnipeg. Probably they will not, because this is the first time they have ever made such an offer and I am sure they did not do so voluntarily, or with very good grace. So, Mr. Chairman, for the minister to say that this is not a very important or big matter is for him simply to beg the issue.

The minister said that he advised the railway unions and these people to make a counter-proposal. How ridiculous can you be, Mr. Chairman? This problem cannot be solved in Nakina or Wainwright. Railway workers from one end of Canada to the other are concerned and upset because they know what has happened in the last 15 years and they know that the tremendous changes which have taken place are going to continue. You cannot expect the people in Nakina or Wainwright or their local or national unions to

work out a plan to apply to only these two places.

Surely if the government really believes in what it has said about planning so eloquently, so often and in so many places, the government ought to be urging, in fact directing the management of the C.N.R. not simply to tell the railway workers and their unions what is going to happen on Sunday in Nakina and Wainwright but to tell them what their plans are for the next five or ten years. Let railway management work out a national plan in co-operation with the railway workers and their unions.

I suggest to members of the committee there is not a single railway worker or a single railway union that does not know about and agree with the idea that the railways have to be modernized and have to change their methods of operation, but the workers do not want to carry the whole burden and they should not be expected to do so. It behooves the management of the C.N.R. and the C.P.R. as well as the government of Canada to work out plans for an orderly transition.

The acting minister says today, as the Minister of Transport said on September 14 when we discussed his estimates for one day, that the department is not satisfied that section 182 of the Railway Act is the proper method by which to protect the rights of the railway workers. The railway workers and their unions are not very concerned about what section of the Railway Act is used, whether it is section 182 or another section or whether entirely new legislation is adopted, but they are tired of the excuses that have been made year by year by railway management and by the government. They want action.

The railway workers are not opposed to the principles and recommendations of the MacPherson report. They are not opposed to reorganization and rationalization of the railways. They are not opposed to the railways being put into a position where they will be able to compete fairly with all other methods of transportation. But they are fed up with the idea prevalent in railway management, which I must say it seemed to me the acting minister expounded very well for railway management, that everything must be done to modernize and rationalize the railways, but nothing can be done to protect the rights of the railway workers, to make sure that there is an orderly transition and that people who have worked for the railway for 10, 15 or 20 years are not thrown on the scrap heap.

I am not going to prolong the debate at this time. However, if the government persists in ignoring and sloughing off the railway workers with double talk when they ask for guarantees in the proposed railway legislation so that they will not be treated in the future as they have been in the past, if the government persists in saying that section 182 is not the right section but they do not know what is, if the government says again what the Minister of Transport said to me on September 14, that the only way this matter can be handled is in the over-all method of handling the problem of automation through setting up a technical committee in the Department of Labour with really no power to do anything, then I want to warn the acting minister right now that it will be a long, long time before the proposed railway legislation will pass, if it ever does. The government is going to have to do a great deal better than it has or it will not get the co-operation of the house in passing that legislation.

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): Mr. Chairman, I must say I listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Melville regarding run-throughs and the many people who will be affected. I also listened with interest to the hon. member for Port Arthur who covered the subject extensively. One thing that gives me great concern is Bill No. C-120 and the question of rail line abandonment. In the railway committee I put questions to the president of the Canadian National Railways about this matter. I think it is most unjust for the C.N.R. to talk about rail line abandonment before it has fulfilled its obligations.

I remember quite well when the Shellbrook-Turtleford line was constructed and how the department of colonization of the C.N.R. went into the area and encouraged homesteaders to settle there and develop the country. I have seen how Canadian National Railways has fallen down on its part of the bargain over the years by never completing this line. It now claims that the line does not pay, but the fact is it has not lived up to its responsibility to complete the gap from Frenchman Butte to Heinsburg, Alberta. It should keep in mind those people who have spent the greater part of their lives in developing this area because the fact is that it is the mismanagement of the Canadian National which has made it impossible for the line to be a paying one, simply because

of the failure to complete the gap of 38 miles. If this were done we would have a main route that would serve northern Alberta including the salt mines at Heinsburg. There would be a direct run from Winnipeg through Prince Albert and North Battleford and the line could very easily be made to pay. But the C.N.R. has this line on its list for abandonment. In talking about abandonment it is betraying those people who went in there and developed that region. The C.N.R. has not lived up to its part of the bargain. If it had done so the line would have paid but it has failed to fill this gap of 38 miles across level country.

If the C.N.R. would take stock of its own failures with regard to some of the lines it is talking about abandoning, I think there would be a different feeling in western Canada. The people in this area are very much concerned because they settled there, established homes, built up fine farms and raised their families. But now they find they are going to be without a rail line of any kind and in many cases they will be 75 to 100 miles away from the nearest rail point. The people of western Canada are very much concerned about these things.

In another case the C.N.R. graded the right of way from St. Walburg to Cold Lake and then did not lay the steel. There the right of way stands today, overgrown with trees. This lack of faith on the part of the Canadian National, this betrayal of many settlements in western Canada, is something that should be considered before we allow the Canadian National to say they are going to pull up this track. The railway should be made to live up to its responsibilities to the settlers, merchants and businessmen all along this line which the Canadian National is talking of abandoning.

These are some of the things to which the railway should give a close look, and to which we as legislators of this country should give a close look. I questioned Mr. Gordon in the railways committee with regard to this. He admitted that the salt mine was still there, but the settlers were still there, and he admitted the railway had betrayed them by allowing them to go in and settle these farmlands, then talk about abandonment. The possibilities are still there, but there is no talk of filling in the gap in order to make this a paying line so that it would be unnecessary to talk about abandonment.

I should like to touch upon one more topic which relates to a misunderstanding between both railway lines. I believe the Canadian Pacific was given running rights over the Canadian National from Prince Rupert to Debolt to complete the 90 miles to Debolt and tap the wealth of the Meadow Lake district. There it sits, with no hint of any extension because the railway has already tapped the wealth of the area, but they have deprived the people of Pierceland, Goodsoil and Cold Lake of access to a railway line. The Canadian National was forced to give the Canadian Pacific running rights on the 90 miles of track, and the Canadian Pacific only had to build 90 miles of track to tap the whole wealth of the Meadow Lake country.

These are some of the things at which I think this government should look before any such abandonment should be allowed. One knows very well that when the Canadian National had this line built to Debolt they were the ones who should have had the opportunity of tapping the Meadow Lake country. I am sure they could have made the line pay very easily. These are the things at which I feel we should have a close look before considering Bill No. C-120. We should consider the completion of these gaps that have resulted from mismanagement by the railways before the railways are allowed to go further in their betrayal of these people. When we stop to think that there is merely 38 miles of line to be completed between Frenchman Butte and Heinsburg to tap the wealth of that land and the salt mine in that area, then I believe the people in the area are entitled to have the line of which they have been deprived for many years. We should take another look at the line from St. Walburg to Pierceland, and the railways should get their heads together regarding running rights. Why should the Canadian Pacific have running rights over this track when they only need to build 90 miles of track to tap the wealth of the Meadow Lake country. They are leaving the people in the Goodsoil area with no chance of being any closer to a railway unless we make the railways sit down and talk some common sense before they talk about rail line abandonment.

Mr. Churchill: I should like to ask the minister one or two questions. I understood him to say that a delegation had waited upon him and had put forward a proposal for postponement of the action which is about to take effect at Nakina at midnight on Saturday, I believe. What was the response to

that request by the minister, and what was the response to that request by the management of Canadian National?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, when the delegation presented its main case it consisted of opposition to any run-throughs at any time. There was quite a lengthy discussion and interview lasting two hours or two and a half hours on the first occasion. The second occasion was much shorter. Immediately following that, and arising out of the discussion—I am not sure of the date—they then brought forward a request for a postponement. This was a request for a postponement, not a counter-proposal to the one put forward by the railways. It did not involve any recognition or tentative admission that run-throughs would be agreed to at any time. This request, which was by itself, was immediately transmitted to the railway company. The railway management replied that they would consider it. There have been several discussions by the railway management. After discussion back and forth the railway has taken the stand that they do not think this partial implementation of the run-through on October 25, which is the main point discussed today, should be delayed. They do not believe it is appropriate to delay it.

Mr. Churchill: In other words, the request for a postponement was denied. What does the minister mean by "partial implementation of the run-through"?

Mr. McIlraith: Well, I do not have the precise data on the Nakina run-through, but it is to be implemented generally by making it applicable to certain railway workers or certain trains only. Perhaps I could express it this way, although there is some danger in doing it, that out of a number of employees, say 90 employees, it would affect about 20 at the moment.

Mr. Churchill: On the 25th; and then when would the others be affected?

Mr. McIlraith: During the next two years—a gradual process during the next two years.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask the minister another question? When was formal notice given by the railway management to the Canadian National employees?

Mr. McIlraith: I cannot give that date, I do not have it. I notice that the brief presented by the community representatives refers to a discussion that took place in May of 1964. There are many references in that brief. In any event, there was a specific discussion of this on September 18, 1964. I do not know on what precise date formal notice was given.

Mr. Churchill: Is the minister satisfied that the railway management has observed the appropriate sections in the Montreal agreement of May, 1926?

Mr. McIlraith: I am not familiar with the Montreal agreement. The first time it was mentioned in any of these discussions was today. It is a new agreement to me, and I immediately drew it to the attention of my officials the first time it was mentioned. I am satisfied all the other agreements have been fully observed. In addition there has been a great deal done that has not been required in law to be done. I am satisfied, notwithstanding some of the sharp criticism by hon. members today, about the generosity, if you like, of the offer to purchase homes from any of the men who wished to move, on the basis of a valuation of them and the implication of that in relation to the tax rolls of the community. I am not aware of any, and I do not believe any criticism has been offered of the method of valuation or anything like that. It has been a refusal to accept the proposition that run-throughs can be implemented that has been the core of the problem.

Mr. Churchill: Well, I will refer to some of these matters in a few minutes. The subject introduced today by the hon. member for Melville and the hon. member for Port Arthur is of major importance, and others who have spoken have drawn our attention to the fact that more instances like this are likely to occur in the near future. It is advisable for the committee to take cognizance of this situation. Perhaps some time during the course of this afternoon we may persuade the minister to communicate directly with the head of the C.N.R. and indicate to him the opinion expressed by members of parliament, suggesting a postponement of his proposed action would be very much in order so that further attention could be given to the problem and the wishes of the people of the community affected taken into consideration.

I do not see anything wrong in postponing an action such as this which, in its final effect, will be disruptive of the life of the community. We in this country are not opposed to modernizing our methods of transport. We have a progressive country and we want to proceed with many of these things. Everyone appreciates that the age of automation is crowding us closely, that disruption of the activities of many people is inevitable, but

at the same time we think the blow should be eased as much as possible.

We have some experience in matters of this sort. A few years ago when I had some responsibility for uranium we negotiated an agreement with the United States on the basis of a stretch out program, so that the mining communities would receive another two, three or four years life before the shift occurred. The blow was eased a little bit, and there was not the sudden chop off in 1962 that was foreseen at the beginning of the negotiations.

The minister is familiar with the disruption of the T.C.A. overhaul maintenance base in Winnipeg. He knows the efforts he and his colleagues have made to stretch out the life of that base. I hoped that the base would not be transferred, but at the very least a stretch out program is essential when the lives of people are affected.

With such experience behind us why can the management of C.N.R. not adopt that principle? The minister has said the management must be given freedom to run its own affairs. Everyone is familiar with the answers we get to questions about crown corporations. A minister replies, "I will direct the attention of the crown corporation to the hon. member's observation or question." We get this all the time with the C.B.C., and over the years we have had the same experience with the C.N.R.

When crown corporations are dependant upon parliament for grants of money, and for modification of legislation that affects their operations, there must be a *quid pro quo*. We are justified in saying, "In return for the things we are doing for you, you must do something for us and our constituents, because we are dealing directly with the lives of people." The problem before us this afternoon affects the lives of people in a community that has been thriving for some considerable time.

On September 14, as recorded at page 7982 of *Hansard* for that date, the Minister of Transport expounded the philosophy that should prevail, and I quote:

> It is our view that it is of great importance that we should give the railways an opportunity to operate as efficiently and as economically as possible and avoid adding unduly to fixed charges that are imposed upon the taxpayers and that inevitably have to be paid for and are therefore a minus factor in the economy. At the same time we must remember that the railways are large employers of labour; that the interests of the employees of the railways, our fellow citizens, must not be overlooked, and that, though change is essential in this field if the railways are to compete and receive a reasonable share of the traffic which will enable them to maintain their services out of their revenues, we must at the same time see that we do not, because of changes for which they have no responsibility whatsoever, visit hardships that are not reasonable and bearable upon a large section of the Canadian population.

That was a good expression of the philosophy that should be kept in mind when we are dealing with this type of problem. We should strive for economy and greater efficiency, but not at the expense of the people operating in the industry. Without people an industry just does not exist. It finally comes down to the human factor, and sometimes we tend to overlook the fact that the employee is a vital segment of industrial development. The employees of the railways are absolutely essential and their interests must be protected. As changes occur, those changes should be stretched out.

I question whether the management of the C.N.R. has lived up to an agreement which it signed on May 1, 1926. I am informed this agreement was signed by a representative of the C.N.R. and by representatives of the brotherhood of locomotive engineers and of the brotherhood of locomotive firemen and enginemen. It is known as the Montreal agreement, and I am told has been effective ever since. Section 9 of it reads as follows:

> Nothing in this agreement shall be taken to permit the company without prior conference with representatives of the employees to change existing home terminal stations of the employees affected thereby—

The action which it is proposed to take tomorrow interferes with that provision. It will change the existing home terminal station of the C.N.R. employees living in Nakina, and I ask the minister whether a prior conference took place between the C.N.R. management and the representatives of the two brotherhoods who were party to this agreement?

A few minutes ago the minister said he did not have the terms of the Montreal agreement in front of him.

Section 10 reads as follows:

> This agreement will become effective when signed by the representatives of the Canadian National Railways, the brotherhood of engineers and the brotherhood of locomotive firemen and enginemen and shall continue in effect until 30 days notice of a desired change is given by either of the parties to the other.

I take it there are two requirements here —consultation and then formal notification from officials to officials, that is, from management to officials of the brotherhood, and it has not been clear this afternoon whether or not these two steps were taken. The suggestion has been left with us that unilateral

action was taken by the management of the C.N.R. If this is the case I suggest to the minister that an immediate phone call should be put through to the head of the C.N.R. with a recommendation that a postponement should take effect and that the status quo should remain tomorrow night. Then let the minister and railway management and the representatives of the brotherhoods get together and discuss whether or not this agreement of 1926 has been abrogated, and reach some conclusion with regard to it. I think a definite responsibility rests on the minister in this regard. I am making no charges. I am asking for information. But it has been suggested to me that the steps to which I have referred, the steps contained in the agreement, have not been carried out. Parliament should know. If those steps have, indeed, been carried out, then the management of C.N.R. would not be under attack on that ground. If they have not been carried out, the management of the C.N.R. would, I think, have to give an accounting to parliament. We have some responsibility to the people of Canada for the way in which the railways are operated, and this is one matter I should like to see cleared up. Until it has been cleared up, I suggest the only reasonable approach is to postpone the action proposed tomorrow night.

I do not think the minister can put us off by saying: This is no concern of ours; it is up to management to carry on its affairs and we should not interfere. I say the management of C.N.R. should tell parliament what it is up to. I refer again to the statement by the Minister of Transport which I read a few minutes ago, the statement which says that hardships or burdens which are not reasonable should not be imposed upon a large section of the Canadian population.

Why this great haste with regard to the operation at Nakina? Why cannot suitable notice be given? Why cannot there be a stretch out program as suggested by the hon. member who spoke before me? Why cannot this operation be postponed until the spring of the year? How much difference would this make to the railway? Would it seriously inconvenience the railway? I doubt that very much. Will the people directly concerned be seriously inconvenienced, now that we are approaching the winter season? I think this is likely, and these are factors which I hope the minister will taken into account.

Other matters affecting the railways will be before parliament soon. Legislation concerning railway line abandonment to permit greater economy and efficiency of operation will be a major subject for discussion. The railways will be expecting concessions and benefits as a result of the actions of parliament. In return we must say to them: Your employees and their families must be given a fair break. This is a good time to start, right now with regard to the problems which have come to our attention today. Let the management of the C.N.R. say right out: We will postpone our proposed change in Nakina, and subsequently give to the Minister of Transport, or to the acting minister, and through him to parliament, our proposals over a long period of time—so that parliament shall not be faced with isolated cases such as the one with which we are dealing today, but will have the general picture of what is proposed as a result of automation and the various changes considered necessary for efficient operation.

Are we to be faced next month with a similar situation in some other railway centre, and then in January with another and in February with yet another? Why can we not have the whole plan put in front of us so that we may understand the general picture. And if railway management thinks we are presently unsympathetic, this is the way to cure that attitude. Give us the information, and then we shall be able to deal with these matters on the basis of accurate knowledge. We should not be faced with such a situation as occurred today—a motion for adjournment of the house on a matter of urgent public importance, raised because of a proposed action by railway management affecting the lives of people in Nakina whose protests had apparently been rejected. What recourse is open to them? Their only recourse is to appeal to members of parliament to raise the matter in the house, to bring it to the attention of the public and to urge the government to take some action.

This is, of course, what has happened today. We just happened to be dealing with interim supply when the subject could be discussed. May I say, in conclusion, that the minister himself is not unfamiliar with the activities of the government in connection with the railways, and employees of the railways, at various times over the years when strikes have occurred or when strikes have been threatened. The government has had to intervene. It has been obliged to consult and confer with representatives of both employers and labour. The minister has, I think, been through this process himself in the past. He will certainly remember the special session of 1950. I have vivid recollec-

tions of being up all night long, when we were in office, until 4 a.m. in the east block conferring with management and representatives of labour with regard to a proposed rail strike.

The government cannot avoid becoming involved in these problems which affect the citizens of this country. Why not take steps to head off trouble before it occurs? In this particular instance, action taken now might well forestall trouble later, though of course I do not know what other steps may be taken by those concerned. But in order to avoid a protracted dispute—and I gather this might happen from what I have heard today—is this not an opportunity for the minister to take appropriate action immediately, to contact the head of the C.N.R., apprise him of the feeling of members of parliament, and to say to him: "Cannot we get a postponement of this?" Let us get all the facts assembled, if we have not already got them at our disposal, and see whether this matter cannot be cleared away without unnecessarily stirring up a hornet's nest. The minister can say to the head of the C.N.R.: "You are waiting impatiently for railway legislation to go through this house. If you proceed with this action you are not going to put the members of the House of Commons in the proper frame of mind to meet some of your requests in the future." I do not suggest that as a threat, but we are all human beings and we understand how these things operate. It is a *quid pro quo*. I make one final request to the minister to do his level best to get a postponement of the situation at Nakina.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, I shall just take a few moments of the time of the committee to speak on this subject of railways. First of all, I should say, in general reference to rail abandonment, that while in some circumstances conditions certainly exist where rail abandonment cannot be avoided and is in the national interest, it has always seemed to me that wholesale abandonment of rail lines indicates a lack of faith on the part of the railways in the future of this country. The fact that our growing population is now nearing 20 million means that in the future in all these areas more rail service will be required because these people will provide more rail traffic than has been the case in the past.

My primary purpose in rising this afternoon, however, is to discuss the question of the attitude of the Canadian Pacific Railway with reference to their policy of curtailing passenger service, specifically as it applies to service by dayliners into and from the city of Halifax through the Dominion Atlantic run via the Annapolis valley to Yarmouth. As members of this committee will know, earlier this week the board of transport commissioners intervened to rule that the proposed curtailment of such service, which would have cut down the number of dayliners and the hours of service in that area for residents of the valley coming into and out of the city of Halifax, should be postponed until public hearings on the matter could be held. This occurred only after there had been widespread public protest. I am confident that when public hearings are held on this matter there will be very strong submissions, and well reasoned ones, against the curtailment of this service.

The only point upon which I wish to comment this afternoon is the fact that it appears to me, using this instance in Nova Scotia as an example, that the Canadian Pacific Railway is interested in getting out of passenger traffic rather than trying to make it pay, and that they are prepared to use whatever guise is necessary to make some of their runs unprofitable so that they can be abandoned. I can come to no other conclusion as a result of what is being done with this dayliner service in Nova Scotia.

Despite the fact that from Hants county and Kings county, which are areas served by the dayliner, as well as from other surrounding counties such as Lunenburg and Colchester, over 1,000 people drive their cars in all types of weather to commute to work in Halifax every day, people who would much sooner travel, particularly in the cold weather, in the comfort of an efficient commuter service, and despite the fact that these dayliners are very comfortable and satisfactory to the people who do have occasion to travel on them, the railway has never found it worth while to attempt to run dayliners during hours which would serve the commuting public in any manner, shape or form.

To give an example, the city of Kentville is about 69 miles from Halifax. All this summer and fall the dayliner service has been leaving Kentville in the mornings at something like 8.30 a.m. and arriving at Halifax at a quarter to eleven daylight time, which is the time in force in Nova Scotia at this time of year. I think you can readily see, Mr. Chairman, that this service cannot attract any but those who wish to travel in leisure at whatever hour they like and who are not working on that day. Now, if that train were

to leave Kentville at 6.45 in the morning and arrive in Halifax at a quarter to nine, although that might be a little late for people in the labouring class who start work at eight o'clock it nevertheless would be of great service to those who work in offices, banks, etc. who start work at nine o'clock in the morning. It does not take a great brain to see that the railway company could have much more in the way of traffic on that train if that were the case.

In addition, the train which leaves the city to go back to Kentville in the evening, the one they want to take off, has been leaving Halifax at a quarter to seven in the evening and arriving at Kentville a couple of hours later after passing through Windsor, Hantsport, Wolfville and other towns. I think it is obvious that if this service left downtown Halifax at, say, ten after five in the evening and made a stop on the outskirts of the city, particularly during the winter months, there would be a lot of people who would travel on the train.

However, I do not mean to suggest that at the present time this train travels empty or that the C.P.R.-D.A.R. application to curtail this service is justified. In the last couple of weeks and while this matter has been under consideration I have made a point of travelling on the train twice. I know that on a Saturday night coming from Halifax—I presume most people who leave the city for the week end leave on the Friday night—there were 38 people on board, which I am told is more than ample to justify its operation. On the week ends the service between Halifax and Kentville is very crowded. Acadia University students, and people at other educational institutions such as King's College, Edgehill and Haligonians going to the valley for one purpose or another, have patronized the service to the point that it has been extremely crowded at week ends. On another occasion during the past two weeks I travelled on the train when there were 140 people on board and I had to stand the whole way from Kentville to Halifax. I think this is a demonstration of the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway is interested only in getting out of the trouble of running passenger service.

Mind you, they are still talking of curtailment despite the fact that they are particularly busy on week ends and could make what I would call a continuous service at week ends when it pays handsomely. They arrange this service throughout the week and bring about a situation where, if a person goes out of or into the city he has no alternative but to stay overnight at his destination and return the next day. This type of commuter service could, I think, be a very efficient and profitable one if ran at the proper hours.

I think there is a responsibility somewhere to provide an efficient service. If the railways are not going to accept the proper responsibility, then it is the responsibility of some level of government—and I know of no other government than the one here—to work in co-operation with municipal officials in areas where rail service is run as part of a commuter service and is the only efficient commuter service serving the area concerned. The railways should consider the interest of the people in the cities. So much for the situation at Halifax.

I have brought this matter up this afternoon so that it receives some public attention before the hearings to which I have referred are held on this proposed rail curtailment, either later in the fall or early in the new year. I think the railways of this country are the foundation of our national existence.

The only other matter regarding the new rail legislation on which I should like to comment at this time is this. I hope I will be reassured by the officials of the government that when this legislation does reach the committee stage for consideration it will contain protection for the maritime interests, and the maritime interests I might add will not be protected as a result of leaving the Maritime Freight Rates Assistance Act as it is. That act, as some hon. members are aware, applies only to domestic cargoes. We are still faced with problems in respect of export and import cargo rates, if the ports of Saint John and Halifax are to remain in business, and that is something I am sure will be discussed in coming days.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Regan: Always.

Mr. MacInnis: To avoid the necessity of making a correction in *Hansard* on Monday, would the hon. member when he is checking his speech change his reference to the cities of Windsor, Wolfville and Kentville?

Mr. Regan: I should have been very happy to make a similar generous appellation with regard to Glace Bay, and since the hon. mem-

ber has made reference to the correction, those are incorporated towns, not cities.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, I should first like to congratulate the hon. member for Port Arthur and the hon. member for Melville for referring in the first instance to this matter. The fact that we have to discuss it during our consideration of interim supply is, of course, one of those things that happen in parliament. I am not going to refer to a decision that was made in this house today, particularly because I noted the chairman looking in my direction as soon as I referred to it, but I do not think there is any more important matter to be discussed by the members of the House of Commons at the present time than the subject we have been considering, and particularly its application to Nakina.

The railroad development that has taken place in this country is one of the most dramatic stories in Canadian history, as well as one of the most controversial. The minister today in his quiet way made some devastating revelations. After all, the matter that has been discussed is part of a larger problem in respect of automation, not only as it affects railways in this country, but as it affects other industry. The remarks placed on the record today indicate some lack of action and appreciation by those who sit opposite and who are charged with the responsibility of dealing with these matters. Railroad development in this country called together not only those men who formed the working unit of our railways, but the necessary resources to make our national railways system the utility it is today.

What has been suggested by the management of the C.N.R. in respect of Nakina is a modification of long term plans which were placed not only before the people of the various communities concerned, but the employees who were taken on as part of this organization. When we consider the extent to which the proposed action will affect many of these employees and communities, and the absolute lack of consideration for those who will ultimately be squeezed out, we cannot help but think that the House of Commons at this time could serve no better purpose than discussing this matter and impressing upon the government and the minister their responsibilities in this regard.

It has been said today that this matter is not directly part of the administrative responsibility of the ministry or government. That may be true in a narrow sense, but every one of us will agree that transportation and railway problems, and problems associated with automation, must be of immediate concern to the ministry which sits in those seats across the way.

There are those individuals who will say that the railway officials have indicated to some that they will do certain things to help lessen the load, but there are others who ultimately will be squeezed out by this contemplated action. I have yet to note any contemplated action which will protect their interests in this matter.

When we consider interim supply we usually look for a grievance as the subject matter of our speeches. Today we did not have to look very far. Many things could have been referred to, but I think it is fitting today that we are discussing this subject which is related not only to personnel abandonment, which is one of the real problems facing the country today, but also to contemplated rail line abandonment. Without getting into a discussion of that aspect of the situation, as has been indicated by several members here today parliament itself should give an indication to the officials of the railways of the determination that the rights and privileges of their employees will not be forgotten. Nor will the future and welfare of the various communities concerned with rail line abandonments be forgotten.

We are told by the minister that there is complete flexibility, but it seems to me there is only flexibility so long as the C.N.R. is allowed to proceed on its chosen path, a path which the minister pointed out today is one which allows certain employees to bump others along the line. This is a procedure which will within less than two years affect the great percentage of the population of the town of Nakina.

The consequence of automation is one of the problems that everyone in the House of Commons and across this country is thinking about today. Every one of us realizes that with new techniques developed there will have to be a readjustment of our working force. We realize at the same time that in any readjustment, not only the companies involved but the government should move very carefully. What is taking place is an upheaval of our entire industrial process in Canada. With such an upheaval most families will necessarily find themselves in a new environment. The question we must ask at this time, and it has been asked by members of the opposition today, is whether or not those directly concerned and

affected by the action contemplated will indeed suffer a measure of inconvenience and loss out of proportion to what any citizen should be asked to shoulder.

The minister referred to the law. May I say to him that there is a law known as the law of common sense, and perhaps that is the kind of law that should govern in a case such as the one under consideration at the present time. A few months delay in this matter is of no great consequence to the C.N.R. but it is of great consequence to the men and their families, particularly having in mind, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, the season of the year when the railway proposes to take this action. Indeed, sir, one would almost think that the management of the railway has forgotten entirely the inconvenience that will be suffered by their employees.

I do not want to take any more of the time of the committee this afternoon. I hope the minister will impress upon the officials of the C.N.R., particularly the president, the necessity for taking action to alleviate this situation, and I look forward to an announcement along that line, at least to the effect that the minister has tried. After the debate we have had today I suggest we have every right to expect that the minister should try to do something in this connection even at this late hour.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to express my complete support of the protests and pleas put before the house and the minister by the dozen or so members who have dealt with the proposals of Canadian National Railways, which will affect the lives of a good many of its employees and the welfare of certain communities. There is no necessity for me to repeat what they have so eloquently, forcefully and in some instances lividly stated.

I also want to express my complete support of the remarks made by the member on the government side of the house from Nova Scotia with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway and its proposals for the abandonment of railway services and lines. I can see that the persons he represents are experiencing, shall I say, the same set of circumstances that the constituents I have the honour to represent experienced over a number of years. In my opinion the hon. member was quite correct when he said that in the first instance the C.P.R. does all it can to discourage passenger service and then uses the small numbers using the service as a reason for abandoning it. That is exactly what happened on the Kettle Valley railway.

For two or three years the C.P.R. did everything it could to decrease passenger service on the Kettle Valley railway by splitting the service at Penticton, by reducing the service and by making it as inconvenient as possible for the over 150,000 people served by that railway in the southeastern interior of British Columbia. While the C.P.R. has been successful in getting the board of transport commissioners to grant its application to withdraw passenger service on the Kettle Valley railway, in view of the fact that because of weather conditions and other circumstances numbers of people in the interior of British Columbia depend on railway travel primarily for good service in the winter, I suggest to the minister that this whole matter should be reconsidered and reviewed. I am not going to go into it at greater length now.

I want to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the acting minister that this railway abandonment fever has again spread to the Kootenay district and is causing concern to the residents of the city of Rossland, and other people in my constituency. An application has been made by the C.P.R. to abandon some 7.1 miles of railway line between the village of Warfield and the city of Rossland. That is not a very long piece of railway line but it is an important one because it travels over a heavy grade into one of the highest cities in British Columbia, a city with a population of something over 3,000 people, a prosperous city which is mostly inhabited by persons employed by the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, or persons who find their occupations in providing services to these employees. This application came out of the blue, as it were, and it has taken the people of Rossland by surprise.

I cannot understand the attitude of the C.P.R. first of all with respect to the Kettle Valley railway, which was and is a very profitable railway, although of course the C.P.R. insists on dividing freight receipts and passenger receipts, when presenting the company's costs. Second, I cannot understand the company's attitude now with respect to the abandonment of the line between Warfield and Rossland in view of the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway makes the bulk of its profits out of its operations in the Kootenays. I think the officials of that company completely fail to recognize their responsibility to the persons who are producing the greater part of

their profits, and I am sure there are a good many members of the house who will agree with me. I can see by the expressions on the faces of a number of members on the Progressive Conservative benches and on the government side of the house that I have a great deal of sympathy in respect of the plea I am making this afternoon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Herridge: I should also refer to the mutterings of approbation and so on expressed by Social Credit members to my rear. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I now read a letter I received from the city clerk of Rossland. It is dated October 2, 1964, and reads as follows:

Dear Sir:

Re: C.P.R. application for abandonment of rail service Warfield to Rossland

Sorry for the delay in answering your letter of September 18 with regard to the above subject. After considerable study city council arrived at the decision that they would not object to the removal of the majority of track within the city limits—

See how reasonable they are.

—providing rail service is maintained from Warfield to the vicinity of the Rossland southerly boundary.

It is felt that in view of the renewed mining activity in this immediate area and in view of the fact that coal, flour and feed and a certain amount of oil and heavy equipment are supplied by rail the rail service should not be terminated to this city. There is 1.78 miles of main line and 1.21 miles of sidings within the city boundaries. Council would consent to this removal.

As a result of the correspondence I have received from the city of Rossland and other sources I have taken the matter up with the board of transport commissioners and I understand that an inspector has been sent to the district to interview the municipal authorities of Rossland, the major shippers in the district and all other persons who might be affected by this railway abandonment. I understand that after the inspector has reported to the board they will then come to a decision whether the circumstances are such as to warrant a hearing in the district with respect to the C.P.R. application to abandon this portion of their lines.

I urge the minister that in the first instance every opportunity be given to business people and other interested persons in the district to present their views at hearings of the board of transport commissioners, that a thorough study be made of the question and that there be no haste in coming to a decision. Here we have a very important industrial centre, the most important industrial centre in south-

eastern British Columbia, having to suffer once again from the railway abandonment fever which has seized the senior officials of the C.P.R. in recent years, and once again they have failed to recognize their responsibility not only to Canada as a whole but to the various employees and communities so seriously affected.

Mr. Pascoe: Mr. Chairman, we have had a very interesting discussion of this very vexing problem. When the hon. member for Port Arthur and the hon. member for Melville attempted to adjourn the house to discuss this very urgent matter their motion was not allowed, but still we have spent the whole day on this question which indicates just how important it is and how much it concerns most members of the house. This is the value of interim supply, that we can bring up these questions, as was pointed out by the Acting Minister of Transport when he argued against adjourning the house to discuss this matter. At that time he asked us to present our views and that is what we are attempting to do.

The acting minister gave quite a lengthy explanation of the railway company's attitude regarding the possible easing of the impact of the new policy upon the employees. It was quite a clear statement, but I do not believe it will allay all the fears of the railway workers. I should like therefore to join with others in congratulating the hon. member for Port Arthur and the hon. member for Melville for the introduction of this question, almost on the eve of what could be the adoption of this run-through policy. I do not want to repeat all the arguments because I believe most of the arguments concerning the impact of this policy on railway workers and communities have been advanced. However I feel I should take some part in this discussion, at least to the extent of pointing out that the main line of the Canadian National runs through my constituency of Moose Jaw-Lake Centre. Since I will be referring to it a little later, I may point out also that the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway also runs through Moose Jaw-Lake Centre in the southern area. The Canadian National is in the northern area. It is for this reason I am joining in this debate to point out that many of my constituents are vitally concerned.

One of the main towns in my riding on the main line of the Canadian National is Watrous. There are a large number of railway employees there. I am sorry that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar is away just now on official business, but I should like

to point out that a town in his constituency, Biggar, is also vitally concerned with this situation. I have received letters about it, Mr. Chairman, but I will not read them. They are from union officials, and although I have a few of them I should like to refer to some comments made in one letter. It deals with what is called the announced intention of Canadian National Railways to implement a change in operations which would require train crews to be on duty for double the length of time usually involved in making a run over twice the usual distance they have been required to operate. I quote:

> We in the railway running trades, being most familiar with train operations, are very concerned over the unsafe condition that will result to both operating personnel and to the public if such a practice is permitted—

I just read that as an example of some of the letters I have received concerning this matter. The hon. member for Meadow Lake, as well as others, have made some reference to railway line abandonment. This is a matter of greater concern to western Canada perhaps, Mr. Chairman, because of the greater impact over a larger area. Now there is the added concern over this proposed policy of run-through. I agree with other speakers that technological advances cannot be stopped. We must advance, the railways must advance, the whole economy of Canada must advance and all industries must adopt technological changes.

However, I believe there are other considerations to offset considerations of railway efficiency or economy of operations. I am thinking of the effect of this run-through policy on individual workers as well as on the communities in which they now reside. The Acting Minister of Transport made a statement concerning the offer of the railway company to buy the homes of workers who are affected by the run-through policy and may have to move. This offer, I imagine, is appreciated to a certain extent, but it certainly is not the whole answer to the concern of railway workers. As others have said there is the disruption of home life, and as one earlier speaker said the attachment to the community is part of the home life. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the effect on the communities, should the railway workers have to move, is one of the main concerns in connection with this problem. I do not know the situation in Nakina too well, to which the hon. member for Port Arthur referred. However, I do know the situation in my home city of Moose Jaw, which is on the main line of the Canadian Pacific. I think I should refer to it briefly, as I know what can happen.

The main line of the Canadian Pacific came through Moose Jaw in 1882. According to records there certainly was a great celebration when that first locomotive reached the small settlement of Moose Jaw. The city was established as the main divisional point on the main line of the Canadian Pacific between Winnipeg and Calgary. So many employees in the city were on the railway payroll that the city was referred to for many years as "Moose Jaw, the railway city". The main roundhouse was built there to service the steam locomotives, and a large proportion of the population was employed by the C.P.R.

The picture changed greatly with the advent of diesel locomotives. No longer was the roundhouse of use. The diesels could go right through without being serviced, and for the last three or four years the roundhouse was used for the storage of wheat. Many of the railway employees were moved to Winnipeg or Calgary, and the city is no longer known as the railway city.

Some years ago a large depot was built which is still in use. Right beside it was a big railway office filled with administrative staff, but now that building is nearly empty, except for the ground floor where the telegraph office is situated. I mention these things to indicate what the hon. member for Port Arthur is referring to when he forecasts conditions in Nakina.

However, during the last three years, due to the huge exports of wheat negotiated by the previous government, many railway employees were brought back to Moose Jaw. Also there is now the great potash development in Saskatchewan, and three or four of the big potash mines are located in my constituency. This development will create more business for the railway and bring more of its employees back to work in Moose Jaw. As a nostalgic gesture commemorating Moose Jaw as a railway centre, a public subscription was recently taken up to purchase a steam locomotive that used to operate out of Moose Jaw. It is now stationed in the city as a reminder of the older days before the big diesels and automation changed railway policy.

The employees are concerned about this policy of run-throughs because it is one more step in changing the mode of railway operations. We should consider the situation carefully, and I thought the hon. member for

Winnipeg South Centre used a very apt term when he said this policy should be stretched out. The terms run pretty well together: Stretch out the run-throughs.

We should impress upon the government and the railways that no precipitate action should be taken. The run-through policy is supposed to go into operation on October 25, but I point out that Bill C-120, previously referred to, is designed to establish a rationalization authority, and I wish to emphasize the word rationalization. I might mention in passing that I could not attend a meeting today which dealt with Bill C-120, as I was waiting my turn to speak on these estimates. I have attended previous meetings in connection with that bill and the attendance at them indicates the great interest in the bill. In closing, Mr. Chairman, I believe the C.N.R. should be asked not to take this action until Bill C-120 is finally dealt with by parliament, at which time the house can take a look at the complete railway picture.

Mr. Winkler: On the occasion of interim supply members of the opposition have an opportunity to raise complaints about specific actions of the government, and in dealing with the subject matter being discussed today I wish to say it seems peculiar that the C.N.R., in a unilateral way, should be taking action against the town of Nakina. It is particularly peculiar when we consider some other aspects of government spending.

On this occasion interim supply involves something close to $800 million, and I would point out that the taxpayers of Canada support the C.N.R. to the tune of about $80 million a year. They also support the C.B.C. to the tune of about $100 million a year, and in view of these amounts it is most peculiar that the C.N.R. would take action practically to eliminate a town of some 400 wage earners and their dependants in an isolated part of northern Ontario, and this to save a few thousand dollars. It is even more peculiar because we know that in the not too distant future, if Bill C-120 is passed, it will implement an over-all pattern of operation for the C.N.R. We think this is quite justified, but having read the brief presented to the government by the delegation from Nakina I have come to the conclusion that it contained very strong arguments.

It is also worth noting that towns in the immediate vicinity also concerned with the functioning of the C.N.R. are in agreement with the terms of the brief. One of the towns which would probably benefit a great deal as a result of this particular change is supporting the brief which was presented to the government. We must consider the social and human effects such a proposal is likely to have, even though the population directly involved might be considered small. It would be another matter entirely if we had the feeling that an over-all plan or policy was being introduced. But all we are getting are bits and pieces of policy. I must add that this is something for which the government itself has long been noted. Hon. gentlemen opposite try to tell us that this is a crown corporation, not subject to direct parliamentary authority, but we do not accept this view entirely because we know that in the interest of the people whose lives are affected the government could, if it wished, play a determining role.

I referred just now to failure to produce an over-all policy, and I would point in this regard to the present session of parliament, the longest I believe in Canadian history. We have witnessed one area of confusion after another. I see the Minister of National Health and Welfare in her place. We all know how many times she has tried to bring her pension plan before the house. Maybe she will be able to do so within a few days; I hope so. But one could examine any phase of government legislation during the present session and find confusion all the way. I referred earlier to the budget of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Here we find a creeping burden on the taxpayer. We find that increases in the expenditure of the C.B.C. have been very great, and undesirable to the people of Canada in many phases, though not in all phases, of the operations of the corporation. I must be fair in saying this criticism does not apply to all phases of the corporation's activities. The expenditure of money seems to mean nothing. I understand from my own research that the expenditures of the C.B.C. are now away beyond even those which are apparent; that the corporation uses methods to spend money in ways which have not been approved by parliament. We cannot get at this authority.

For the greater part of our discussion today the committee has been considering a proposal which would have an adverse effect on the people of Nakina and on the economy of that part of northern Ontario, and we must do something in this parliament to see that the rights of these people are fully protected and that they do not suffer as a result of the harsh policy which the C.N.R. is now adopting. The people who live in these railway towns are not the only ones who are uncer-

tain about their future. We need look no further than the Department of National Defence under this very government, and the uncertainty which prevails within that department at the present time. In addition to those in the Nakina area directly affected by the railway proposals, there are of course the small business people, the people who offer service in the stores and elsewhere, the police department, the school teachers, and so on. All these people are affected. It is all very well to offer a monetary return, but this does not really solve the problem. Does the C.N.R. intend to cut out these smaller towns right across the country, making all those concerned feel they do not know where the axe will fall next? I suggest that for once the government should take a decision. Let us take a small community of this kind and show the people of Canada that we intend to act in a democratic fashion. Let us not say: This affects only a few people so we do not need to worry about them; throw them out the back door. It is time we got down to serving the people of this country. If there is to be an over-all pattern, let us have it expressed in Bill C-120.

I was disappointed that only one hon. member opposite rose to support the views expressed by the opposition. I am referring to the hon. member for Halifax. I think sometimes that he should be over on this side of the house, but I will allow the hon. member to remain there as an outstanding member of the Liberal party, who can at least rise on occasion to criticize the policy being followed by his own government when he knows it is wrong.

In concluding these few remarks may I express the hope that the minister in charge of the Department of Transport will take another look at this situation affecting Nakina and take action to postpone or cancel the decision which the company has reached until at least such time as the house is able to consider Bill C-120.

Mr. Barnett: I gather that most of the speeches made today have been directed to the minister who is piloting interim supply through the committee, the Acting Minister of Transport. I should like to direct a few remarks to him in his position as President of the Privy Council. May I say I am glad to see his colleague the Minister of Public Works present because the subject I am about to raise is of concern to his department, too.

I think the most expeditious manner in which I can place this question before the house—it is one which involves several departments and for that reason I raise it on interim supply—would be by reading the following letter which came into my hands today.

Dear Mr. Barnett:

I am sorry to have to call upon you once again. I hope this will be the last time.

My purpose in dealing with this letter is to try to ensure that it will be the last time, because I have had to do some trouble-shooting before in this connection.

Last January we came to an agreement with the Department of Public Works regarding payment for land expropriated by the Department of Justice a year ago in August. To this date the agreement is all we have. Actual money does not seem to enter into their scheme of things.

To begin at the beginning:

1. In February, 1963, we came to an agreement with the Vancouver office (of the Department of Public Works) regarding terms of sale of our land bordering the French Creek boat basin. Our offer was fully endorsed by the Vancouver office and forwarded to the Minister of Public Works in Ottawa. However, we received neither acknowledgement nor reply to our letter.

I might say that the project undertaken in connection with the sale is now proceeding. It is a good project, and I am happy to see it go on. Nevertheless, I think the other party concerned should not be left out in the cold. The letter continues:

2. In August, 1963, without any previous warning, the Department of Justice expropriated our property and informed us after it had been re-registered. We had been assured by the Vancouver office that under no circumstances would this be done. You will understand our indignation, especially after we had been led to believe that our offer would be accepted.

3. In January, 1964, our offer of February, 1963, was accepted and a cheque was received by Mr. Bruce Brown, Qualicum, solicitor for the Department of Justice. Naturally, we believed that interest was owing for the time lapse since expropriation and Mr. Brown withheld the cheque pending further word from the Department of Public Works.

4. In February, they agreed to the payment of 5 per cent interest up until the time we received the money.

5. In June, having heard nothing further I wrote to Mr. Walkey in Vancouver and his department assured me that our cheque had been mailed to Mr. Brown on May 26. By July, neither Mr. Brown nor I had received word of it. Again I wrote to Vancouver. This time they informed me that the Department of Justice had to get word from the department of the treasury before the cheque could come through. Mr. Brown wrote the Department of Justice immediately and they did not acknowledge even his letter. At the end of August he wrote again and this time the Department of Justice replied. They stated that they were waiting to hear from the Department of Public Works.

In September our lawyer in Vancouver was assured by the Department of Public Works that the delay had been caused by the E & N Railway rights

but that everything was now cleared and that our cheque would be here within a few days. That was a month ago.

You will understand now why we have come to regard any statement made by any of the departments with distrust. My husband maintains that they should set up a department for activating other departments.

This matter is all tied up with my mother's estate. We are a family of five and we all think the situation has passed the ridiculous. Our lawyer agrees with us. What private individual or company would be allowed such inefficiency and actual dishonesty?

We would be grateful if you could take up the matter with the appropriate department—treasury, justice, public works? It is obvious that any individual's letter is beneath the notice of all of them.

Yours sincerely,
Mrs. M. Urie

I have put this letter on record in the hope that it may save the writing of another 20 or 25 letters on the subject, and also in the hope that the departments of justice, public works and the treasury will take due note of its contents. I also hope some immediate action will be taken to unsnarl this administrative tangle so that I will not have to follow through with the idea of proposing a motion to set up a department to activate other departments.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Chairman, as the hour is almost up now for the day, I should like to say a few words on this subject and possibly conclude my remarks on Monday. First of all I should like to say that I am shocked that it has been necessary to bring the situation which exists in Nakina up in this manner. We have had on the order paper since September 14 Bill No. C-120 which outlines the action planned by the government to provide for the country a national transportation policy. This bill has been on the order paper now for more than a month but still no action has been taken by the government to see that it comes before us for debate and the policies outlined considered so that we can determine whether or not it is good and helpful legislation and legislation which will be of benefit to the country.

Only recently in this house the Prime Minister, in answer to questions posed by the hon. member for Saint John-Albert, assured us that the railway bill should be of assistance to the maritime provinces and that no detrimental action as a result of the bill would be forthcoming. However, I may say that the hon. member for Halifax indicated today that he was not anywhere near as optimistic about the legislation as was the Prime Minister. He is concerned about the Maritime Freight Rates Act and the effect that this legislation will have on our area of the country. I may also say that Premier Stanfield recently indicated in a release that he was not anywhere near certain that the railway legislation was going to be of as much benefit as the Prime Minister would have us believe. Premier Stanfield indicated that a hike in freight rates for the Atlantic provinces would likely result from the new freight rate legislation now before parliament.

In view of the conflicting comments relating to this legislation, I am wondering whether or not it is the policy of the government to withhold any consideration of this matter until after November 9. I say this because a very important by-election is taking place in a very important railway centre in the maritime provinces. The city of Moncton derives a great deal of its livelihood from the operations of the C.N.R. and there is no doubt in my mind that there is a good possibility that what has happened at Nakina and what is possibly going to happen in Wainwright might very well happen in Moncton.

This government does not want the constituents of Westmorland who will be putting their ballots in the box on November 9 to learn that this is going to happen in their area; to learn that there will be unemployment and people thrown out of work who now feel they have security and steady employment. No, this is not the type of thing this government wants those particular people to know about, so the government are leaving this legislation sitting on the order paper and taking no action on it in the hope that the people of Westmorland are not going to know anything about this, and that it will come as a great shock to them after they cast their ballots. This is done in the hope that if these people know nothing about it they will cast their ballots in favour of the Liberal party.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Liberal party is going to get a shock because it is not going to get the benefit of the railway vote in the way hoped by pulling shoddy tricks like this, and not telling the people in the Moncton area that there is a very good chance, if this legislation is passed in the way it is presently framed, that they are going to be without jobs in a very short while. I think that the honest approach would have been for the government to bring this legislation before the house, to inform these voters what is actually going to happen in this area, and then let them decide what action to take at the polls on November 9.

This government will derive nothing but the deep distrust of the voters of Westmorland, and I certainly hope the voters react in the only way they can, and that is by showing this government on November 9 that this type of shoddy treatment is not what we in the maritime provinces expect, even though it is what we have been getting ever since this government has taken office.

May I call it five o'clock.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. It being five o'clock, and in order for the house to proceed to the consideration of private members' business, it is my duty to rise, report progress and request leave to sit again this day or at the next sitting of the house, as the case may be.

Progress reported.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): It being five o'clock the house will now proceed with the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely public bills, private bills.

POST OFFICE ACT

USE OF MAILS FOR DISSEMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION LITERATURE

The house resumed, from Friday, October 16, consideration of the motion of Mr. Orlikow for the second reading of Bill No. C-43, to amend the Post Office Act (hate literature).

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I was not in the house when my colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) introduced Bill C-43 a week ago. However, I have read the debate and I wish to make a few remarks to urge the house to give second reading to this bill, or at least preserve the principles of it by adopting the suggestion made by the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Klein), that this bill and others of a similar nature be referred for careful study to a committee of this house.

Mr. Speaker, I read very carefully the interesting speech of the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) on this bill. He pointed out in his remarks the dilemma that faces anyone who is considering how to deal with a problem of this sort, and that censorship may be an evil greater than the disease it is supposed to correct. I myself as a lawyer, who has been interested over the years in civil liberties, think that we should not rush headlong into this suppression of freedom of speech or right to disseminate information merely because some material appears particularly odius or objectionable to us. I agree with the minister when he says that the courts are, generally speaking, the best places to determine what is legal or illegal and whether or not some particular publication goes beyond the boundary of tolerance. Although I share the hesitations of the minister, and I think these hesitations if I may say so are creditable, I think this particular bill deserves our support.

I believe it is necessary for us to have a balance in these matters, and I do not believe that the public or postal services of this country need be a vehicle for the hateful, dangerous and disruptive phenomena that we have seen in respect of this so-called hate literature. I think the evil is palpable as well as vicious. Even the most ardent champion of freedom of speech will recognize that a man who in a crowded theatre shouts "fire" has to be suppressed.

The minister himself told us he had found it possible to act under the Post Office Act in respect to scurrilous publications by proceeding under section 7. Can anyone doubt that in a shrinking world the most dangerous and most disruptive thing there can be in a human society is a matter which is calculated to bring into hatred, ridicule or contempt a person or group of persons by reason of their race, national origin, colour or religion—and I take those words from the bill introduced by my colleague. Nor do I think this language is too vague, or so broad as to invite interference with the rights of normal and healthy criticism. There is no real danger that just because on occasion one criticizes an individual or group of individuals there is likelihood of a postal ban being applied, if this legislation is adopted. I point out to the house that the ban applies only when the minister has reasonable grounds for believing that an attack contained in material is calculated to bring an individual or group into contempt by reason of race, national origin, colour or religion.

The minister told us that in the particular cases with which he had to deal he was able to conclude that the material in question offended some provision of the Criminal Code. I know, as do other members of this house, that the language of the Criminal Code is often necessarily very vague. In the field of sedition, for example, the classic definition uses language very similar to the language used in the bill before the house.

The minister, quite rightly in my opinion, was hesitant about exercising the jurisdiction to decide what is offensive and what is scurrilous. I point out to the house that that duty is already imposed on the minister by the terms of the Post Office Act. All that Bill C-43 does is clarify what is offensive and what should not be allowed the use of the mails, by referring to that which creates hatred and contempt by reason of race, religion, and so on. There is nothing here to interfere with or stop in any way legitimate criticism of other groups. What is interfered with is something which must be calculated to bring individuals or groups into hatred or contempt.

There is nothing wrong with criticizing other groups of people, but it is when that criticism is based upon the fact of race or religion that it becomes disruptive of the society as a whole. Most of us in this house know what the effect has been of tolerance or indifference when this sort of poison is permitted. I see no reason why the public mails of this country should be allowed to be used for this type of very definite, very calculated and very real, if I may say so, menace we have seen at this time.

While I am speaking on this subject I should like to refer, without detail, to the sort of thing I mean. A distinguished member of the community from which I come, Rabbi Feinberg is referred to in a pamphlet issued by a man named Stanley, as the "red rabbi". This pamphlet is published by the world service of Birmingham, Alabama, and distributed by Canadian publications. It refers, in tones that are definitely anti-Semitic, to a man who has rendered great service to his community. I must admit that he is a controversial figure, but the basic statements are without foundation. Why is it that on the back of this pamphlet the protocols of learned elders of Zion are advertised? This is something I think all hon. members of this house will know was used as almost a symbol of hate literature and violent racial poison. This advertising in itself attacks this distinguished rabbi of the community from which I come. We do not all happen to agree with Rabbi Feinberg, and he is a controversial man, but we know this sort of thing is scurrilous and insulting not only to him, not only to the particular race that he happens to represent, but to the whole community which he has served with distinction.

As I have said, I believe that while we should not jump headlong into more areas of censorship, and I would be the last to suggest that should be done, I believe this particular bill defines, in clear enough terms, a clear and present danger, and that in all jurisdictions—in the supreme court of the United States as well as others—the right of the community to deal with clear and present danger has been conceded as a proper exception to that general respect that we have and should have for freedom of speech.

The minister in this respect has no absolute discretion. His discretion is only in respect of making an interim order, and informing the people concerned, who have a right of appeal to a board of review. There are many other cases in respect of which we in this group have urged that ministerial discretions should be subject to a board of review. Under the Post Office Act they are. The minister was right in being hesitant about assuming this responsibility. I suggest he would discharge his responsibilities much better because he is hesitant. However, as he himself has said, he has had occasion already to deal with scurrilous literature. I do not see why this house should not strengthen his hands by passing this legislation.

I should like to conclude by saying that if the house feels that the actual wording of this legislation requires further study, if it feels there are implications about putting such provisions in the Post Office Act rather than in some other legislation which members wish to review, this can be done without our carrying on the spectacle of futility that sometimes happens when we merely talk out a bill of this sort. If the house is not ready to deal with this matter and give second reading to the bill I would hope we would accept the proposal made by the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Klein) and preserve the basic idea on which I think we are all in agreement, that we must use what powers we have and can have to stop this hate literature. Therefore I hope this measure will be referred to a committee of the house, together with other bills that affect the same subject, so it will be clear that we are concerned and that we do realize the clear and pressing danger and propose to do something about it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexis Caron (Hull): Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, everyone without exception detests this hate literature which is spread about the country by various means—through the mails or otherwise. I do not know anything more pernicious than this literature which reaches us through the mails, through newspapers, and which criticizes Jews, Protestants, Roman Catholics and other organiza-

tions because they do not entertain the same beliefs as the writers of such literature.

I think this is something we should abhor, something which should be removed from our statutes and our organizations, but this would be difficult because the mails are still secret. We have not yet come to the point of examining letters sent through the mails with a view to detecting hate literature, as is the practice in certain totalitarian countries. Furthermore, our postal employees, who are sometimes well-meaning, may not be quite qualified to examine seriously and thoroughly this literature which is addressed to us through the mails.

Many letters are sent from various post office boxes, various homes, various parts of the country, from the United States and elsewhere, and that literature is always as detrimental as the previous or the next one. It would be difficult for the post office and its employees to study and examine that literature and decide whether or not it should be intercepted. It would be difficult for the department to ask its employees to act in a totalitarian manner.

In my opinion, it would be preferable to examine this matter more thoroughly, and to obtain legal advice which would enable us to stamp out that literature. Those organizations are known to change their names and their postal boxes, and when reached in such and such a place, they are elsewhere and keep on sending us the same literature. If we were to amend every Canadian piece of legislation, we would not be any more able to prosecute the writers of such literature.

For the most part, this literature comes from the southern United States where Jews, Negroes and Asiatics are hated. I wonder whether it would not be advisable to refer this bill to a committee for careful and serious consideration, in order to see if there is some means of remedying this situation.

[*Text*]

I know it has been very hard for the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) and the postal officers to find the exact way to deal with this problem. It is an onerous one. It is one of the worst problems we have now or have had in the past, and I do not think we can find any easy way to deal with it. It is not that we do not hate this practice. We hate it just as much as anybody else does, but human nature being what it is there are only a few such crackpots throughout the country. They are crackpots in some ways, but in other ways they know how to change their postal addresses and how to move from here to there. When we just about reach them here we find they are over there and we cannot reach them. So it is a difficult matter unless we can find some way to catch up and deal with all of them at one time. We cannot change the law every time they change their postal box number, so I think we need a committee to deal with the subject matter of such bills having to do with hate literature.

The government is most anxious that the whole subject of hate literature and all its ramifications be subject to the most searching scrutiny by a committee of the house. I believe that all parties in the house have at some time implied their agreement with such a proposal. When Bill No. C-21 dealing with genocide and group libel was before the house a government motion to refer the subject matter was turned down by certain opposition speakers. Since that time the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) himself has suggested in the house that the government should set up a committee to look into hate literature.

In view of all the public speeches purporting to be in favour of action in this regard, I now ask for unanimous consent to allow Bill No. C-21 to be dealt with at the same time as the bill now under discussion. To achieve this purpose I move, seconded by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Badanai):

> That Bills C-21 and C-43 be not now read a second time but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the standing committee on external affairs.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I might offer a suggestion. I think the house does wish to do what the hon. member for Hull has suggested. The fact is that Bill No. C-21, which is No. 64 on today's order paper, already has lying against it an amendment to refer its subject matter to the standing committee on external affairs. I think what the hon. member proposes could be accomplished if his amendment were to the effect that the subject matter of my hon. friend's bill, Bill No. C-43, be referred to that committee, and then the house would perhaps agree to move immediately to order No. 64 and do the same thing with Bill No. C-21. I think this is what we want to do and I am sure those of us who are here would be glad to agree to this.

Mr. Caron: That is what I wanted to do but I went too far. It appears that we can only deal with Bill No. C-43 now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I think it would be far better procedure if we were to deal at the moment with the bill which is before the house. If it is the desire of the house to have Bill No. C-43 referred to a committee—

Mr. Knowles: The subject matter.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): —the subject matter, I think it would be much better if we were to deal with that individually.

Am I to assume now that a motion is moved by the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Caron) that Bill No. C-43 be not now read a second time but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the standing committee on external affairs?

Mr. Knowles: Agreed.

Mr. Caron: I so move.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Motion (Mr. Caron) agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Does the house give unanimous consent now to proceeding with order No. 64 on today's order paper, namely Bill No. C-21?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GENOCIDE

PROVISION OF PENALTIES UNDER UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION

The house resumed from Friday, July 24, consideration of the motion of Mr. Klein for the second reading of Bill No. C-21, respecting genocide, and on the motion proposed thereto by Mr. MacNaught.

Mr. Walker: Let us put the question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I am advised that there is already before the house a motion to refer the subject matter of Bill No. C-21 to the committee on external affairs. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Motion (Mr. MacNaught) agreed to.

BUSINESS OF HOUSE

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, having accomplished the two matters relating to public bills, I would suggest that we await the arrival of the house leader in order to ascertain where we go from here. So far as this side is concerned, we have no other bills with which to proceed at the moment, unless somebody on the other side has one.

Mr. Knowles: We could take up the resumption of my bill to abolish the Senate.

Mr. Walker: There is another alternative; we could call it six o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Does the house give unanimous consent to calling it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles: What is the business for Monday?

Mr. Churchill: We will carry on with interim supply.

Mr. Robichaud: As was stated we will carry on with interim supply on Monday.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, October 26, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

TRADE

ANNOUNCEMENT OF BRITISH IMPORT SURCHARGE

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, over the week end the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Harold Wilson, advised me in advance of the special economic measures announced in Britain earlier today. The Minister of Finance received a supplementary message from Mr. Callaghan, the chancellor of the exchequer.

The British government, on the basis of a review of Britain's present financial and economic situation, particularly the current and prospective balance of payments deficit, has concluded that in addition to a number of internal measures designed to increase productivity and measures to encourage exports, immediate steps were necessary to reduce imports from all sources.

Accordingly the British government has decided to levy a temporary import charge of 15 per cent on imports other than—and the exceptions are very important for us—foodstuffs, basic raw materials, and unmanufactured tobacco. The exceptions, Mr. Speaker, are very important for us covering as they do a large proportion of our exports to the United Kingdom. No detail is as yet available as to the specific impact of this new charge on particular Canadian exports. However, it appears that in general it will apply to Canadian manufacturers. We are awaiting further information concerning the applicability of the charge to Canadian semi-manufactured materials.

It is important to note that the new charge will apply to imports from all sources. Moreover, existing margins of tariff preference will not be altered. Mr. Wilson has told me how much he regrets that it has been necessary to impose charges on certain imports from the commonwealth, but Britain's non-discriminatory obligations and the urgency of the situation left him no alternative. He has assured me that the new charges are essentially temporary and will be reduced as soon as the balance of payments situation permits and abolished at the earliest opportunity. The British government will maintain the existing parity of sterling. Mr. Wilson has indicated that in this connection ample facilities are available for the support of sterling. Britain, Mr. Speaker, is Canada's second most important market and we value highly our trading relations with her. Britain's economic strength is important to Canada and to the rest of the world.

I have expressed our hope that the combination of measures introduced by Britain will result in the speedy restoration of balance of payments equilibrium and the earliest possible elimination of the special charge on imports. I have assured Mr. Wilson that he can count on the understanding of the Canadian government with respect to the present economic difficulties facing Britain and the necessity of measures on their part to overcome them.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the house will recognize the difficulty of the situation created in consequence of the action taken by the government of the United Kingdom. In saying that I want to make it quite clear that we in Her Majesty's loyal opposition recognize that the cirmumstances in the United Kingdom must have been such as to impel the government of that country to bring into effect a system of imports surcharges which of course will have a very considerable effect on Canada's trade with the United Kingdom. The imbalance that has existed over the years has been large, and naturally this is one of the circumstances that have exercised the minds of successive governments in our own country to the end that that imbalance should be diminished to the greatest degree possible.

I join with the Prime Minister in the expression of the hope that the action taken by the government of the United Kingdom may be terminated at the earliest possible date. We found ourselves in that position in 1962. We acted, and the co-operation we received from the United Kingdom and other countries at that time certainly merits a similar attitude being taken by us at this time. Our hope is that the United Kingdom will soon find it-

self in a position where once more the normal trading relations, free from controls and the like, may be resumed.

[*Later:*]

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 Trade and Commerce in connection with the increased duties being applied by the United Kingdom. Can he tell us what proportion of Canadian exports of manufactured products to the United Kingdom will be affected, in particular what industries will be affected, and the proportion of Canadian exports of semi-manufactured products which may be affected?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): We have not yet received, Mr. Speaker, the full details of the application of the temporary British charge on imports. So far as we have been able to make calculations, about two thirds of our exports to the United Kingdom will be free of the charge and the remaining one third will bear the charge. We cannot be more precise than that. The charge will apply not only to fully manufactured goods but to most goods in semi-processed form. It will apply, for example, to paper. The best guess I can make at the moment, perhaps, is that about two thirds of our exports are free and one third subject to the levy.

Mr. Harkness: Can the minister tell us what other classes of semi-manufactured goods might be affected? Would sawn lumber come under this classification of manufactured products?

Mr. Sharp: The British order, as we have seen it, lists the exempt goods; therefore what is not exempt is subject to the levy. The information I have given is on the basis of a calculation of the exempt items, which would be about two thirds of our exports last year.

Mr. Harkness: Will the minister indicate how soon he might be in a position to make public a list of the goods that are specifically going to be affected by this charge? I think this would be a matter of considerable concern to a large number of people in Canada.

Mr. Sharp: I should like to assure the hon. member that it will be one of the main tasks of the Department of Trade and Commerce to give advice to Canadian exporters in this connection. I am quite satisfied that in the course of the next few days and weeks we shall be publishing a good deal of information to the trade as a whole on the application of this tax.

WHEAT—ANNOUNCEMENT OF FURTHER SALE TO RUSSIA

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I should like to inform the house that the Canadian wheat board announced today that it had entered into a contract covering the sale of 250,000 long tons of wheat and 25,000 long tons of flour to the Soviet union. This amounts to the equivalent of approximately 10.6 million bushels of wheat.

The wheat and flour have been purchased for cash and will be shipped from St. Lawrence and Atlantic ports, commencing in November and continuing through the crop year. The contract provides for the shipment of the wheat and flour to the Soviet union and/or Cuba, similar to the contract entered into in 1963.

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce which arises out of the statement he made earlier today on motions. How much of the approximately 10 million bushels will be delivered in the form of flour and, though he may not be able to answer at the moment, could he also give an indication of how much of this flour will be shipped out through west coast ports?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, in the course of my statement I gave the amount of flour, namely 25,000 long tons, which is included in the contract. The wheat and flour have both been purchased for cash, and will be shipped from the St. Lawrence and Atlantic ports.

UNITED NATIONS

STATEMENT RESPECTING OTTAWA MEETING ON STAND-BY UNITS FOR PEACE FORCE

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I wish to make a statement to the house on the peace keeping conference which will be held in Ottawa from November 2 to November 6. This meeting is the outcome of a suggestion made by the Prime Minister of Canada in his address before the general assembly of the United Nations on September 19, 1963. At that time the Prime Minister stated that Canada would welcome an opportunity to share its expe-

rience with other countries which have participated in United Nations peace keeping operations. To this end he proposed that there should be an examination by interested governments of the problems and techniques of these operations.

One of the main tasks confronting the United Nations is to find ways of strengthening and improving the peace keeping capacity of the organization, to learn from the experience gained in previous operations, and to seek more effective ways to perform this function in the future. The present meeting is a first step in that direction. As I explained to the standing committee on external affairs on July 9, the aim is to review past experience of the United Nations peace keeping operations and to exchange views on the practical and technical problems which have been encountered in the course of these operations. The meeting will provide an opportunity for informal discussions of these problems amongst the representatives of those countries which have made major contributions in men to United Nations peace keeping operations, or have formed stand-by units for possible service with the United Nations or announced their intention to do so.

Given the nature of the meeting, it is intended that representation should be at the working level and be drawn from persons mainly military experts, with practical knowledge of the problems. The exchange of views would be informal, confidential and without commitment. The points for discussion cover such questions affecting the work of United Nations peace keeping forces as composition; command; control and liaison; training and operational problems; environmental operating information; logistic support; personnel administration; public relations; accounting procedures and legal problems.

Members will note that all these are practical and technical problems, the kind that must be faced whenever a United Nations peace keeping force is organized. This is the first attempt to organize a meeting of this kind. Thus the meeting will be exploratory in nature, and the discussions will concentrate on the practical and technical problems involved in United Nations operations, with a view to strengthening the capability of the participating governments to serve and support the United Nations.

The wider political issues surrounding the authorization, control and financing of United Nations operations are to be discussed at the United Nations. This meeting will not deal with how future peace keeping operations are established or how they are financed. Nor will it attempt to set up a permanent United Nations force or to form co-ordinated stand-by arrangements. This is the responsibility of the United Nations itself.

We believe that the exchange of views will be fruitful and should be of great value to the participating governments. No formal steps will be taken to draw conclusions, and it will be for participating governments to decide what use to make of the information gained at the meeting.

We have already had informal assurances from the following governments that they are prepared to participate: Brazil, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, Ghana, India, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Malaysia, The Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, Tunisia, and the United Arab Republic. Formal invitations have been extended to these and other governments, and we are hopeful that a number of other countries will accept. The response thus far has been most encouraging.

I have instructed our ambassador at the United Stations to transmit the text of this statement to the secretary general of the United Nations this afternoon.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this meeting that is being convened will be most theoretical in its nature until some determination has been made as to the responsibilities of member nations within the United Nations to pay their shares and assessments of the costs of peace keeping.

This meeting is simply the formalization of what has taken place in the past among various peace keeping nations in informal discussions. Though it has been described as a significant step forward, in effect it is not of the consequence that some would give to it. Until there has been a settlement among the nations belonging to the United Nations, and a readiness by each nation to undertake its personal and several responsibilities as a member of that organization, meetings like this, while always helpful and always described as fruitful, will be meaningless.

I would like to hear the views of the Canadian government on the stand it will take in the United Nations regarding the U.S.S.R. and these other nations which, in a cavalier manner, have disregarded their pledged acceptance of the principles of the charter.

As for this conference, it will be a fine get-together, but I think it should be made clear that Canada and Canadians as a whole

do not relish being in the position of playing their part in peace keeping while other nations, derelict in carrying out their responsibilities, do not assume that burden. That is the problem which should be faced. That is the problem which must be faced if the United Nations is to take effective action to ensure that peace keeping operations are maintained and that peace is preserved. This is simply window dressing until there is a decision made in the United Nations which will effectuate the principles of the charter.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): On behalf of this group I should like to welcome very warmly the announcement which has been made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Although there are serious problems, as the Leader of the Opposition has mentioned, from our point of view a conference of this sort is by no means meaningless. On the contrary, we think it has an important contribution to make.

If there is one feature of international affairs which has been a hopeful development it has been the gradual emergence and growth, step by step and from precedent to precedent, of peace keeping activities under the United Nations. We are fully conscious that these are only first steps and that there are many practical difficulties to be overcome. We believe Canada is in a unique position to make a contribution in this field, and we congratulate those responsible, including the government, for having this conference called in Canada. We wish the conference the very best of luck. We know this is only one step forward, but we believe it is an important tactical step and one which should be welcomed without reservation by the Canadian people.

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): I am sure we all agree that the principle of peace keeping is a most commendable one. On the other hand, when we consider the problems and issues which surround this important matter it becomes apparent that there is a great deal of misunderstanding and, I think, a good deal of regret that more substantial results do not accrue from the meetings which are held from time to time in this regard.

The minister has indicated that many of the most important policy problems will not be discussed at this conference, for instance the financing of peace keeping operations. Another matter which I believe should receive considerable attention is the finding of political solutions which would eliminate the causes which necessitate the sending of peace keeping troops to these various areas.

As was pointed out, this is not necessarily a policy making conference; it is, rather, to be an information sharing conference. While it does not go as far as we would like, I believe it will be worth while and we wish the delegates success as they meet for these talks.

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): My question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Can the minister tell us to how many countries invitations were extended to attend the peace keeping operations conference early in November?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Twenty seven.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER TO EXAMINE PROPOSED RUN-THROUGHS

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I should like to announce that the government has taken steps to appoint a commissioner to examine the proposals by Canadian National Railways for running through Nakina, Ontario, and Wainwright, Alberta, the matter discussed in this house on Friday. Following representations forwarded by the government on this matter to the president of the Canadian National Railways I was informed by telegram received from Mr. Gordon this morning that the company would be willing to withdraw run-through plans and withhold further action on their implementation pending an examination into the railways' proposals by an independent and impartial commissioner.

In reply to this telegram the government acknowledged the willingness of Canadian National Railways to withhold run-through plans and, conditional on this being done, is taking steps immediately to appoint a commissioner with appropriate terms of reference.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to table copies in English and in French of the exchange of telegrams between Mr. Gordon and myself.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is too bad that this course was not followed before the matter became a crisis. I recall that it was brought before the house on several occasions and members in various parts of the opposition asked that action be taken. On October 22 I raised the matter, and again on the 23rd, in

order to find out the answer of the minister; whether he had transmitted the questions that had been asked to the president of Canadian National Railways and what the reply was. Now, when this sorry spectacle has developed into a serious situation—and the railwaymen are not the ones responsible—this action is taken.

I find it difficult to understand the message from the president of Canadian National Railways to the Prime Minister in which he said:

> We fully believe our discussions with employees affected and their union representatives would have reached amicable understandings as has been the case elsewhere and that present situation is due largely to intervention by third parties which has led to misunderstandings and distortions of actual situation.

I do not know who these third parties are, but on Friday last this house spoke with definiteness and clarity in this connection and demanded action. Now the action the government should have taken earlier is taken today. It is late, but at least it indicates that these third parties, members of parliament, when they express themselves for the Canadian people will be heard.

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to move along the line of criticism of the Leader of the Opposition, but I forgo that temptation and raise a couple of points in connection with the Prime Minister's statement. The Prime Minister may be aware that there are at least 2,000 employees of Canadian National Railways all the way across the system from Montreal to Vancouver who are at present booked unfit for duty, or are sitting around the clock in union meetings.

I have received communications which indicate that while they are pleased the Prime Minister has taken this action, they would like at least two points cleared up. One is that there will be no recriminations and no disciplinary action contemplated by the management. There is nothing in the Prime Minister's statement or the wire from the president of the C.N.R. to touch on this. That is No. 1. The second is whether the terms of reference for the commission of inquiry will be general enough to take care of the points that should be considered.

I wanted to make this point clear. The three brotherhoods which have an interest in this matter, the engineers, the firemen and the trainmen, made representations to the Minister of Labour in connection with the statement of declaration of intent of Canadian National Railways to unilaterally operate crews through recognized terminals.

This was brought forward six months ago and is a request for just such a commission of inquiry, and it sets out the general terms of reference they would like. The first is to investigate unilateral actions of Canadian railways in changing working conditions and altering conditions of employment detrimental to the interests of their employees during the currency of a contract. The second—and this is the important part—is to study the provisions of the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act and the Railway Act to ascertain whether railway employees are adequately protected under existing legislation and interpretations relative thereto, and recommend any necessary amendments.

If these men are to go back to work it seems to me the government must go further, and go further immediately, with some information to the men, perhaps through management, that there will be no recriminations, and that the terms of reference will be broad enough so the inquiry is not just confined to the narrow situation in Nakina and Wainwright but that these other important considerations can also be taken care of.

I underline the importance of this because we do not get spontaneous reaction from Montreal to Vancouver, in respect of men scattered throughout the country, just on the basis of what has taken place at Nakina and Wainwright. I should like to ask the Prime Minister or the Minister of Labour whether they would take some action in respect of their comments so these men can get back to work and the C.N.R. can begin to move again. I should also like to ask that the documents be made an appendix to *Hansard* rather than merely tabled.

Mr. Bert Leboe (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, all I have to say in this connection, related to what I said on Friday, is that we are very happy to have a commission set up to look into this matter, and that the management of the railways has decided not to proceed with the run-throughs, as a result of requests to delay their implementation.

In this connection, I believe the procedure now being followed will have good results. I must say that I have to agree with some of the remarks which have been made to the effect that we have not in the past taken this situation seriously enough, nor dealt with it as we should have done. I hope this same attitude will be taken in respect of other difficulties which may arise in future. The government should take action to prevent these difficulties from occurring, rather than

waiting until they occur, so the individuals concerned will not have to book off on sick leave, placing themselves in the position of not being on call for work. There are many avenues open to the government which I should like to see it follow so that appropriate action can be taken to deal with some of these problems.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that the documents tabled by the Prime Minister be printed as an appendix to *Hansard*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For text of documents referred to above, see appendix.*]

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister what actual steps are being taken to get the railroaders back to work?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on the first point raised by my hon. friend in his statement, to which I could not reply on motions, I should tell him that steps have already been taken to clear up the situation. I am talking about the penalties that have been threatened.

So far as the terms of reference of the commission are concerned, we are trying to work them out without delay and in a way which we hope will be satisfactory to all those concerned. We have already invited a commissioner to take on this task and are waiting to hear from him. Perhaps I should add that the Minister of Labour is in touch with the labour unions concerned with this matter as well.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

TABLING OF TEXT OF INTERVIEW WITH MINISTER OF JUSTICE

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the right hon. Leader of the Opposition asked that a copy of the interview given by the Minister of Justice on the French C.B.C. program "Aujourd'hui" on October 15 be tabled in the house. A transcript has now been prepared by the C.B.C. from the tape of that particular broadcast, and I would ask that it be tabled at this time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO QUEBEC

Question No. 1,755—**Mr. Ouellet:**

1. What payments did the federal government make to the province of Quebec during each of the fiscal years 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64 and 1964-65 (estimated) under the following headings, in detail (a) unconditional grants (b) conditional grants (c) payments to individuals (i) unemployment insurance benefits (ii) family allowances (iii) old age security (iv) others?

2. What is the total amount of all payments made in each of the fiscal years mentioned above?

3. What is the per capita share paid by the government with respect to each of the above items compared with the per capita share paid to the other nine provinces?

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Federal payments to the province of Quebec:

—	1961-62	1962-63	preliminary 1963-64	estimated 1964-65
		(in thousands of dollars)		
1. (a) Unconditional grants—				
Statutory subsidies	4,023	4,023	4,023	4,023
Equalization	62,632	77,755	69,064	95,066
Share of federal estate tax	—	—	—	8,382
50% of federal income tax on certain public utilities	2,064	4,481	4,623	4,965
Sub-total	68,719	86,259	77,350	112,436

Questions

——	1961-62	1962-63	preliminary 1963-64	estimated 1964-65
		(in thousands of dollars)		
(b) Conditional grants—				
(i) Agriculture—				
Agricultural Lime Assistance	2,239	2,099	1,205	1,205
Farm Labour agreements	21	24	25	25
Ram Premium policy	2	2	—	—
Freight assistance to Royal Winter Fair	6	5	4	3
4-H Clubs	11	10	10	10
Potato warehouse construction	—	—	139	32
Compensation for disease losses	—	—	2	2
ARDA	—	216	2,670	3,555
Barberry eradication	—	—	—	10
Sub-total	2,279	2,356	4,055	4,842
(ii) Health—				
Hospital construction	4,988	5,786	5,883	4,020
General public health	1,641	1,923	1,794	
Tuberculosis control	1,232	1,238	1,043	
Mental health	2,476	2,331	2,575	
Professional training	466	501	638	9,087
Cancer control	480	586	696	
Public health research	650	562	613	
Medical rehabilitation and crippled children	533	628	743	
Child and maternal health	549	501	393	
Vital statistics fees	18	21	—	—
Disability advisory services	—	13	12	12
Blind pensioners	—	10	16	15
Sub-total	13,033	14,100	14,406	13,134
(iii) Hospital insurance	73,022	88,714	113,849	119,000
(iv) Welfare—				
Old age assistance	10,896	13,794	13,860	16,362
Blind persons allowances	1,412	1,663	1,643	1,904
Disabled persons allowances	7,461	8,578	8,081	9,532
Unemployment assistance	38,222	33,579	39,439	43,000
National Welfare grants	—	—	—	148
Sub-total	57,991	57,614	63,023	70,946
(v) Fitness and amateur sport	—	—	—	334
(vi) Vocational training—				
Student aid	100	100	100	100
Vocational school training	—	—	897	897
Technician training	2,825	5,445	4,900	5,560
Trade and occupational training	3,376	5,380	5,200	6,300
Training in co-op. with industry	12	27	45	200
Training of unemployed	930	1,655	1,300	2,000
Training of disabled persons	—	299	112	312
Training of technical teachers, etc.	55	59	75	80
Training for federal departments, etc.	23	22	—	46
Correspondence courses	—	34	20	25
Capital assistance—technical schools	1,509	7,391	9,000	22,000
Sub-total	8,830	20,412	21,649	37,520
(vii) Highways and transportation—				
Trans-Canada Highway	2,703	9,622	20,000	18,460
Railway grade crossing fund	119	152	—	—
Miscellaneous	8	971	—	—
Sub-total	2,830	10,745	20,000	18,460

—	1961-62	1962-63	preliminary 1963-64	estimated 1964-65
		(in thousands of dollars)		
(viii) Resources development—				
Fishing vessel construction	—	174	226	135
Industrial development—fisheries	—	—	15	12
Forest inventories	—	—	—	
Reforestation	—	—	—	
Forest fire protection	281	268	639	1,907
Forest access roads	1,099	1,076	1,000	
Forest stand improvement	—	224	268	
Camp ground and picnic areas	29	—	—	—
Roads to resources	426	2,281	1,500	1,400
Sub-total	1,835	4,023	3,648	3,454
(ix) Civil defence	427	669	1,543	1,729
(x) Municipal winter works	10,634	11,548	14,055	15,000
Total	170,881	210,181	256,228	284,419
(c) Payments to individuals—				
(i) Unemployment Insurance benefits	135,782	123,026	116,695	N.A.
(ii) Family allowances	157,713	160,299	162,324	160,000
(iii) Old age security	131,711	155,360	172,992	188,000
(iv) Others—				
War veterans pensions (estimated)	19,743	19,578	17,853	17,609
War veterans allowances (estimated)	8,387	9,127	9,860	9,700

2. The above federal contributions to the provinces or individuals resident in the provinces for the following fiscal years are set out below:

—	1961-62	1962-63	preliminary 1963-64	estimated 1964-65
		(in thousands of dollars)		
Unconditional grants	543,366	275,198	252,818	326,327
Conditional grants	606,453	846,202	880,992	902,058
Unemployment insurance benefits	454,739	403,191	365,655	N.A.
Family allowances	519,537	530,225	537,045	544,735
Old age security	624,668	733,857	807,827	881,425
War veterans pensions (estimated)	163,462	161,777	159,537	156,800
War veterans allowances (estimated)	75,019	81,398	82,708	84,600

3. Per capita contributions to (*a*) Quebec and (*b*) Other nine provinces.

	1961-62		1962-63		preliminary 1963-64		estimated 1964-65	
	(*a*)	(*b*)	(*a*)	(*b*)	(*a*)	(*b*)	(*a*)	(*b*)
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
Unconditional grants	13.07	36.67	16.08	14.35	14.15	13.11	20.22	15.69
Conditional grants	32.49	33.66	39.17	48.31	46.86	46.66	51.14	45.30
Unemployment insurance benefits	25.82	24.65	22.93	21.28	21.34	18.59	N.A.	N.A.
Family allowances	29.99	27.96	29.87	28.10	29.69	27.99	28.77	28.22
Old age security	25.04	38.09	28.95	43.94	31.64	47.41	33.80	50.86
War veterans pensions	3.75	11.10	3.65	10.80	3.26	10.58	3.17	10.21
War veterans allowances	1.59	5.15	1.70	5.49	1.80	5.44	1.74	5.49

NOTE: The above answer, with respect to payments to individuals, includes the five most important categories of payment but excludes a very large number of smaller payments which have not been included because of the amount of work which would have been entailed.

[*Text*]

PROVINCIAL EMPLOYEES IN GOVERNMENT, SCHOOLS AND MUNICIPALITIES

Question No. 2,066—**Mr. Gelber:**

1. What is the most recent information in the Department of Labour on the number of persons employed by each provincial government, and the average annual wage for each province?

2. What is the most recent information in the Department of Labour on the number of persons employed in each province in primary and secondary schools, and what is the average annual wage for each province?

3. What is the most recent information in the Department of Labour on the number of persons employed in municipalities in each province, and what is the average annual wage for each province?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour):

1. Employees and gross earnings by province —departmental services, March 1964:

Province	No. of Employees	Gross earnings
Newfoundland	7,138	$ 1,777,495
Prince Edward Island	1,760	374,450
Nova Scotia	9,377	2,254,283
New Brunswick	6,584	1,897,665
Quebec	30,136	10,706,000
Ontario	53,430	19,067,782
Manitoba	7,409	2,555,513
Saskatchewan	10,268	3,704,643
Alberta	14,785	5,099,349
British Columbia	*	*

Note: Institutions of higher education, government enterprises, and workmen's compensation boards not included.

Source of data: Dominion bureau of statistics.

2. Number of teachers and principals and average annual salaries in primary and secondary schools, 1963-64, by province:

Province	No. of Teachers	Primary	Secondary
Newfoundland	5,097	$2,516	$4,306
Prince Edward Island	1,235	2,819	4,098
Nova Scotia	7,720	3,499	5,023
New Brunswick	6,321	3,038	4,984
Quebec	61,995	*	*
Ontario	60,903	4,771	7,485
Manitoba	9,395	4,073	5,982
Saskatchewan	10,152	4,246	6,359
Alberta	14,869	5,073	6,639
British Columbia	15,253	5,343	7,018

3. Employees and gross earnings in urban municipalities with population greater than 10,000, departmental services, by region:

Region	No. of Employees	Gross earnings
Atlantic Provinces	4,681	$ 16,973,030
Quebec	27,812	126,016,850
Ontario	46,477	199,600,000
Prairie Provinces	19,142	82,816,150
British Columbia	109,275	53,066,081

Note: Figures do not include municipal enterprises not normally associated with departmental activities of municipal government. Also excluded is information for municipally owned hospitals and municipal school boards.

20220—596½

Source of data: Dominion bureau of statistics.

*Not available.

FISHERIES DEPARTMENT SHIPS, WEST COAST

Question No. 2,080—**Mr. Basford:**

What are the names, sizes, headquarters port and intended purpose, or use, of all Department of Fisheries motorized ships of 20 feet overall length or more, stationed on the west coast?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries):

Motorized Ships—West Coast
Department of Fisheries

Name	Size	H.Q. Port
Agonus	37′	Butedale
Arrow Post	54.6′	Bella Bella
Atlin Post	61.5′	Nanaimo
Atolla	37.3′	Tofino
Babine Post	55.7′	Butedale
Beaver Rock	51′	Campbell River
Brama	42′	Port Hardy
Branta	36′	Donald's Landing, Babine Lake
Chilco Post	63′	New Westminster
Ciona	34.5′	Zeballos
Clavella	52′	Prince Rupert
Comox Post	54.2′	Port Alberni
Daphnia	34′	West View
Diaphus	39.6′	Arrandale
Egret Plume II	46.5′	Rivers Inlet
Falcon Rock	50′	Rivers Inlet
F.D. 102	34.1′	Comox
F.D. 202	38.2′	New Westminster
Gavia	40.7′	New Westminster
Howay	115.7′	Victoria
Hunter Point	90.6′	Victoria
Kitimat	79.7′	Prince Rupert
Laurier	113′	Victoria
North Rock	45′	Bella Coola
Onerka II	46.5′	Arrandale
Pholis	37.3′	Quatsino
Pillar Rock	51′	Masset
Rissa	36′	Mission City
Sarda	31.9′	Walters Cove, Kyuquot
Seal Rock	43.5′	New Westminster
Sooke Post	55.7′	Queen Charlotte City
Star Rock	39.9′	Steveston
Statistic	30′	Cowichan
Stuart Post	54.6′	Alert Bay
Surge Rock	48.3′	Sandspit
Temple Rock	45′	Westview
Takla Rock	26′	Stuart Lake Station
Thrasher Rock	32.8′	Ladysmith

These vessels carry out patrols necessary for fishery resource management.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

A. P. Knight	78′	Nanaimo
Alta	38′	Nanaimo
G. B. Reed	177′	Nanaimo
Investigator No. 1	60′	Nanaimo
Melibe	25′	Nanaimo
Noctiluca	33′	Nanaimo
Velella	76′ barge	Nanaimo

These vessels serve as floating platforms for the conduct of research operations at sea and in coastal waters.

*REFIT OF H.M.C.S. "BONAVENTURE"

Question No. 2,091—**Mr. Fisher:**

1. Does the government intend to carry out a major refit of H.M.C.S. *Bonaventure* in 1966 and, if so, what are the spending implications of this refit; in particular, what is the total expenditure; how much of it is to be included in maintenance expenditure and how much in a capital program?

2. What is the top estimated figure of the spending necessary to bring the *Bonaventure* up to requirements?

3. Is there any possibility that this ship will ever be returned to the British navy and, if so, what conditions in the agreement are there for making changes in the ship so that it will be acceptable to the British and who is responsible for the cost of such changes?

4. Is it the intention in refitting the *Bonaventure* to achieve an efficient naval troop carrier and, if so, has any consideration been given to the purchase of a fleet logistic ship, such as the British navy is building at the cost of approximately two milion pounds?

5. How many executive personnel in the R.C.N. are now involved in working on the proposals for altering the *Bonaventure* aside from the ships officers and the normal administration work which would relate to the vessel?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the answers to parts 1 and 2 of the question are yes, as indicated in reply to part 1 of starred question No. 1,169. A decision on total expenditure and whether the costs will be provided from operations and maintenance or capital funds depends on the type and extent of the work to be undertaken, and this matter is now under review.

The answer to part 3 of the question is no, inasmuch as the *Bonaventure* is owned by Canada, unlike her predecessors the *Magnificent* and the *Warrior,* which were on loan.

The answer to part 4, regarding the sea-lift capability of the Royal Canadian Navy, is that this is also a matter of current study.

The answer to part 5 of the question is, six Royal Canadian Navy officers.

TENDERS FOR HEADSTONES, HALIFAX DISTRICT

Question No. 2,103—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Who was the successful tenderer for the supply and installation of headstones and markers in the Halifax district for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the 12 month period commencing October 1, 1964?

2. How many bids were received and what was the amount of each bid?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. Tingley Monuments Ltd., Amherst, N.S.

2. Three bids were received, in the following amounts: $10,823, $10,969, $11,076.

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN C.P.R. SERVICE, QUEBEC

Question No. 2,139—**Mr. Latulippe:**

1. Does Canadian Pacific Railways intend to reduce by 50 per cent its schedules in various regions of the province of Quebec and, among others, cancel the runs known as 202 and 203 between Lac Mégantic and Montreal?

2. Will the government ensure that no action will be taken until the population affected have been consulted?

3. Will steps be taken by the government before October 25, 1964 to prevent or delay such reductions in service?

[*Translation*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): In respect of part 1, the board of transport commissioners advise as follows:

The following reductions in passenger train service have been announced by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to take effect on October 25, 1964:

Trains 202-203 which now operate daily between Montreal and Mégantic, P.Q. are to be discontinued.

Trains 31-32 operating daily between Montreal and Farnham, P.Q. are to be discontinued. Trains 31-32 form part of a through service between Montreal and Boston.

Trains 137-138 now operating Saturday only and

Trains 132-133 now operating daily between Montreal and Ottawa via Lachute are to be discontinued.

The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has also indicated its intention to reduce the frequency of the passenger train service operating between Montreal and Mont Laurier, P.Q.

Notice of these changes was posted in all railway stations on the lines served by these trains on September 25, 1964. Concurrent with the posting of this notice, advice of the changes was also furnished the board.

Subsequently, the board directed the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to defer the effective date of these changes with respect to the Montreal-Farnham and Montreal-Ottawa services.

In the case of the Montreal-Farnham service, since this change would have involved a complete abandonment of passenger train service on a portion of this line in Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been advised that it will be necessary to secure the board's approval before making this change. Consequently, this reduction in service will not take place on October 25, 1964 as contemplated.

The change in service on the north shore line between Montreal and Ottawa represents a reduction in the existing service and as such does not require the board's prior approval. However, the substance of the submissions filed protesting this reduction in service caused the board to direct Canadian Pacific Railway Company to continue these trains pending consideration of these protests. The seriousness of the complaints received with respect to this particular service is such as to have prompted the board to set the matter down for public hearing.

A change is also being made in the Montreal-Mont Laurier passenger train service effective on the same date. This change, however, does not involve the discontinuance of specific trains but a reduction in the frequency of their operation. Such a change in passenger train service does not require the board's approval.

Complaints have, however, reached the board with respect to this particular reduction as well as the proposed elimination of the local passenger train service between Montreal and Mégantic. The board has directed the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to file its submissions with respect to the specific points raised in these complaints.

2 and 3. The Minister of Transport has no power to take such action but the steps taken by the board of transport commissioners are set out in the answer to part 1.

[*Text*]

BANK OF CANADA PROFIT

Question No. 2,144—**Mr. Latulippe:**

1. What is the Bank of Canada's main source of profit or revenue?

2. Is the annual net profit made available to the government for the advantage of the nation?

3. What profit was made by the Bank of Canada in 1944, 1954 and 1963?

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1. Income on investments.

2. Yes. Since 1955 when the rest fund of the Bank of Canada reached $25,000,000, being five times the paid up capital, the whole of the annual net profit has been paid to the receiver general as required by section 24 of the Bank of Canada Act.

3. 1944, $20,312,659.68; 1954, $51,877,398.94; 1963, $116,386,458.94.

[*Text*]

*C.B.C.—CANCELLATION OF NOON BROADCAST BY B.B.C.

Question No. 2,147—**Mr. Noble:**

Is the B.B.C. twelve o'clock noon broadcast from London, England, being dropped by the C.B.C. and, if so, what are the reasons which will cause the termination of this most outstanding and reliable newscast?

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that the B.B.C. news from London has not been discontinued. The hon. member's question may be concerned with a change of scheduling that has recently taken place at CBL, Toronto, where the B.B.C. news is now scheduled at 7 p.m., Monday to Friday, and at the noon hour on Saturdays and Sundays.

C.B.C. COVERAGE OF ROYAL VISIT

Question No. 2,148—**Mr. Noble:**

During Her Majesty the Queen's visit to Canada, what was the number of C.B.C. employees who participated in programs in (a) Charlottetown (b) Quebec city (c) Ottawa, and the estimated cost in the case of each city named herein?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: The radio and television coverage of the royal visit for French and English networks and international service involved a total staff of approximately 400. The assignment of staff by locations was as follows: (a) Charlottetown and Summerside, 196; (b) Quebec city, 183; (c) Ottawa, 154.

The budget for the complete 1964 royal visit coverage was authorized at $270,000, including contingencies. No breakdown was made on the basis of locations.

C.B.C. PERSONNEL AT OLYMPIC GAMES

Question No. 2,152—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. How many commentators employed by the C.B.C. are in attendance at the Olympic games in Tokyo?

[Mr. Latulippe.]

2. What is the total number of C.B.C. personnel, both permanent and temporary, in attendance at the Olympic games?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

1. Fifteen to cover English and French radio and television services.

2. Twenty one.

C.B.C. CAMERAMEN COVERING ROYAL VISIT

Question No. 2,153—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. How many cameramen were designated by the C.B.C. to cover the recent visit of Her Majesty to Canada?

2. How many of these were temporarily employed?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

1. Nine film cameramen.

2. Six.

AMENDMENTS TO INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS ACT

Question No. 2,154—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Is the government considering amendments to the industrial relations and Disputes Investigation Act and, if so, will such amendments include provisions to penalize an employer who uses industrial espionage to interfere with the right of association granted to employees under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): It is the intention of the government, when an opportunity permits, to consider the amendment of the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act. At that time, such consideration will take into account all unfair labour practices, not only the matter of industrial espionage.

*PROTESTS RESPECTING C.B.C. PROGRAM "FESTIVAL"

Question No. 2,159—**Mr. Noble:**

Were telephone calls, letters and telegrams of complaint received by the C.B.C. regarding the plays that were shown on C.B.C. t.v. on October 7, 1964 and October 14, 1964, on the program "Festival" and, if so, how many?

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that the plays presented on October 7 and 14, 1964, in the "Festival" series have received about 160 telephone calls and 80 letters and telegrams commenting on the presentation. Thirty per cent contained favourable comment and 70 per cent unfavourable.

NEW BRUNSWICK—VETERANS TREATED OUTSIDE LANCASTER HOSPITAL, 1964

Question No. 2,167—**Mr. MacRae:**

For the province of New Brunswick, now many cases of war veterans allowance recipients, all classifications, were operated on or treated medically, outside of Lancaster military hospital, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1964?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Four hundred and sixty five.

NEW BRUNSWICK—VETERANS TREATED OUTSIDE LANCASTER HOSPITAL, 1963

Question No. 2,168—**Mr. MacRae:**

For the province of New Brunswick, how many cases of war veterans allowance recipients, all classifications, were operated on, or treated medically, outside of Lancaster military hospital, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1963?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Four hundred and eight.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

C.N.R. BOAT CHARTERS, NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 1,760—**Mr. Fisher:**

1. Did the C.N.R. charter any boats for service on the Newfoundland coast from January 1, 1951 to December 31, 1963 and, if so (a) what was the date of charter (b) name and address of owners (c) condition of charter, length of each (d) amount paid each year and to whom it was paid (e) what officials of the C.N.R. are in charge of chartering (f) what tonnage did each boat carry each year from January 1, 1951 to December 31, 1963 (g) what was the tonnage capacity of each ship?

2. Did the C.N.R. pay any bonus besides the charter price from January 1, 1951, to December 31, 1963 and, if so, what was the amount of same and to whom was same paid?

3. Did the C.N.R. pay any salaries for crews on any chartered boat from January 1, 1951 to December 31, 1963 and, if so (a) what was the amount paid to crews as regards to each boat (b) to whom was each amount paid?

4. Did the C.N.R. do any repairs at C.N.R. expense on any boat chartered from January 1, 1951 to December 31, 1963 and, if so, what was the cost of repairs on each boat and the name of same?

5. Has the C.N.R. any unpaid accounts for repairs to boats not owned by the C.N.R. at St. Johns, Newfoundland from January 1, 1951 to December 31, 1963 and, if so, what is (a) name of boat repaired (b) value of repairs for each year on each boat?

6. What is the actual amount of claims for lost freight claimed at North Sydney for each year from January 1, 1954 to December 31, 1963; what is the actual amount paid by C.N.R. to claimants each year from January 1, 1954 to December 31, 1963?

7. Has the C.N.R. any unpaid accounts for freight charges between January 1, 1959 and December 31, 1962 over $1,000, and, if so, what is (a) name of debtors and addresses (b) what steps have been taken to collect (c) date of charges as yet unpaid?

Return tabled.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

INTERVIEW WITH LEADER OF U.S. NAZI PARTY

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State, asking him whether his attention was drawn to a C.B.C. television program on which the so-called leader of the United States nazi party was interviewed, and whether there has been any complaint in connection therewith. Were complaints received, among others, from the Zionists' convention and from representatives of the Royal Canadian Legion? The program in question had to do with a man whose conduct is such that I can see no reason why it should receive the attention of the C.B.C. across Canada, nor why nazism should be glorified in this way.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I have indeed received views and protests against the announcement by the C.B.C. that they were going to interview this individual. I transferred those views and protests to the president of the C.B.C. I hope the corporation took them into very serious consideration before reaching its decision. They seem in fact to have been taken into account if we consider the statement made by the narrator, John Drainie, as a preamble to the Rockwell interview, which I will be glad to table if the house sees fit.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, does the minister agree that one way in which we could find out why this sort of thing is going on is through a committee before which the president of the C.B.C. could appear, so this kind of thing will not appear to receive the tacit approval of parliament which is supplying the money to operate this corporation?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question on a number of occasions during this session. I have already said that at the present time the C.B.C. is proceeding with an internal study of the organization, and that the advisory committee which was established at the end of May has been asking all kinds of questions which necessitate a good deal of work by top management. I have already said that the

president of the C.B.C. has appeared during this session before the public accounts committee. If, in addition, the C.B.C. were asked to appear before a parliamentary committee, this in my view might completely paralyse the corporation in its work, which would most certainly be undesirable.

Mr. Marvin Gelber (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Would the minister inform the C.B.C. that statements such as those made by John Drainie in introducing the program are rationalizations of the position of the C.B.C.? On the basis that the C.B.C. wants responsible policy in Canada, it should follow a responsible policy itself?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. Bert Leboe (Cariboo): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the minister if he thinks it is right that parliament should set up a crown corporation and then be barred from having anything to do with that corporation because the government will not set up a committee to deal with the problems that exist?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, when we introduce legislation next session I think that will be the proper time for the hon. member to express his views.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the minister when he expects his estimates will be before parliament.

Mr. Lamontagne: That, Mr. Speaker, depends on the house leader.

[*Later:*]

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): I should like to return to the questions about the television program "This Hour Has Seven Days". The question I should like to ask is directed to the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Justice who is now visiting St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary.

On this show last night a serious allegation was made that there was a prisoner in this penitentiary who had received a 14 year sentence as a result of his participation in the riot of two years ago. This prisoner was a French Canadian. Another prisoner, who had led the riot, was said to have got an extra sentence of one day. The second statement that was made that was very shocking was that this French Canadian prisoner had his letters to his family and other people stopped. This is a very serious infringement of ordinary human rights. I should like the Prime Minister to ask the Minister of Justice, when he makes his statement to the house concerning his visit to the penitentiary, to make some attempt to tell the members of the house the truth about these statements made on television.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I agree, Mr. Speaker, that both these matters should be and will be investigated, along with two or three other statements that were made on the same program.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): I have a further question relating to the C.B.C. program to which the attention of the Secretary of State has been directed. Does the minister not consider it an impropriety for the C.B.C. to make available to a large number of United States viewers and voters on the eve of their election a highly controversial political film which the leader of the party which made that film had decided should not be released over any United States television outlet?

Mr. Lamontagne: As long as I am responsible for reporting to parliament for the C.B.C. I intend to follow the example which was given me by one of my predecessors, the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings, who, as the hon. member knows very well, said he would not comment on the programming of the corporation.

REPORTED COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF FRENCH NETWORK

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): The question I am about to ask has nothing to do with programming; it has to do with a speech made by Hon. Bona Arsenault; I have to refer to this before I can ask the question. According to a report I have here Mr. Arsenault said:

> There has been left wing communistic infiltration of the French network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, most of our newspapers and political organizations, perhaps even the Quebec Liberal federation.

However, the administrative responsibility of the minister does not go beyond the first. Has this statement been brought to the attention of the minister? Will the hon. gentleman get in touch with the president of the C.B.C. and have him secure from Mr. Arsenault information regarding this communist influence in the C.B.C. in Quebec, to which reference has been made on a number of occasions?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I will be very glad to ask Mr. Arsenault whether he has any names—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, no. The minister cannot do that; he has just told us he cannot do that. Will he take up this matter with the president of the C.B.C. and let us get to the bottom of this suggestion, because it is repeated frequently that there is communist influence there.

Mr. Lamontagne: I will be happy to ask the president of the C.B.C. as well.

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR INCREASE IN FAMILY ALLOWANCES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance.

In view of the budgetary surplus for the first six months of the current year, could the minister tell the house if he is considering the possibility of increasing family allowances next year?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I presume my hon. friend refers to a statement of the government accounts as at the end of September, which shows a very heartening improvement over last year. This reflects in large measure the improvement in conditions in the country.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And higher taxes.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gordon: My right hon. friend is now talking about something he understands full well.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is something the minister does not understand.

Mr. Gordon: I would point out that not too much by way of inference should be drawn from these published statements—

Mr. Grégoire: That is not what I asked.

Mr. Gordon: I will come to your question in a moment—until the results for the full year are in. In some particulars there have been differences in the way amounts have been collected, so to some extent the comparisons are not completely on the same basis. As to my hon. friend's question, I suspect he knows it is out of order, Mr. Speaker, because he is asking for a statement of government policy on orders of the day.

Mr. Lambert: So has the answer been out of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, respecting the point of order, I believe that if the Minister of Finance deemed that my question was out of order, he took quite a long time to answer it and then say that it was out of order.

I would like to ask him a supplementary question.

Does he deem that the prosperity of the country is measured by the increase in taxes? Is this the meaning of the answer he just gave me?

[*Text*]

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the situation will the minister consider the removal of the 11 per cent sales tax?

Mr. Gordon: I have already answered that question on several occasions. If there are any changes in taxation they will be announced in the next budget.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON REORGANIZATION OF MILITIA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. In view of the fact we are long past the first half of October, when his colleague the associate minister indicated that a decision would be announced with regard to the second half of the Suttie report, is the minister now able to give some certainty of future to the militia by announcing what the decision of the government is in regard to the recommendations in that report?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, at the moment the Suttie proceedings and the departmental position in relation to them are being reproduced and translated. As soon as this mechanical process has taken place we will be in a position to table them. I would expect this to be within a very few days.

Inquiries of the Ministry

TRANSPORT

WHEAT SHIPMENTS THROUGH PORT OF CHURCHILL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture but in his absence I will direct it to his parliamentary secretary. It concerns a question I directed to the minister on July 16 regarding the shipment of grain through the port of Churchill. At that time the minister answered as follows:

> The hon. member may like to know that last year we shipped a record amount of wheat through Churchill, and I suppose we may even exceed that record this year.

In view of the figures just released, which show that 21,644,773 bushels have been shipped through Churchill this year and that this is a million and a quarter bushels less than last year and a half million bushels less than 1959, how can the minister now justify the answer which he gave me on July 16?

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am unable to provide the hon. member with the information he requires. I will bring the question to the attention of the minister, and I am sure he will make a report at the first opportunity. In view of the prefatory remarks to the question of the hon. member, I think he might be interested in the itinerary of the minister for today.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I really think we could save the time of the house by avoiding such material.

POWER

INQUIRY AS TO STUDY OF CONTINENTAL GRID

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Marvin Gelber (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. The minister issued a statement advising that a study is being made of phase two of a national power network which would take into account north-south connections. I wonder whether any consideration is being given to a study of a continental power grid.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether the hon. member would put this question on the order paper.

[Mr. Hellyer.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources.

Since the minister announced last week the establishment of a federal-provincial committee to look into long distance power transmission, I should like to ask him whether he has invited a representative of the province of Quebec to sit on that committee.

If so, what was the reply made by the province of Quebec in this connection, since I note the absence of a Quebec representative on the committee?

[*Text*]

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the hon. member that we have endeavoured at all times to work very closely with the province of Quebec. They were not represented on the interprovincial committee, but it was specifically understood in the interprovincial committee, where this decision was taken, that Quebec be kept advised in every respect on every move that is made.

IMMIGRATION

DAISY MAUD HENRY—CONSIDERATION OF DEPORTATION ORDER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last, in answer to a question by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, I advised the house that I would give serious consideration to the case of Miss Daisy Maud Henry, to see to what extent I could use the discretionary powers of the minister to allow her to remain in Canada.

I wish to emphasize again that the decision in her case was based wholly on the fact that she gained entry to Canada by material misrepresentation, and there is no doubt that she was properly ordered deported. I have decided, however, that the actual deportation will be suspended for three months, during which time all the circumstances relating to Miss Henry and her children will be thoroughly reviewed.

TORONTO—STATUS OF PERSONS CONCERNED WITH NEWSPAPER STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, while I

am on my feet I should like to give an answer to the hon. member for Danforth with regard to a few cases involving workers on newspapers in Toronto. In view of all the circumstances with respect to the dispute in the newspaper industry in Toronto, I deem it proper not to grant landed immigrant status to seven persons who have come to Canada from the United States for employment with the newspapers and who have not been landed, unless in one or more of these cases factors not now known arise that make such landing proper.

To this end I have directed that the case of each of the persons concerned be concluded immediately, and unless exceptional factors arise each person concerned will be asked to leave voluntarily at once. In default of so doing the provisions of the Immigration Act respecting special inquiries and deportation if necessary will be invoked.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. I wonder whether he would consider adding a supplementary answer to the one he gave today to the question by the hon. member for Danforth, giving the names of the persons to whom he is about to deny landed immigrant status so that we may compare them with the information given in answer to my starred question No. 2,054, made by his parliamentary secretary on October 14.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I do not have with me the names of the people concerned and I wonder if it would be proper for the minister to give that information to the house.

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: If that is not possible, will the minister look again at the answer given on October 14 to see whether he can give any more information regarding the names which were placed on *Hansard* on that date?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I shall inquire whether there is a reconciliation to be checked and whether there are contradictions.

[*Text*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS TO PENDING LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the strong objections to Bill No. C-126 by the Vancouver board of trade, the air lines, the Northland Shipping Company, the B.C. towboat owners association, the automotive transport association of B.C., will the minister defer further consideration of this bill in the house, even at this late date, and receive delegations from these industries and organizations?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): I would be glad to receive delegations with a view to hearing representations on this bill. The principal objection to the bill, as I understand it, from almost all these organizations has to do with the hours of work. I think in committee of the whole there will be an opportunity to discuss this and possibly to satisfy hon. members that the provisions of the bill are not as restrictive as they might appear at first glance.

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): I should like to ask the minister if he has replied to the many representations he has had from the trucking industry, and will he table a copy of his reply for the information of the house?

Mr. MacEachen: I have signed a good many letters in reply to representations from the trucking industry. I would be glad to table or make available copies of those letters, or representative copies.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): In view of the answer given by the minister a moment ago are we to take it that all that is going to be done in the committee is to explain that the effects of several sections of this bill are not as the trucking industry believes them to be? Is that all he meant by the statement? I wish to ask him at the same time, in view of the objections that have been raised which appear so well founded—and I am referring to those trucking industries operating between province and province—is it the intention of the government to reconsider the section dealing with hours of work so that the necessary exemption may be provided for that industry?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, presently I have under consideration this particular transitional section which provides for the deferment of the total application of this section, and that I would hope would take into account the objections that have been made. The bill has received second reading, and I think it would not be the wish of the house to depart from the principle, but I think it would be the wish of the house to make it possible for all groups to comply without undue hardship and to consider how this clause might operate or how changes might be made in it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I thank the minister for his statement, because that is along the lines of the answer he gave in the house the other day. Will these various industries, particularly the representatives of interprovincial or national trucking companies, have an opportunity of placing their views before the committee so an amendment may be brought in to assure that the industry shall not be struck a mortal blow?

Mr. MacEachen: I have already heard from the trucking industry, and I gather that hon. members generally have received similar representations. This industry involves a number of complicating factors, including the long hours that have been traditionally worked and the operations which in part may be federal and in part provincial, as well as the further complication of competition between provincial operations, which are under provincial jurisdiction, and competitive organizations under federal jurisdiction. All these things are under consideration. I would not wish to depart from the principles of this bill so that we could achieve them, but I would hope that in committee of the whole we can reach a conclusion which will make it possible for these industries to comply without receiving a mortal blow.

Mr. Gene Rhéaume (Northwest Territories): May I ask the minister a supplementary question which is based on a charge made in this morning's Montreal *Gazette*, to the effect that he conspired with certain Liberal members of parliament to lose the committee vote that made Remembrance day a statutory holiday. I want to ask the minister if he has seen the report, does he agree with it and, if so, why—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I would like to debate this on the late show.

Mr. Speaker: It is possible to debate a question which is in order, but I do not think one which is out of order should be debated.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): As I understand it, the minister is now proposing that we resolve these difficulties in committee of the whole. Would the minister not reconsider and bring this matter before a committee of the house to which we can invite representatives not only of the trucking industry but of other industries, such as the country elevators in western Canada whose interests will be seriously affected by this legislation? In such a committee their viewpoints can be brought directly to all hon. members instead of being leaked into the house by individual members.

Mr. MacEachen: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not intended to send the bill at this stage to a special or standing committee of the house. We, as well as individual hon. members have been hearing the representations of interested groups over the past ten days, and I believe we could deal with the matter effectively by continuing our discussions in committee of the whole. There is one particular point involved. I think there is a solution for it in the bill, and possibly this solution can be improved.

Mr. Chatterton: As a supplementary question, can the minister say whether the shipping and air lines industries were contacted by experts from his department before final drafting of this bill?

Mr. MacEachen: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have attempted discussions, extending back quite a number of months, with interested associations in the country. I cannot say specifically whether discussions were held with these operators prior to the introduction of the bill, but I am sure discussions have been held by officers of the department with at least one group involved, and we would be glad to have discussions with the air lines.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): As a supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I suggest to hon. members that this is almost becoming a debate. We have had seven, eight or nine supplementary questions already.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, may I put this one supplementary which has not been asked. Has the minister received representations from the three prairie wheat pools and other elevator associations in the west with regard to country elevator operations and how Bill No. C-126 applies to them?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have had representations. We have given and are

continuing to give them most careful consideration.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Would he advise the house whether, since the adjournment of the debate last week, Bill No. C-126 has been referred to the law officers of the crown for re-examination to see to which industries it does apply and to which industries it does not apply?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, certain questions did arise in the discussion last week, for example with regard to the fishing industry, and I have asked for advice on the application of the bill to some of these borderline cases which I, as a non-lawyer, would hesitate to deal with myself without further advice.

Mr. Lambert: As a supplementary question, does the minister suggest that the bill was prepared and presented to the house without this prior consideration as to what would be its ambit?

An hon. Member: Typically Liberal.

Mr. MacEachen: No, Mr. Speaker. We have included within the ambit of the bill the traditional jurisdiction of the federal parliament in labour matters. If my hon. friend will refer to other labour acts he will find that we have followed exactly the claims made in those previous acts with respect to jurisdiction.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): As a supplementary question, now that the Department of Justice is studying the bill, would the minister ask that department to list all the industries to which the bill is applicable and those which are excluded from its provisions?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I said I had referred the bill to the Department of Justice. I have asked for further advice on certain points that were raised. The industries that are included in the application clause are those which are covered by the Annual Vacations Act, which my hon. friend introduced. There is exactly the same coverage.

Mr. Starr: In view of the tremendous doubt that there seems to be in the minds of many industries across Canada would the minister not consider asking the Department of Justice to list all the industries to which the bill will be applicable, and those excluded from its application?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I suppose ultimately this is a question that will have to be determined by the courts, but in this bill we are claiming the exact jurisdictional area that has been claimed for federal laws of this kind in the past, and surely there is an experience there that will assist industries in determining the application of this bill to their operations.

[*Later:*]

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I have a question related to the one asked by my hon. friend from the Northwest Territories. Has the government evolved a new technique of governing by proposing legislation which its own members will assist in defeating or amending by staying out of the house?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Aiken: I am not satisfied with the answer, Mr. Speaker, and I give notice I should like to debate this matter at ten o'clock

Mr. Speaker: I may say I am not satisfied with the form of the question.

Mr. Aiken: My question related to the administrative responsibility of the government and I should like to know why it is out of order. I may be wrong, but I phrased it in such a way that it would be in order, as far as I could see.

Mr. Speaker: I may be wrong too, but in my opinion it was a statement, not a question.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

PHYSICAL CONDITION OF PERSONNEL RECALLED TO WORK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Transport. Has he received complaints today that over the week end the C.N.R. called back to work people who had been turned down previously for certain work because they were colour blind and, in one or more other cases, because they had heart conditions? If he has received such complaints will he look into the question of the possible safety hazards involved?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have not received any such complaints.

Interim Supply

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INQUIRY AS TO FRENCH EDITION OF GOVERNMENT TELEPHONE DIRECTORY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put to the Secretary of State a question which I asked about two or three weeks ago and which has remained unanswered.

Could the minister tell us why we have received the government telephone directory in English but not in French?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I had the reply with me the other day but the hon. member was not in the house. I do not have it with me today but I shall give it to the hon. member tomorrow.

[*Text*]

HOUSING

HALIFAX, N.S.—LOW RENTAL ACCOMMODATION FOR NAVAL PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General as the minister in charge of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. What action does he anticipate as a result of his recent meetings with members of the Royal Canadian Navy at Halifax, with regard to providing housing accommodation for ordinary seamen and non-commissioned officers at reasonable rents, a situation that is non-existent today?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that question just a few days ago. If the hon. member will look at *Hansard* I am sure that he will see the answer.

SUPPLY

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

INTERIM SUPPLY

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $740,710,974.77, being the aggregate of

(a) two twelfths of the total of all of the items to be voted in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965, as reduced, except finance item 15, mines and technical surveys item 25, national research council item 10, and transport items 15 and 25 for which the proportion is one twelfth and atomic energy item 5, external affairs item 20, forestry item 25 and legislation item 20 for which no proportion is being released, $651,829,576.84;

(b) an additional two twelfths of the amount of public works item 70 (schedule A), of the said main estimates, $666,666.67;

(c) an additional one twelfth of the amount of fisheries items 5 and 10, legislation item 5, mines and technical surveys item 70, post office item 1 and public works item 40 (schedule B), of the said main estimates, $20,263,800.00;

(d) two twelfths of all of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (A), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, except national defence item 56a, and loans, investments and advances items L12a, L17a and L37a for which no proportion is being released, $20,612,522.50;

(e) an additional two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103a (schedule C), of the said supplementary estimates (A), $872,966.67;

(f) nine twelfths of the total of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (B), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, $46,215,108.75;

(g) two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103b (schedule D), of the said supplementary estimates (B), $250,333.34,

be granted to Her Majesty on account of the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965.

Mr. Lambert: We are dealing today, Mr. Chairman, with the third or fourth request by the government for interim supply. On this occasion it is for two months and this, of course, represents a very large amount of money. We should bear in mind, I think, that on the last occasion three months' supply was granted, and I feel it is incumbent upon members of this committee, especially in view of the fact that there is some doubt as to when the main estimates will come forward —from time to time additional items are brought in—to give this request close consideration.

If we consult a calendar we will find, if I recall correctly what a certain radio announcer said yesterday, that there are 66 or 67 days left before the end of the year. As far as this parliament is concerned it means possibly some 40 sitting days. The Minister of Fisheries, I believe, is doing some fast calculating; he is bringing in all kinds of things. If he wants to get down to a real discussion, then he and I can have one. I should like to get down to a worth-while discussion of the estimates of this government, including those of his department.

In these main estimates the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is responsible for some $88 million, and we are asked to approve one sixth of this amount on this occasion. But there is another item, to which reference may have been made at an earlier date in this house. At the back of the esti-

mates, among the money loans, is an item of $14¼ million to be lent to the corporation. Considering the type of operation carried on by the C.B.C. and the financing carried on by the corporation for a number of years, how is it expected that this loan will be repaid? The total budget of the corporation is far in excess of $88 million, in fact well over $100 million; the C.B.C. has certain revenues of its own. Yet the government of Canada is asked to make up a deficiency of some $88 million for the operation in the coming year. This sum of $14¼ million is presumably to meet expenditures of a capital nature.

In the past such expenditures have been included within the current budget, and when the corporation sought approval of parliament for the provision of the sums it needed, those capital requirements were included in the figure shown in the estimates; there was nothing tucked away in the back of the book. This is one question we should like to have answered. How is it expected that the corporation will repay this loan, and what will be the terms thereof? It behooves us to have more information that the Secretary of State, reporting for the corporation, has given today and on previous occasions when representations have been made from this side of the house and when, I am sure, they have been made by members on the government backbenches to the effect that it is high time the broadcasting committee was reconstituted to look into the affairs and policies of the corporation.

This is not with an idea of conducting a witch hunt. Mr. Chairman, I have to laugh at the sort of coy smile that appears on the face of the Minister of Fisheries when I say that because, after all, my connections with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation are far in excess of his. For three years I was parliamentary secretary to the minister who reported to this house, and I had very cordial relations with the officers and know a good deal about the operations of the corporation. Certainly in the proposals that I make today I have no idea that this house should conduct a witch hunt; that parliament should become in any way a censor of the programming of the corporation, despite the pressures that are on members of parliament by their constituents, or out of their own desire, to bring some influence to bear on the programming standards of the corporation.

This is a public body, financed by public funds, and therefore has a responsibility perhaps even greater than a similar body with a private financial structure. It has been granted a tremendous responsibility by the Broadcasting Act, and I think in the main its record has been good. The officers of the corporation would be the first to admit that a review of their philosophies with regard to programming should be aired before the public, whereby they could place their views before a committee of members from all parties of this house. This would furnish them with the appropriate forum in which they could put across the philosophies of their programming and the principles of their operations. Then members of this house could more readily appreciate the problems and complexities of the operations of such a corporation. It is a big business. I cannot understand the hesitancy on the part of the government at this time, with the rather lame duck excuses made by the Secretary of State that the corporation could not or should not at this time be available for a complete review of its operations.

After all, Mr. Chairman, when hon. members who now occupy the treasury benches were sitting on this side of the house they were always after the government of the day to have the C.B.C. appear before a committee. As a matter of fact the broadcasting committee sat in 1959 and, if I recall correctly, it sat last in 1961. Three years have elapsed since that time; certain questions were under study then, and in a committee members could far better determine what progress has been made and what difficulties have been encountered in the formulation of future programming of the corporation and the extension of its services since 1961.

But no; we are told there is an advisory committee which will report in a confidential manner to the government. This advisory committee is headed by a man who had previously sat on a commission that had to do with broadcasting and who, frankly, made some recommendations that did not work out. This committee is to report to the government. Then, apparently under a cloak of confidentiality, policy will be determined and it will then be announced. It is said that then a broadcasting committee may be set up.

Just who is the government trying to fool? This is not going to help the corporation. It has a public relations responsibility to the viewing public, to the citizens of Canada; and I am afraid that at the present time its public relations have suffered, because never have we seen so much in print, either in letters to the editor, comments in newspaper

columns, or representations by members, about the nature of programming.

I readily agree that individual members should not be in the position of acting as censors, because what is one man's meat is another man's poison. But why this disquiet? It must mean that there is an uneasiness about the philosophy at the back of certain types of programs. Let us take the field of public affairs. I personally am very concerned as to why certain individuals seem to have a prominence on many programs; that they are the ones who are invited to be interviewed; that they are people who represent far-out ideas, whether they are from the right or from the left, whether they are of a wildly non-conformist view or whether they are just plain oddballs. It seems that the smart thing to do is to guarantee them a prime forum. They represent a minuscule of opinion in this country, and they could not buy the forum they are given.

Let us look at the situation at the time of the royal visit and after those unhappy events in Quebec city. What happened in the case of the leader of a very minor group, a man who had been castigated by the Prime Minister, by the Minister of Justice, by the premier of the province of Quebec, and by right thinking citizens across this country? The C.B.C. was indecently precipitate in putting him on one program called "Front Page Challenge". I am talking about the man Bourgault. Lo and behold, if that was not enough, on the Sunday night the Queen arrived in Ottawa I watched the program "This Hour has Seven Days" and one of the interviewers, with perhaps a touch of wry humour, indicated that the man who had done most to make the stay of the Queen in Quebec city unpleasant had not been able to appear on that Sunday program because he had been stopped, or he could not get to the studios because of the size of the crowds that were welcoming Her Majesty in Ottawa.

It is not that I object to the fact that a man is going to be interviewed on a program, but I do not understand why he should be allowed to use this forum. Last night the C.B.C. imported a man from the United States to Canada whose philosophy is that which was adopted by a group which many of us who served for years in Canadian armed forces, attempted to destroy. The hon. member for York South was mystified as to why he should be allowed or invited to appear.

Last year a man who had been convicted in the United States and fined thousands of dollars, and was subject to further penalty in relation to downright dirty pornography, was brought to Canada for the purpose of interviewing him on a television program. I should like to know what is the philosophy behind this type of programming. These programs come into our living rooms, and as parents of children, who are very impressionable, we realize what detrimental effects this type of thing can have. It seems that the C.B.C. follows a policy in respect of programs whereby anything which is wrong, a deviation, or detracts from common decent morality or commonly accepted authority should be glorified.

The corporation does a great deal of good work in many fields. I hope to see it do much more work in the field of education. The C.B.C. does a great deal of good work in respect of its productions which show various areas of Canada to Canadians. It does good work in respect of its documentary productions, and in this regard it should be commended. On the other hand, are members of parliament asked to appear on C.B.C. programs to answer questions or present their views in respect of things that affect us all as Canadian citizens? That is not the case. Are members of parliament, or men in public life, asked to present their views in respect of certain films? That is not what is happening.

The thing I object to is the choice of individual who is interviewed on television. I do not know whether the officials of the C.B.C. are aware of this fact, but an individual who appears on television seems to have received a sort of seal of approval, or at least this is the impression in the minds of a great proportion of Canada's viewing public.

The hon. member for Grey North on several occasions has asked serious questions in respect of particular programs which have appeared as parts of series. Many of these programs have been highly objectionable because they are viewed by family groups. It is not sufficient to say that if we do not like or object to particular programs we should turn off the television set. That can be done, but some of the things which are shown and statements which are made are not foreseeable, and any harm that might be done will have been done before the set can be turned off. Many of these statements are made from one second to another, and one cannot avoid the possible harm by turning the set off after the objectionable things have been said.

I suggest we must receive answers to questions so that we will know why certain programs are being allowed. Many of them deal with subjects of morality. Not too many days ago on the program called "This Hour has Seven Days", individuals were interviewed about the contraceptive pill. The program contained street interviews of high school girls, and the view that these pills should be issued in high school was blithely presented. Apparently it was suggested that there is a lack of morality in our high schools, and because of human relationships these pills might just as well be made available. I wonder what could have been in the minds of the producers of this program when they allowed this expression of opinion by individuals interviewed on the streets, and what effect they think such an opinion would have on teenagers. While it may be of interest and benefit to discuss matters of this kind among adults, I can see no possible advantage in presenting this type of opinion to the people of Canada. Again I say that we must look into this situation and find out why the C.B.C. is allowing this type of program.

In this regard I should like to refer briefly to an article which appeared in today's Toronto *Globe and Mail* under the by-line of Dennis Braithwaite. The article is headed "Fighting Sin, C.B.C.". I do not intend to read this article, but wish to say that it is a protest by various groups against certain programs which seem to glorify sin, sexual deviation and crime. The people referred to in this article are not a group of oddballs, but are responsible citizens discharging their responsibility with respect to and concern with the things around them. The list of individuals includes members of fraternal organizations and women's organizations who are very concerned with this whole question.

During the past few years there has been a great deal of criticism in respect of the corporation because of its programming policy. Surely it is the duty of all members of this house who are charged with the safeguarding of the public interest to demand—and I do demand—an examination and a review of the C.B.C. There may be some point of view on the part of the corporation that we as individuals not connected with the broadcasting industry may not appreciate, and the corporation could put forward this view. I want to see this frank exchange of views in order to make what I think is a soundly based broadcasting organization function more efficiently.

I do not know whether the management of the corporation are deaf to the things that are said by individual citizens in regard to what is done by the corporation. Certain producers, and what have you, move in rather arty circles where views are somewhat freer and there is perhaps not quite the same appreciation of everyday morality, but the fact is their views as to what should appear on television screens and come forth from loudspeakers do not necessarily represent what is the best for Canada.

I cannot share at all the views of the Secretary of State this afternoon that the management of a corporation could not possibly cope with committee hearings. They are much more able men than that. He is actually underestimating their capacity. In addition, it is not only the top management whom we would like to question. There is within the corporation a very extensive middle echelon and I think it would be most helpful to have these people explain their operations. It is not those who work at the headquarters of the C.B.C. and live in Ottawa who determine the exact nature of a program. After all, I am sure that the president and vice presidents only become aware of certain programs if they happen to see them on the screen and then it is too late to do anything about them.

Another aspect of the corporation that we would like to examine is its facilities. What are its plans for Vancouver? We have had a lot of questions on this matter. There is already a great deal of controversy between the city of Vancouver and the corporation. Let us help resolve the matter. Let us bring it out in the open where it can be examined and where the corporation can state its point of view.

What about Montreal? Where is the corporation heading there? What is being done? What progress is being made? In this regard it is not sufficient to have the minister responsible for the corporation answer questions on the discussion of his estimates. I am sure the estimates of his department and of the corporation will be among the last to be examined by the house and they will be caught in the gallop toward adjournment. This has happened so often in the past and it can easily happen again.

What about Toronto? There is an amount of $14 million here that we want explained. When we pass the motion for interim supply we will have granted eight twelfths or perhaps nine twelfths of the total amount of the estimates. This is more than the proper time to be discussing what the corporation is going to do.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Lambert: If I may have a couple of minutes I shall be finished.

The Chairman: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lambert: I would refer to another point in which the hon. member for Churchill, the hon. member for Port Arthur and a number of hon. members from Newfoundland are also most interested. I have in mind the extension of services to outlying areas. It is three years since we have had a statement of policy in this regard informing us what the corporation planned to do at that time. We should like to know what it has done in the interval and what it intends to do in the future.

In the same vein, what about colour television? This will cost the Canadian people a vast sum of money not only for facilities for the C.B.C. but with regard to the private television network and also for individual receiving sets. This is a matter on which we must have some information from the corporation.

As an individual I should also like to see what the corporation is really doing with regard to planning in the field of educational programming and co-operation with the ministries of education of the provinces. We are interested in what can be done. What use is being made of visual instruction? I know it is already being done in a limited way in the schools for certain subjects at certain levels, but I think we should really look into this matter in view of the expected great shortage of teachers.

Yesterday I was talking to a man who had come to Ottawa for the Canadian universities conference. This year the universities have been hit with the front line of that wave of students who were born in the immediate post-war years, and the universities frankly do not know whether they are going to be able to cope with the problem. Is television part of the answer in order to deal with the shortage of teachers and the shortage of plant? I think we could get a worth-while contribution from the corporation in this regard by ascertaining what its ideas are on the subject. If it has no ideas we want to know why.

For these reasons I think the government has been most remiss in refusing to accede to the legitimate demands of members of the house for the setting up of the broadcasting committee many weeks ago. In my view a lot of the difficulties and much of the criticism on orders of the day, which will continue, would have been taken care of if we could have had a broadcasting committee. I intend to emphasize this point again and again and I am sure my colleagues are going to do the same. I do not think it is the corporation that is at fault. Rather it is the government that is at fault by refusing to accede to our request for a parliamentary committee and prefering to set up its own little confidential advisory committee. I do not think that such a committee is a good answer to our requests.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, members of this party have been asking for a parliamentary committee on broadcasting for several months. There have been a number of reasons why we felt this was necessary and many of them were repeated once more by the hon. member for Edmonton West in his remarks. If the government, and the Secretary of State in particular, continue to refuse to set up this committee it leaves those of us who feel strongly about the matter with only one alternative, that is to take advantage of these interim supply motions from time to time to air our grievances about the operations of the C.B.C., thereby taking up a lot of time that could be devoted more properly to legislation. If this committee had been set up, all of these grievances and representations could be made in the committee. What is more, Mr. Chairman, this procedure would be more beneficial because we would have not only the senior officers but other officials from the C.B.C. before us and we could get some answers to the questions we ask.

Now, over the years, particularly during the last few months, whenever questions pertaining to programming or any other aspect of C.B.C. operations are posed to the Secretary of State, who has the responsibility of answering for the C.B.C. in this house, he consistently ducks the questions by saying, "I will communicate the opinion of my hon. friend to the C.B.C." He has also been fairly consistent, Mr. Chairman, in not coming back with the answers. As I have said, this leaves us no other course of action except continually to raise these grievances on interim supply motions. The hon. member for Edmonton West repeated something that has been said in this house on a number of occasions, that is that probably the estimates of the Secretary of State, which include the C.B.C. estimates, will be introduced during the dying hours of this session when there will be a rush to complete a number of tag

ends. We can look back over the record and find that last year the C.B.C. estimates were introduced after supper—it was after seven o'clock—on the last day of the session. I cannot but believe that this was done deliberately so that there could not be opportunity, or at least it would be awkward and inconvenient to have a detailed examination of some of the activities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

The year before that there was no detailed examination of the estimates of the C.B.C. This parliament, therefore, which is supposed to have some control of the operations of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, has been completely denied any access to the officers of this corporation for the last three years. This parliament has been denied even the opportunity of interrogating the minister when the C.B.C. was asking for nearly $100 million of the taxpayers' money. We believe this practice has gone completely beyond reason. We do have a responsibility. So far as I am concerned, I am getting tired of providing the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation with a blank cheque for about $100 million every year without having the C.B.C. answer to this house for what they do with it, and whether or not the people who are providing that money are satisfied with the kind of service they are getting.

There is a great deal that could be said about the kind of programming in which the C.B.C. seems to persist, regardless of the protestations they receive. I can remember for example, there were protests in this house, and by way of letters to the newspapers all over the country, regarding a program called "Quest". I believe they even started a new season of "Quest" after these protestations were received, and the program continued for many months. The government never provided us with an opportunity to examine any officer or producer, whoever it is inside the organization, as to why they insisted on keeping this kind of program. I think that the whole moral structure of that which the C.B.C. is apparently prepared to present has deteriorated to such an extent that the members of this house have not only a right but an obligation to have a good, hard look at who is perpetuating this kind of thing.

It has been repeatedly stated, but I am going to say it again because we do not get any answers. The C.B.C. is responsible directly to parliament and to no one else. But we are in fact prevented from getting a minister involved in the details of answering for the activities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. At the same time we are denied a parliamentary committee which would give us an opportunity to send for witnesses from this organization. Now, putting these two things together simply leaves you in a ridiculous, frustrated position. I believe it is about time the government took these protestations seriously. I am convinced that resentment amongst members of this house, and amongst Canadians generally, is building up to the point where some drastic action has to be taken and the people are prepared to support this kind of drastic action against the C.B.C.

It does not seem to me it is any protection for the members of the government to refuse parliament this broadcasting committee. I cannot understand why the government persists in its position. It is providing an internal examination conducted by another so-called committee. Perhaps this committee will perform a useful function, but why this should necessarily prevent the setting up of a parliamentary committee is beyond my comprehension. What is the government afraid of? What are the officers of the C.B.C. afraid of? If they are afraid of something, we ought to have them before us. As I have said, I am not concerned with whether or not it is convenient for the senior officers of the C.B.C. to meet a parliamentary committee. To me, this has no weight at all. I feel there has been enough representation that whether or not it is convenient for them they should be called and they should be prepared to testify to the kind of action they have been taking.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these protests have come from a number of parties in the house, and have come from a number of organizations. Perhaps in some respects you may say that this stems from some dissatisfaction with what the C.B.C. does about public affairs programs and how they allocate political time. Certainly there has been room for dispute about the justice of the manner in which they handle this, but it is considerably worse than that at this time.

The hon. member for Edmonton West referred briefly to an article in today's *Globe and Mail,* written by Dennis Braithwaite, and I should like to deal with it in more detail as it is pertinent to the matter before us this afternoon and is in line with the resentment building up in the country. I quote from the article as follows:

Did you ever hear of an all-Canadian movement called Declaration by Canadian Women? Its purpose, which it has been pursuing among women's organizations and church groups over the past year at least, is, in the words of its manifesto, "to end

the domination of a minority who misuse the C.B.C. to spread propaganda for perversion, pornography, free love, blasphemy, dope, violence and crime." In its general preamble, attached to a petition form, Declaration states that both radio and t.v. are being exploited to maintain a constant assault on character, to undermine faith in God and respect for law and authority and to destroy sound home life and the knowledge of right and wrong. Noting that the C.B.C. last year spent $86 million of public money, the document calls on members of parliament to make the corporation "answerable to the Canadian people." Lest anyone think this is a demand for censorship, the declaration insists that the present freedom of the C.B.C. is a form of censorship. "Those who kill the conscience of a nation dig the grave of freedom and prepare the ground for dictatorship. It begins when God-given standards are mocked and their proponents are belittled, bullied, or silenced altogether."

This might be called a fairly strong statement, but let us have a look at those supporting Declaration by Canadian Women. They are people such as Mrs. Ward Markle of Toronto, president of the Ontario section of the Catholic women's league; Mrs. J. E. Houck, of Brampton, a former UN delegate and C.B.C. director; Senator Quart of Quebec; Ethel S. Wilson, minister without portfolio in the Alberta cabinet; Mrs. G. C. V. Hewson, president, Ontario division of the Canadian mental health association; Mrs. Cora R. Casselman, former member for parliament for Edmonton East; Mrs. A. D. Keith of Winnipeg, president of the women's Christian temperance union of Canada; Mrs. Isabel Ross, a member of the board of education of Toronto and Mrs. H. M. Schweitzer, past provincial commissioner of the girl guides of Saskatchewan.

The article adds:

While the language of the declaration can be dismissed as extremist and even hysterical, these names (there are 30 in all) carry weight. How did the usually circumspect C.B.C. manage to alienate so many of those who should be its friends and supporters?

The reason it has been able to alienate a lot of high placed and reasonable thinking people is its cavalier disregard of those protestations that were made during the past few months. We have come to the point where it is without doubt the responsibility of the government to set up this committee at once, first in order to clear up this matter of the protestations and second, to exonerate, if that is possible, a crown corporation that is financed from public funds to the extent of about $100 million a year.

We as members of parliament have no right to continue to provide public funds to an organization that has fallen into the disrepute that the C.B.C. has. It is, as I said, incomprehensible to see the government adamantly refuse to shed some light on the reason officers of the C.B.C. are continuing to allow this kind of programming.

I believe the C.B.C. has probably done more to spotlight the divisions between English and French speaking Canadians than anything else, and has done so by giving repetitious attention to the extremist viewpoints. For the most part we in this parliament consider these divisions as one of the most serious problems facing the nation, yet when protestations are made through the Secretary of State to the C.B.C. to stop providing a platform for these extremist viewpoints, we are told we must not be concerned with C.B.C. programming.

Another thing which disturbs me is the tremendous expansion of the C.B.C. If it is responsible only to parliament I would like to know where it got the authority to continue to expand year after year to its present magnitude. I have never heard anyone on the floor of this house demanding that the C.B.C. expand its activities and its budget year after year, but when I say that I must make one modification. There has been a demand for the C.B.C. to extend its broadcasting facilities through satellites in order to carry its signals into some areas that are not served by any television channel. That is a valid request for expansion, but to my knowledge no member of parliament has requested that the C.B.C. continually expand its budget.

Over the past ten or 12 years the C.B.C.'s estimates have grown from $25 million to $50 million to $70 million and are now well over $100 million annually. In this connection I would point out that the argument advanced by the hon. member for Edmonton West, that its estimates for operations are a little deceptive, is a valid one. Prior to 1964-65 the C.B.C. has included in its estimates so much for operations and so much for capital works or the expansion of capital works. We all know very well that when it starts out on a $30 million or $40 million building in Toronto or Montreal, but only requests something like $10 million or $14 million in the first year, once we approve that initial expenditure we are hooked for the rest of it.

In addition to the matter of loans this is a complete deception because, as has been pointed out, the C.B.C. does not have any substantial income other than that voted by

parliament. So when it calls these moneys loans we know very well they will have to be paid back out of appropriations passed later by parliament. In my opinion this is not a proper way to proceed and present estimates. It is a kind of subterfuge to circumvent what may be required under the law respecting estimates, and it gives the C.B.C. the opportunity to spend more money than is indicated. These are some of the more important reasons we need the officers from the C.B.C. before us.

On a number of occasions we in this party have taken the position that there is neither a fair distribution of free political time nor objective reporting of the news from this parliament. We have seen a screen of silence come down within the C.B.C. over the activities of members of this party in the House of Commons, and we should like to have someone from the C.B.C. explain why this is being done. I know that members of the Social Credit party have been most vociferous in their criticism of the corporation. We do not apologize for that. What is more, we intend to continue this criticism in line with what we consider to be our responsibility. If this is some kind of revenge being practised on this party in the allocation of free political time and also in the imposition of a news blackout upon us, those concerned may as well know now that we do not intend to be intimidated by actions of this kind. I have asked the Secretary of State in this house at least three times to tell me how the C.B.C. allocates time to the various political parties on both the national and the provincial scene. The program on the national level is, I believe, called "The Nation's Business" and at provincial level it is called "Provincial Affairs", at least in Alberta.

I happen to know that in some years, 1961 and 1962 particularly, there was a difference of as much as 61 to one. Yet when the C.B.C. allocated time on "Provincial Affairs" in Alberta they gave the same time to the party with one member in the provincial legislature as they did to the party which had 61 members. I happen to know that one of the conditions they laid down before any time was granted on the national scene was that a party should have some members in the House of Commons. Yet there were occasions in Alberta in the "Provincial Affairs" program when free time was given to speakers belonging to a party which did not have a single member in the provincial legislature. My hon. friend from Cariboo tells me it is that way in British Columbia now.

This is not fair, and we have asked time and again: who is it who sets down the formula? Who makes the decisions, and why are they not consistent as between one area and another or one province and the next? The Social Credit party to my knowledge has not been provided with any free time on "Provincial Affairs" broadcasts in any province where it has no elected members. Yet we find parties in Alberta and B.C., parties which have no members in the legislatures, being given time. Why? Who sets up the formula? Who decides these things? We never get answers from the Secretary of State or from his parliamentary secretary who replies from time to time. We want to get answers to these questions. We do not want to be dismissed with elusive remarks and perhaps a smile. To us this is a serious matter. We believe that when we are called upon to provide $100 million for a public broadcasting system and are told consistently that this corporation is responsible to parliament and to parliament alone, there should be some opportunity for the members of this parliament to interrogate the officers of the corporation. That ought to be clear. It does not seem to me that there is any ambiguity about that request. But still the government adamantly refuses to set up the committee to enable us to look into this question.

There are many other questions which should be asked. The committee should look into allegations concerning the management of news; allegations with respect to the type of individual who is asked to appear on public affairs programs. We should like to find out why certain patterns are followed. No one can deny that this forum which is provided by the C.B.C. does have a profound influence on public opinion in Canada. Certainly, if it does not, it is a complete failure because it is one of the major media of communication with the masses in Canada. So it seems to me that the government could save itself a lot of headache and a lot of time on interim supply motions if it would move quickly to set up this parliamentary committee on broadcasting and clear the air with regard to some of the allegations which have been made. Serious allegations made by very responsible people have not been dealt with.

Members of the opposition have been criticized for taking too much time in the House of Commons on supply motions and other matters. If the way in which the government has handled the queries which have come to it concerning the C.B.C. is to continue there will certainly be a lot more time taken up. I heard it said this afternoon that a lot of time

could be saved in the question period preceding orders of the day if the government would agree to set up this committee, and I believe this to be a fact. Indeed as the days go by I am sure more questions will be asked before orders of the day are called, and a lot more time will be used to discuss matters on the floor of this house unless we are given an opportunity to examine some of the officers of the corporation.

I cannot understand why the government appears to be protecting the C.B.C. at the present time. Our examination of the officials need not interfere in any way with the work of this other committee, this secret committee or whatever you want to call it, which the government itself has set up. Even if we did not receive satisfactory answers from the officials of the C.B.C. to the extent that we could revise the relationship between the corporation and members of this house, at least we would have the opportunity to indicate to those officials the opinions coming to us from the people we represent. This process is the essence of democracy as far as I am concerned. Asking members of this house to provide money for a corporation while at the same time refusing them an opportunity to examine the affairs of that corporation is, to me, the exact opposite of democratic procedure. So I hope the government will understand that there is increasing pressure to establish this parliamentary committee, and the sooner they get on with it the sooner we will be able to have some time and clear up some of the business before the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: I have but a few comments to make, Mr. Chairman. Further to the previous speaker's remarks, I would point out that members on this side of the house have no objection whatever to seeing those of the opposition do their duty.

I think many hon. members would benefit greatly by being a bit more concise in their remarks. Some of them go on until their time has run out, when they could easily cut down what they have to say to ten or 15 minutes. As for me, I should like to give evidence of such conciseness in the points I wish to make in this debate.

Last Friday during the debate on interim supply the house dealt with C.N.R. lines. Today we are discussing the C.B.C. For my part, I feel that the most important problem facing us now is that of national unity. That is why I should like to take the opportunity afforded me by the examination of interim supply to express a few ideas.

[Mr. Olson.]

In my opinion, what is missing in our country at present is the development of a Canadian ideal. Regionalism is showing itself here and there across Canada. Often an excessive provincialism also manifests itself. I feel it would be much more in keeping with this desire to achieve the Canadian ideal to look after, if not the creation, at least the consolidation of a Canadian ideal.

What is a Canadian ideal? If it can be summed up schematically, it is an ideal according to which one believes in the expansion and dissemination of the two fundamental cultures of our country. Many speeches are heard on both sides. Speeches intended to proclaim equality of rights, speeches intended to illustrate the greatness and beauty of our two national cultures. However, on the practical level, tremendous deficiencies become evident.

This is why I feel it is urgent—and this becomes imperative for the federal government—to work unceasingly on this task, in order to create, to consolidate and to strengthen a Canadian ideal.

Today Canadians co-operate mainly for economic purposes. But we need more than solidarity on the economic level. I believe that we should all acquire a deep patriotic ideal, which at present does not exist.

As far as I am concerned, I would approve the federal government taking the initiative in this area, because if it is held in suspicion among French speaking Canadians, it is due to the fact that it was realized and it is still being realized that the federal government does not seem interested in promoting French culture. What the French Canadians obtain, they always gain after bitter demands, often after recriminations, and we are wondering if this complex of recrimination is not being forced into us; at times, this becomes an exhausting task.

In my opinion, the federal government must assume a determining initiative in the area of national unity. It could, for instance, create a department of French culture, as a division perhaps of the Secretary of State department. There is nothing contrary to this in our constitution. The emergency created today by the stormy events of the last several months certainly indicates a crisis in our national unity, and we know that according to our constitution, peace, order and good administration in Canada fall under the jurisdiction of the federal government. This department of French culture would not in any way violate any provision of our constitution, because the Massey-Lévesque commission

established very fine shades, subtle distinctions between the area of education and that of primary and secondary education, which falls exclusively and which will always fall exclusively under the jurisdiction of the provinces; distinctions made between the field of education and that of culture as such.

That is why, in my opinion, it would be quite consistent with our constitution for the federal government to take the initiative in this area by creating a department of French culture and thereby take advantage of the new spirit in this regard. This must be pointed out, in order to pay tribute to those who show this fine attitude. Attention must be drawn to this new climate which prevails in a goodly part of the English speaking population, which today shows a far greater understanding of the French fact than it did some 25 or 30 years ago.

For my part, I must say that within the Liberal party—I do not wish to make a political issue of this, but I must say that I could not feel more at ease than I do within the Liberal party, and I feel that this spirit of mutual understanding, which is favourable to biculturalism, is due in the first place to the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Pearson.)

Mr. Chairman, while establishing a department of culture, we could refer to some figures which are most significant and promote the French culture from coast to coast, instead of limiting it to Quebec.

Statistics show that, in all provinces of the country, there is a French fact. It is more or less powerful, according to the demographic strength of the various provinces. So, may I point out to you that, in Prince Edward Island, 8.8 per cent of the population is French speaking, in Nova Scotia, 6.9 per cent is French speaking, in Manitoba, 8.2 per cent, in Alberta, the figure is lower, but still significant, 4.7 per cent. In British Columbia, 3.6 per cent. In Ontario, figures are a little more comforting, that is 9.4 per cent; in New Brunswick, 37.8 per cent of the population is French speaking.

What part would a department of French culture play? Its importance would be as follows: I quoted figures relating to the French speaking population in the various provinces; if one now refers to the people of French origin, one notes a set-back, because many people of French origin in certain provinces can no longer speak French. Therefore, a certain assimilation took place. I do not hesitate to say that the Durham report belongs to the past.

There is no question today of assimilating the French speaking population. On the contrary, this new climate which should make us happy, instead of promoting this assimilation, tends more to encourage the development and the growth of the French fact.

Mr. Chairman, assimilation has been fairly intensive in all provinces. In Prince Edward Island, for instance, 16.6 per cent of the population is of French origin but only 8.8 per cent speak French. In Nova Scotia, 12 per cent of the people are of French origin but only 6.9 per cent of them are French speaking. In New Brunswick, 38.8 per cent of the population is of French origin but only 37.8 per cent speak French, there being a loss of 1 per cent in that province.

In the province of Ontario, 10.3 per cent of the people are of French origin but only 9.4 per cent of them are French speaking. Comparative figures for Manitoba are 9.1 and 8.2 per cent. The situation is the same in the other provinces.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, so as to put an end to this assimilation movement, to promote an atmosphere of national unity, to show that the great principles we advocate with regard to bilingualism and biculturalism do not remain meaningless and empty statements, I think it is time, now more than ever, for the federal government to stop being suspected of furthering assimilation, since on the contrary the federal government must strive by all available means to keep these two cultures, these two civilizations in our country more flourishing than ever.

I would add a suggestion, Mr. Chairman, in order to accomplish which seems to me the most urgent task: There is a royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism whose terms of reference in my opinion, should be extended to include a study of a vital and essential problem, i.e. immigration.

As we know, immigration is the chief instrument through which the French cause could be served, for immigration can affect the population pattern in this country. At the present time, immigration could be one of the greatest instruments at our disposal. I said it again and again, and repeat it once more today, immigration has always operated against the French fact.

I believe immigration is a vital problem, and the terms of reference of the royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism should be broadened to include a study of this serious problem, as it affects national unity and the French fact, so that a fair

balance might exist and that French Canada be no longer victimized by our immigration policy.

There is another instrument which can be beneficial to French Canada. I refer to television, which comes under the Secretary of State and to which there could be added another branch, that of French culture. Television could then play a leading part and be beneficial to us.

I believe that in promoting the French fact we shall create that climate of national unity which is becoming more and more essential at this juncture.

[*Text*]

Mr. Gundlock: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just resumed his seat brought certain aspects of this debate to your attention and to the attention of this committee. I noticed particularly that he related his remarks to the actions of the C.B.C., the biculturalism and bilingualism commission, to immigration and to a new spirit of cooperation. He also suggested that a new minister be appointed in respect of the C.B.C. The hon. member also referred to contributions to French culture, and called attention to certain percentages.

At this time I do not mention these items by way of criticism, but should like to point out that in spite of the fact that on many occasions during past weeks, months and even years when these questions have been asked, the minister responsible to parliament for the operation of the C.B.C. has not been in his place. That is a significant fact which should be brought to the attention of this committee, and possibly to the attention of the public as a whole. I think the public should be made aware of the situation, in view of the fact that this crown corporation is asking us to approve, by passing these estimates an expenditure in the neighbourhood of $88 million. I should like to remind this committee that these are tax dollars, and we are only discussing a portion of them today. The hon. member for Edmonton West earlier today drew attention to capital loans in the amount of $14,500,000. To use the vernacular, Mr. Chairman, that ain't hay.

I have in my hand an article written by an individual closely associated with broadcasting, which relates directly to certain points I should like to refer to this afternoon. Basically this article dealing with broadcasting principles, particularly of the C.B.C., reads in part as follows:

[Mr. Choquette.]

In principle, it is parliament which determines the roles of the various elements within the Canadian broadcasting system. However, in practice—

I should like to repeat that for emphasis, Mr. Chairman.

However, in practice parliament has confined itself to the declaration of certain broad national objectives without offering many specific instructions concerning how the goals are to be achieved. For the most part, it is content to examine, and usually approve, methods devised by others.

For example, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has placed its own interpretation on its simply worded parliamentary mandate to provide "a national broadcasting service". The corporation has devised policies, which, in its judgment, meet this requirement and these it refers, periodically, to parliament for endorsation. Since the corporation's inception, this procedure has been a significant feature of its operations. It has been followed consistently, and without serious parliamentary criticism. Consequently, the C.B.C. is justified in assuming that it is interpreting its role correctly.

Mr. Chairman, after this quotation from a prominent broadcaster in respect of his interpretation of the C.B.C.'s role in the Canadian broadcasting system I should like to refer to specific cases, to which almost violent objection has been taken both in this and that other place, as a result of representations by Canadian citizens. I should like also to refer to specific statements which have been made both during the question period and during the debate in this committee this afternoon. I refer again to this sentence from the quotation: "It has been followed consistently, and without serious parliamentary criticism". This can hardly be so, Mr. Chairman. As the member for one constituency it would be my conclusion that in some cases the C.B.C. has almost flagrantly disregarded public opinion. As I pointed out earlier, almost violent representations have been made to members, and I will put some of them on the record later.

There is also a general misunderstanding among the Canadian public with regard to the very conception of a crown corporation. We as members of the house understand what is really meant when it is said that the C.B.C. or any other crown corporation is subject to parliamentary control. But there is general misunderstanding among the Canadian people with regard to the C.B.C. in particular and this may be because people are so much more familiar with the actions of this crown corporation. The average Canadian citizen or taxpayer has the impression that control of the C.B.C. by parliament may be obtained by a mere objection or prayer or petition to his representative in parliament. Few people realize that control by parliament actually means control by the government in

the first instance, second, by the House of Commons and, third, by the other place. Very few people indeed realize that there has to be a combination of expression of views by all three before the management of the crown corporation really listens to parliament.

We had a good example earlier today in connection with Canadian National Railways. How many times and for how long have objections been raised in the house with regard to the C.N.R. which as a crown corporation is in my view almost identical to the C.B.C.? For a long, long time in committee of the whole house we have heard objections about certain aspects of the management of the C.N.R. But what happened? Actually the situation was allowed to deteriorate to such an extent that the railway personnel had to take action which resulted in service to the people being curtailed.

When was the control finally exercised by parliament? Earlier today there was tabled in the house a communication between the Prime Minister and the head of the crown corporation. After years of representations and many complaints, only then did the crown corporation come close to being controlled by parliament and even then the control was temporary.

In my view the government, or at least the minister responsible for reporting to the house for the C.B.C., should take note of some of the things that have been said today. I have pointed out the final reaction with regard to complaints and disputes about one corporation, and in so far as the C.B.C. is concerned I hope that things do not have to proceed to that point in order to have the management of the C.B.C. at least listen to some of the complaints made in parliament, particularly by people who feel that such a crown corporation should be controlled by parliament. After all, the people who are elected to represent the taxpayers of Canada certainly should be listened to with regard to crown corporations more so than has been the case for some time past.

I mentioned earlier that revisions in C.B.C. programming have only been made in some cases, not all, after almost violent objections by decent, intelligent citizens. If I may, I should like to put something on the record in this regard. The letter to which I wish to refer has to do with a program no longer broadcast but it bears on the point we are talking about today. The letter is signed, is from Lethbridge and is dated February 26 of this year. It is addressed to me as a member of parliament and reads as follows:

Dear Sir:

I am writing to you to complain about that program "Quest".

I know this is old hash but it does bear on the point I am trying to make this afternoon.

I think it is the most filthy program I have ever seen and last night it was terrible. Everybody around here is disgusted. It makes you ashamed to be a Canadian. It is no good writing to the C.B.C. They have had so many letters and pay no attention to it. I think it should be taken off the air. It is surely no program for teenagers. If you have not seen it, especially last night's, I wish you could.

I might interject that I did not see the program.

Usually we turn "Quest" off, but we left it on last night and it was disgusting. I can't understand the players. Don't they feel embarrassed playing parts in a thing like that? I thought I would write to you and see if there is anything you can do. Thanking you for your time...

P.S. There have been a lot of people here talking over telephone this morning and everybody is disgusted with last night's "Quest" program. The C.B.C. have quite a lot of good programs.

I want to emphasize that too, Mr. Chairman. The C.B.C. has a lot of good programs.

Why spoil it by putting on things like last night's?

That brings up another point, and may I say I do not mean to be completely critical, Mr. Chairman. Many Canadians, I among them, are very proud of the corporation, particularly because of the fact that service was made possible long ago to people who might not yet have either radio or television broadcasting service. The position of the corporation has been jealously guarded and I think it should continue to be. However, the corporation also has a primary responsibility in that it has a captive audience and therefore the corporation must give first place to its primary responsibility. In my view its primary responsibility encompasses such things as educational programs, factual programs, factual reporting of the news and so on.

The hon. member for Edmonton West brought forward a good point when he mentioned education by television. In the more remote areas, this applies to radio as well. I think we could go even further than that and refer to the impact that television and radio have today on the written word. I believe that the power of the written word is still the most powerful influence today. Not only do we have a responsibility in so far as television and radio are concerned, therefore, but television and radio have a respon-

sibility today with regard to their influence on the press, as we commonly refer to the written word. This, to me, is very important.

In order to emphasize what I said earlier, I want to refer to a current happening. The Canadian people have the idea, with regard to the C.B.C. as well as other crown corporations, that this parliament shall determine the various roles of the various elements within the Canadian structure. I said in the beginning, and I want to repeat this, that if parliament is to control or even to consider the role the C.B.C. and other crown corporations have in the general Canadian structure, then why is the minister responsible for reporting to parliament on the C.B.C. absent when we are discussing this matter?

Mr. McIlraith: I will explain that in a moment.

Mr. Gundlock: Now?

Mr. McIlraith: No, as soon as the hon. member completes his remarks.

Mr. Gundlock: I hope it will be a good explanation and I appreciate hearing from the minister. Nevertheless this question will be a matter of record today. The hon. member who spoke before me mentioned some new ideas. They were good ideas. I agree with them, probably with the exception of his reference to a percentage of French and English. I am not talking about that, I am talking as a Canadian. I am thinking of Canada as a whole. I do not care about percentages here and there. Some of the best friends I have are probably members of smaller groups. Perhaps hon. members in the house at the moment belong to one of the larger groups but, Mr. Chairman, I have no idea whatever of referring to these percentages. I am talking about Canada as a whole and the benefits to be derived by Canada as a whole. If other hon. members want to refer to this topic in terms of percentages, then whatever I have to say I am quite sure will not have any bearing on these percentages.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I dislike hearing Canadians referred to in terms of percentages. I think Canadians are Canadians. I feel, too, that we have something of which we should be very proud. I feel that our constitution, the British North America Act, or however you want to refer to it, is something of which Canadians as a whole from one end of this country to the other can be very proud.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Say that to the member for Three Rivers.

[Mr. Gundlock.]

Mr. Gundlock: I will say that to any member in this house. I am putting it on the record and I am quite sure it will be public. I say sincerely and honestly that we in this house, the members in the other place, and the people of Canada can be proud of our articles of confederation, the British North America Act, the constitution or whatever you want to call it. It is something of which we should not only be proud but something we should advertise. It might very well be, Mr. Chairman, that the C.B.C. could have done this a couple of weeks ago. We have something of which we can be proud and something to show the rest of the world. Sure, we have our troubles, and we have people right here talking about percentages. Surely we, as Canadians, we in this house, have something of which we can be very proud and we should advertise it to the whole world. The C.B.C. could well have done so some time ago and Canada's image throughout the world would be better than it is today.

I hope you will forgive me, Mr. Chairman, for getting sidetracked but I felt very sincerely that I had to say these things. I thank the hon. member opposite for reminding me of this because it was away down in my notes.

Mr. Choquette: We did not want you to miss anything important.

Mr. Gundlock: How much more important could anything be? If you have a different version, I will gladly yield the floor to you.

Mr. Choquette: You are right.

Mr. Gundlock: O.K., then; keep smiling and we will get through.

There is something else that I want to mention, and I referred to it a moment ago. I should like to refer to the Queen's visit. We have to realize that during this time the sovereign probably could have been humiliated to some extent. I am rather hesitant about bringing this matter forward, but I do feel that I must. I just said a moment ago that the C.B.C. might have done something along this line.

I note from a popular magazine and from the press that there were 400 reporters from the C.B.C. alone reporting the visit of Her Majesty to Quebec city, and I am reminded of the fact that many years ago, and under different circumstances, a club known as the 400 club was formed. I wonder if the C.B.C. is trying to form a new 400 club. There were 400

reporters there, but what did we see and what did we hear?

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Did the hon. member say 400 reporters or 400 employees?

Mr. Gundlock: I said 400 newsmen—reporters.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): I thought the hon. member meant employees.

Mr. Gundlock: No, I said reporters covering the event—reporters, cameramen. Perhaps I should have said employees—but 400 personnel were there.

Mr. Habel: Four hundred C.B.C. men?

Mr. Gundlock: Four hundred men, including cameramen, copymen—

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Employees.

Mr. Gundlock: All right, employees. It is the same thing; 400 C.B.C. personnel.

Mr. Habel: Where?

Mr. Gundlock: At Quebec. If any hon. members opposite want to give their version I will yield the floor to them. Some of them may have other facts and if they want to put their version on the record I will let them. Does anybody deny that the C.B.C. had 400 personnel at the Quebec visit?

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Not reporters.

Mr. Gundlock: I said personnel.

Mr. Grégoire: No, you said reporters.

Mr. Gundlock: Admittedly I said reporters, but quite frankly I meant personnel.

Mr. Grégoire: Why did you say reporters?

Mr. Choquette: Because he meant personnel.

Mr. Gundlock: Were you there?

Mr. Choquette: In Quebec, yes.

Mr. Gundlock: Mr. Chairman, I may have made a little mistake, but may I continue. Roughly there were 400 there. I am not going to say 399 or 400 or 401 because members opposite might get the facts and say there were 398 or 402 and I would be shown to be wrong; but generally speaking there were 400 personnel from the C.B.C. covering Her Majesty's Quebec visit. What did the Canadian public get from this?

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. Gundlock: The point I want to make—

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member a question? Is he familiar with the answer given today to question No. 2,148?

Mr. Choquette: I think Her Majesty deserves more personnel.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gundlock: I am not familiar with the answer to that question, but what does it have to do with this point? I agree Her Majesty deserves more than that, but the point I am trying to make is that I think she deserves better results from that number of personnel.

Mr. Choquette: I have never seen anyone attack Her Majesty the way you did.

The Chairman: Order please. I have to interrupt the hon. member and advise him his time has expired.

Mr. MacNaught: Let him continue.

The Chairman: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): We like you.

Mr. Gundlock: Thank you very much. It is very seldom I get that sort of agreement. The point I want to make is that what we saw on t.v., heard on the radio and read in the press was not the actual facts of the case. I know the press will criticize what I have been saying today and will refer to one short program that showed us what actually took place. But generally speaking throughout the period of the visit what we were shown were empty streets, the lack of flags flying and that sort of thing. True enough there was one short program, I think it was on "News Magazine", that reported the visit fully, but surely we could have had more than that. Earlier I said something should have been done in the matter of public relations. There should have been programs dealing with confederation, the B.N.A. Act and the things of which Canada has reason to be proud. We did not see that; we did not hear it; we did not read it.

I want to thank hon. members for the extra time they have allowed me.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I feel obliged to interject a few remarks at this point in the proceedings to remind the committee of one or two relevant facts as I see them, with which some members may not agree, but which I think should be drawn to the attention of the committee. Before doing so, however, I wish to answer a question asked by

the hon. member for Lethbridge who has just resumed his seat. He asked why the minister responsible to the house for the C.B.C. was not here to discuss these estimates. The answer is very clear, that we are not now discussing the main estimates. We are merely discussing interim supply for the expenditure of moneys for a two month period.

The detailed estimates of departments are examined by the committee of the whole house and may be approved or rejected as the committee sees fit. That being the situation, it has not been the custom in this parliament to have the individual ministers come to the committee discussing interim supply to answer for their departments. Rather it has been the custom—

Mr. Lambert: May I ask a question?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, in just a moment. Rather, it has been the custom to discuss the details of the estimates when they are before the house and to discuss on interim supply any major grievance against the administration that the opposition parties may have. That is the reason why the individual ministers are not here to answer for their individual departments and for the details of the individual items involved in the main estimates.

Mr. Lambert: Does the President of the Privy Council not recall the many instances when he and his colleagues were on this side and they used to try to castigate a former minister of finance on this particular point?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, I recall that experience very well and I have based my remarks on it. I recall how careful the opposition of that day was to confine its attack on the then government, on one occasion for its failure to bring in a budget in a fiscal year, and on another occasion for certain matters having to do with the Bank of Canada. I recall very well how careful the opposition was, not to discuss the details of the main estimates on interim supply.

Mr. Lambert: That is nonsense.

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member is entitled to his opinion of my remarks. I might remind him that I did him the courtesy when he was speaking of not expressing my opinion of the remarks he was making earlier this afternoon. I thought that was the courteous procedure to follow in committee of the whole. I refrained from any comment while he was speaking. I know he follows a different procedure but that is his privilege and his responsibility—

Mr. Lambert: The hon. gentleman's halo hangs heavy.

Mr. McIlraith: In any event, I do wish to point out to the committee, and I believe it is my obligation to do so although some hon. members may differ from me on this, that we have now, in this session of parliament, had supply before the house on some 72 days out of a total of 176; that we have been calling estimates for consideration three days out of five every week, with one exception, for many weeks in the recent past, and that in the United Kingdom parliament the time allowed for supply is only some 26 days for the whole year, though I agree the procedure followed there differs from our procedure in Canada. If the government is devoting three days out of five to supply, surely on interim supply we should not be discussing details of the estimates of particular departments? I invite the committee to consider that notwithstanding the fact that some 70 full days debate on supply have taken place this year—I point out in all fairness that instead of taking the permitted 12 days on supply motions the opposition only required seven days out of 12 and generously gave up five days—notwithstanding the fact I have mentioned, we have only succeeded in approving the estimates of only eight departments out of some 26.

I would point out, also, that though today we have been discussing the affairs of the C.B.C. almost exclusively, no opposition group has requested that the estimates of the C.B.C. be called before the committee of the whole when we are considering main estimates. If the opposition wants to discuss these estimates they can be brought forward on a convenient day very soon and I invite members of this committee to consider whether we should not do better if we were to pass this interim supply bill now and devote the time we would otherwise spend on it, considering main estimates. If there are any suggestions which would expedite the final passage of the main estimates, which hon. members opposite in any of the groups or parties wish to make which would bring to a conclusion the examination of the estimates within a reasonable length of time, bearing in mind that we have already spent 70 days on supply this year, the government would be very willing to listen to such suggestions and consider them very carefully. I feel it is my obligation to bring this matter to the attention of hon. members because it must be readily apparent that in the light of the legislative program on

the order paper and with the approach of Christmas, having had no adjournment since the house started its work earlier this year, some thought should surely be given to the subject. I make this appeal to hon. members because it seems to me, having listened attentively and carefully to the debate this afternoon, that the whole of the discussion might better have taken place on the main estimates.

It was a different situation on Friday when hon. members felt they needed to raise a subject matter of urgent and special significance which could not wait until the main estimates were called. But we have three days on estimates this week and if hon. members have suggestions for additional days in the week, for calling and considering estimates I would be very glad to have their proposals considered by the government. I make an appeal to hon. members to consider this matter and, if they have any views on it, to bring them forward.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, after the remarks which have just been made by the President of the Privy Council I would not have proceeded with my observations had I not noticed that two or three other members were rising at the same time. Indeed, I find myself indulging in a sentence which opens many speeches in this house, namely, "I had not intended to take part in this debate, but—".

However, it seems to me that even the devil deserves an advocate. The devil in question may not appreciate my being the advocate but I do feel something should be said in this day's debate on the other side of the issue, as far as the C.B.C. is concerned. The fact is that every speech on this subject this afternoon has been a speech in which the C.B.C. has been treated as a popular whipping boy. It is true the C.B.C. makes mistakes from time to time; it would probably go on making mistakes even were it to listen to the criticisms voiced in this house. But there are one or two things which might be said on the other side.

First of all, I want to congratulate the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation on being the subject of controversy. If there were no controversy surrounding the C.B.C., if nobody complained about anything which appeared on the C.B.C. programs, it would not be worth five cents of public money. It is to the credit of the corporation that it is presenting challenging programs, that it is making us look at new ideas. It is to its credit that people are expressing their views pro and con about what appears on C.B.C. television programs or over its radio network. There are times when I myself am critical of some of the things I hear and see and, like other members of this house, I do not think the C.B.C. gives me proper coverage for my work in the House of Commons. But the C.B.C. is like the press in that respect. We are used to that.

An hon. Member: You will get it, now.

Mr. Knowles: We shall just have to wait and see. Surely this is a time in man's history when it is necessary for us to do some new thinking. Some of the great organizations of our time are going through agonizing reappraisals of their thought, their doctrine and their position. This is of great importance both for them and for our society. I believe that to the extent the C.B.C. presents to us new ideas and makes us look at the problems of our country, of our hemisphere, of our world and, indeed, one might say today, of our universe, it is doing us a service.

This does not mean we are denied the right to be critical of some of the programs which are broadcast. However, I think there should also be an occasional word of commendation and I welcome this opportunity to voice that word at this moment. I doubt whether the argument over last night's program in which this fellow Rockwell appeared will ever be settled. There will be those who will contend as long as we recall it that it should not have been put on. There will be others who will think it was a good idea to put on this program. I shall not at this moment try to settle that argument one way or another, but since so much has been said against the Rockwell interview having been aired over television, may I suggest there could be some advantage from its having been broadcast? Surely the Canadian people now realize what racism can lead to; surely we have had a picture of how serious can be anti-Semitism, antipathy toward negroes, toward coloured races, toward people who disagree with us. Surely people can realize that Hitlerism, so far as its ideas are concerned, is not necessarily dead because world war II is over.

I fully appreciate the views of the Zionist organization of Canada and of the Royal Canadian Legion and others, who still wonder whether that program should have been aired last night—and it is a good question; but I suggest there is also the other side, and that maybe it has helped us in Canada to realize that we want no part of racism, of totalitarianism or of the kind of arrogance

that was displayed by that man on our television screens last night. John Drainie's prediction, so far as I am concerned, was correct; I was shocked, sickened and disturbed by what I saw. But I dare to believe that Canadians generally will have been so shocked, sickened and disturbed that there will be an increasing opposition to any form of racism in this country.

There have been many appeals this afternoon to the government to set up a committee on broadcasting so that the C.B.C. can appear before that committee. I agree that there ought from time to time to be reviews of broadcasting policy. I think, indeed, that once in a while there has to be a review by a royal commission—not just by a private advisory committee such as we now have, but a full-dress royal commission. I also think that from time to time there has to be a review by a committee of parliament. This is the way you keep broadcasting by a public body responsible to parliament and, through parliament, responsible to the people. But in between these reviews I insist that the board of governors, the management of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, should be free to arrange its programming and should not be subject to censorship by the government; neither should it be subject to interference in its day to day programming by members of parliament. We are free to make our complaints; we are as free as any citizens of the country—but surely, having set up a corporation to do a job, having given it the policies we think it should carry on, we should give it the opportunity to carry on those policies. If we do not like them, if we disagree with the things that are being done, our function is to get rid of the board of governors, to get rid of the management and bring in new people to do the job.

It is very common in this house to talk about the way things are done in Britain. As members are probably aware, the activities of the B.B.C. are not even permitted to be the subject of the kind of questioning, in the House of Commons at Westminster, that goes on here in the House of Commons in Ottawa. There the attitude is taken that the B.B.C. is set up as an autonomous body, and in between the times its work is reviewed it is free to do what it thinks is the best job in broadcasting, subject to the knowledge that if it does not do a job that is satisfactory to the people, the management will be changed, the board will be fired. It seems to me that should be our approach, rather than the attitude of heckling at and carping about the C.B.C. day in and day out, as goes on in this house.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that seems inconsistent with the opening remarks I offered when I congratulated the C.B.C. on being the subject of controversy. But if it is going to be attacked, not only in letters to the editors of our newspapers, not only in the columns our columnists write and in editorials, but also here on the floor of the House of Commons—and I take no objection to the criticism because I think it is good that members stand up and express their clear and honest views about what is happening—I suggest there is also a place for those of us on the other side, who feel that the C.B.C. is doing a good job, to say so in the course of a debate of this kind.

As I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, I think that the C.B.C., like any other organization run by human beings, has made many mistakes. Sometimes its public relations are rather poor. I think sometimes its advance announcements as to what is going to be broadcast have not been fully thought out. I believe, like anybody who advertises his products, the C.B.C. sometimes overemphasizes what is coming and the show it has not boosted turns out to be better than the show that has been boosted for a week or so. But in the main this organization is trying to help Canadians to think; it is trying to help us look at the problems which face this country; it is trying to bring to the radio and television audiences the things that are happening in this country; it is trying to give our artists, performers, speakers, and so on, the opportunity to put forward their views. I think that in the main the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is doing a good job. It deserves to be looked at critically; but it also deserves once in a while to be told that it is doing a good job.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Knowles: Gladly.

Mr. Greene: The hon. member stated that the C.B.C. should be criticized when it abuses its licence, when it brings forth programs that deal with hatred; but I gathered from his remarks earlier that he did not think this criticism should come from members of parliament. Am I correct in believing that he feels they should be criticized by anyone but members of parliament?

Mr. Knowles: First of all, Mr. Chairman, whether or not a program on C.B.C. is one

that deserves negative criticism is of course a matter of opinion. But if I did not make myself clear before, I thank the hon. member for Renfrew South for giving me this opportunity to make myself clear. I believe it is perfectly proper for members of parliament to voice their criticism in a debate such as this, provided we do not dictate to the C.B.C. what it should do; but my main point is that, with everybody else expressing negative criticism, I thought there should also be opportunity for someone to express positive criticism, and that is what I have tried to do.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Rosthern.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, may I call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, before the supper hour we were privileged to hear a few words from the minister, the hon. member for Ottawa West. It seemed to me that he was complaining that we were discussing the C.B.C. today because he thought that the details should be discussed at some other time. As I listened to the debate today it did not seem to me that we were discussing the details, but a broad outline of a policy under which the C.B.C. might be a more effective instrument on behalf of the Canadian public. It was very strange that the minister should change his mind so soon, because only on Friday a matter was referred to by the hon. member for Port Arthur and the hon. member for Melville, which the minister at that time thought did not deserve enough attention to set aside the normal business of the house, but that the details of that matter should be gone into during our consideration of interim supply.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member does not want to misrepresent me. The proceedings of Friday are on record, and he will find that what took place is quite different from what he is asserting, in so far as the record represents what I put forward. What I did suggest was that since there was an opportunity to discuss what was the major complaint of the opposition concerning the government on interim supply later in the afternoon it should proberly be discussed then, rather than on a special motion to adjourn the house.

The point I made today is that since we are discussing the C.B.C. estimates, the proper place to discuss them is during the consideration of the main estimates and not on interim supply. That statement was accompanied by my offer to have the main estimates brought forward, since we are already giving three days a week to a consideration of them.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, the minister has aptly defended my point, because the details of the C.B.C. have not been discussed. We have been discussing general policy. He has come to the defence of the position I have taken. I think the record of last Friday will indicate in no uncertain terms that that is the case. However, I do not intend to go into that phase of the discussion at all tonight, Mr. Chairman.

At this time we are being asked to vote $740 million for the carrying forward of the government's program for the next two months. Naturally the opposition must ask itself why it should vote this money. As I asked myself that question tonight I found it very difficult indeed to find any reason why the government opposite should be given $740 million necessary to carry on the business of this country for the next two months, and I make that statement because of the conditions which exist in this country today.

Mr. Chairman, one need only look back to last Friday and what happened at that time to realize that this government never moves until it is almost too late to consider problems which deserve attention. I think that fact is made clear by the action taken over the week end by the minister and the government, and indicates that the debate which took place last Friday could very well have been dispensed with had this government done its duty in regard to the particular matter under consideration at that time. I refer to the railway problem.

The problems affecting agriculture today, and I think immediately of the plight of the turkey growers of this country, and the government's lack of action, represent one reason for not voting confidence in the government, but for withholding supply. The decline in the price being paid for cattle across this country and the lack of action on the part of the government is another indication of why steps should be taken to withhold interim supply from the government opposite.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nasserden: I note there are some hon. members who represent the areas concerned, where there has been crop failure in eastern Canada and in parts of the province of Quebec, and I should like to ask you, sir, what this government is providing in this vote of $740 million for the relief of those people? One need only think of the dairy problems in eastern Canada today to ask what this government has done to alleviate that situation.

When we pick up our daily newspapers these days what do we see? We see an indication by this government opposite that there is to be a tax cut some time in the near future. This announcement is only a belated reparation of the damage done to the economy of the country by the Gordon budgets, which brought forward an 11 per cent sales tax which is stifling industry, to a certain extent, and reducing the full impact of increasing employment which could have been ours had the government followed the policy which should have been followed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nasserden: That is another indication of the carelessness of hon. members opposite. When one thinks of the $740 million required by the government to run the affairs of this country for two months, he at the same time can only think of inflation and the alarming increase in the cost of living which today is eroding the value of the Canadian dollar to consumers in every part of the country. When one thinks of the situation, bearing in mind the tremendous increase in consumer credit in this country today, he cannot but ask what action the government opposite is proposing to meet that situation? One need only travel to any part of Canada today to realize the tightening application of taxation measures on the books today, as they are applied to individuals and corporations.

Mr. Chairman, I could cite scores of examples, almost all of which indicate that the government opposite is reaching unrelentingly to obtain every last dollar it can on almost any pretence it can find. This afternoon the minister made some reference to the approach of Christmas and I thought that he thought he could perhaps bring about a mellowness in the chamber that would cut short this debate and thus infringe upon the responsibility of members of the opposition to question the government on the measures and courses they are now following. One need only ask: As Christmas approaches, what is the situation that faces the thousands of Canadians who during the past year have had to bear the burden of the increased taxation that the government has levied on them since it came into power? During that period of time there has been little appreciable increase in the income of the average and below average income employable person in this country. One need only look at what the government have done and the attitude of mind they have displayed to realize the direction in which they are heading and where their sympathies lie.

I think of the old age pensioners who received an increase of $10 per month, but which was not made retroactive as were the increases of $8,000 to members of parliament. I think of the other increases in salaries granted to hundreds of people in the upper levels of the civil service.

Mr. Winkler: The president of the C.B.C.

Mr. Nasserden: They received increases of $3,000, $4,000 or $5,000 and the president of the C.B.C. received a salary increase beyond the imagination of most people in this country. But those in the lower income groups were lost sight of by the government opposite and by the Prime Minister who it was said during the election campaign was a man who cared. What does he care about? That is the question we have to ask ourselves on this occasion.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): He cared about you.

Mr. Nasserden: He cared about me but he did not care about the thousands of little people in this country.

Mr. Cashin: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Nasserden: As soon as I am finished I will be very glad to do so. There is another reason why we should question the advisability of providing interim supply to the government opposite. I refer to the carelessness with which they have arranged the business of the House of Commons. The order paper is in their hands. They have the responsibility and the opportunity as well to place before the House of Commons a bill of fare that in an orderly way will provide the maximum benefit for the Canadian people. That has not been the case during the 16 months the government has been in office.

One need only think of the pension plan, the revisions in that plan and the questions that are still being asked to realize that this is a government that did not know what it wanted to do, did not know how to do it and in the final analysis wasted the time of parliament by the reconsideration of ill-prepared, ill-conceived measures that did not receive

the attention of the ministers concerned which is expected from responsible ministers of the crown.

One need only think of the flag resolution, and I will say no more than that, to realize that the government has brought forward the kind of faltering policy that has endangered the reputation of parliament itself. We should not forget the first budget introduced by the Minister of Finance and the threatening aspects of that budget not only with regard to the domestic scene but in international circles as well.

Mr. Greene: Things look pretty good now though.

Mr. Nasserden: Things look pretty good now?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Winkler: You had better talk to your farmers, Joe.

Mr. Nasserden: That has always been the great boast of the Liberal party, but in no sphere of activity has their failure been greater than in the sphere of national unity. One need only look at Canada today to realize how shallow, how utterly deceitful, have been the claims that have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite when they have spoken about the unity of our nation.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nasserden: The hon. gentleman can make a speech later if he wants to but he knows, as all members across the way know, that national unity is questioned today as it never was before, and all because we have in power a government that has failed in its responsibilities to all Canadians, but more so with regard to the province of Quebec because it has made greater promises to the people of that province than to those of any other province. I think of the damage the government has done to the theme of a strong central government, a government that can fill the expectations embodied in the articles of confederation and also give people in all parts of this nation that stature, that opportunity, that the Fathers of Confederation had in mind when they laid the foundations for the building of a united nation made up of French, English and those of other races all in one big happy family.

These are the reasons why we have to question the government on the courses upon which it has set out. There is before the Canadian people today one aspect of governmental activity that has brought all of these questions into even greater focus. I refer to the role of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. If we go back and look at its origin and purpose we will see that at the time it was brought into being there were high hopes that this instrument would be one of the great unifying factors in the development of this nation. I am sure it is true that members in all parts of the house thought that in the development of Canada over the years the C.B.C. would be able to search out talent that would enhance the cultural genius of our nation. But what has been the effect of the policies deliberately embarked upon by the management of the C.B.C. over the last decade or two?

Mr. Winkler: Lincoln Rockwell.

Mr. Nasserden: What manner of search have they made for talent here in Canada? Look at what they have done to challenge the very institutions that Canadians in all parts of this nation hold dear by holding up to ridicule and questioning the moral and religious foundations of our nation. I cannot help but wonder what they have been trying to inspire because certainly it has not been the unity of Canada. Certainly there has been no effort on the part of the C.B.C. to try to inspire and encourage a philosophy that would enhance Canadian citizenship in the eyes of the people of the world as well as in the eyes of the people of Canada and their children.

The Chairman: Order, please. I should like to suggest to hon. members who wish to carry on conversations in the chamber that they should do so in a soft voice so that the chairman will have an opportunity to hear the speeches that are being made.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is the hon. member for Longueuil who has been chattering like a chipmunk all through my remarks.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am sure you were not referring to me when you were saying somebody was speaking out of turn.

An hon. Member: If the shoe fits, buddy, wear it.

Mr. Greene: A chipmunk knows a nut when he sees one.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): I may have been laughing sometimes, because he says some funny things.

Mr. Nasserden: If it is funny for a member of this house to question the direction the C.B.C. is taking today in connection with the cultural aspirations of our people, the way in which it has challenged everything in which the people of Canada believe—and this is just as true in your constituency as it is in mine—then I believe more consideration should be given to these matters than you have been giving to them up to date.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Could I ask a question?

Mr. Nasserden: As soon as I have completed my remarks. I believe that because of the reluctance of the minister responsible for the C.B.C. to engage in any type of consideration of what is going on in the C.B.C., there has grown up in that organization almost a contempt for this parliament and for the desires of the Canadian people. I do not say this by way of criticism of the present minister only, nor by way of criticism of the former minister who now sits in the opposition, but I say it by way of criticism of those who have held up the C.B.C. as one of the holy cows that could not be questioned concerning the direction in which it was trying to develop Canadian thought and Canadian culture. I believe, from the observations I have heard in every part of Canada, and from letters I have received as well from people who are the backbone of this country today, that the Canadian people are fearful of the consequences if this organization is allowed to continue without some kind of direction from parliament.

This does not mean that we want to interfere with individual programs, but it does mean that there must be some philosophy behind a crown corporation charged with the great responsibility that was given to the C.B.C. when it was originally formed. If I may say so, sir, it has been left without direction of any kind from parliament itself. We are to blame in this parliament and in the parliaments that went before us for what is taking place in this organization. I believe that the time is long past when parliament itself should give some expression to what parliament hoped this cultural organization, if you wish to call it that, could do for the unity of our nation, for the development of our future as a nation amongst the nations of the world.

I do not wish to go into individual programs and will not do so tonight. This is not because I have not seen programs on the C.B.C. that were open to question. It is not because I have not received letters from people who have been seriously concerned about these matters. I think someone here today referred to the fact this organization has a captive audience. I thought that was very well put because, in many parts of this nation, they have a captive audience. What they did, and what they did not do, in a very large measure could affect the future of this nation. There are many other things that could be said about the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. There will be other occasions when we can deal with this in greater detail. This is in conformity with the wishes of the President of the Privy Council who indicated the estimates of the C.B.C. will be brought forward very shortly for consideration.

Mr. McIlraith: Well, I offered to do that.

Mr. Nasserden: The minister says he offered to do it. This is the kind of hedging we have had on so many occasions from ministers. First of all, they like to hold something over your head as a club, and that is exactly what the minister tried to do today. However, he did it in such a nice way that none of us could take exception to it. He is very adept at that, I have to admit. However, this does not subtract from the fact that he tried to hold this club over our heads and say, if you boys pass these things quickly without examination, we will bring forward the C.B.C. estimates.

The fact is, sir, that there are other matters that engage our attention as well as the C.B.C. There are danger signs in our Canadian economy today. Some hon. members opposite may feel I am talking through my hat when I talk in this fashion, especially if one looks at some of the figures. But when you analyse those figures you realize that some of these things have happened because of the tax policies that have been evolved by this government. You cannot help but realize there are serious implications in what is happening throughout Canada today.

I want to return to what I said before concerning the increased use of consumer credit in this country. This is one of the most dangerous aspects of the present situation. It is a situation to which not only the President of the Privy Council but the Minister of Finance and other members of cabinet should be giving much more serious consideration than they are at the moment. During the past year Canada has enjoyed the fruits and benefits of the sale of grain made to the U.S.S.R. This was a great shot in the arm to our economy. Today we had an announcement

from the Minister of Trade and Commerce of the sale of 10.6 million bushels of grain to the U.S.S.R. This, in itself, will not be much of a shot in the arm to the economy this year. We had hoped the sale to the U.S.S.R. would have been much larger. In fact, there is reason to believe they will require more than 10.6 million bushels in the year ahead.

I ask myself again, why should we vote this government $740 million? Why should we give them permission to carry on for another two months? We have heard very little from the benches opposite today or Friday to indicate there is anything in the complexion of the situation that faces us today that could inspire confidence in the government amongst the Canadian people. We recall the action that was taken a few years ago to devaluate the Canadian dollar. We recall the words that were spoken. We recall those green pieces of paper that were sent from one end of the country to the other questioning that action.

No one on the government benches can claim much credit for what has happened to the Canadian economy because almost everything has been as a result of the devaluation of the dollar at that time, and of the trade promotion program begun by the former administration, which had an eye to the future of Canadian industry and labour. All we have had since then is a hit or miss program aimed at certain localities, almost bypassing the national scene and leaving outside parliament's consideration that sense of equity that must exist between one area and another in developing a national program for our people.

Once again I come to the question, why should the government be voted $740 million, why should it be given another two months in office in order to carry on the tactics it has employed during the last several months? The government has been slow to take action on hate literature. Perhaps one of the reasons for its slowness is that if it passes legislation outlawing hate literature it would make all its own campaign literature obsolete. That is a valid statement to make when one recalls what took place during the last general election, and despite the hon. member opposite, who is not in his seat—

The Chairman: I regret to have to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): May I ask the hon. member a question.

The Chairman: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, my principal purpose is to speak for a few minutes on the subject of the C.B.C. Quite a number of speakers have dealt with it at some length today. They took up a considerable part of parliament's time to talk about it and I think I am justified in using a little of its time to speak on the same subject.

First, may I say we are always interested in hearing the monthly state of the union address by the hon. member for Rosthern, who tonight indicates that he sees danger signs to the Canadian economy. If we are to judge from recent newspaper reports probably the danger signs he sees are that the budget may be balanced this year after seven years of monumental deficits. In his state of the union address he omitted that, and failed to mention anything about the re-establishment of fiscal responsibility, about the buoyant economy, or about the reduction in unemployment.

However, referring to the C.B.C. the hon. member had a good idea when he said it was useful to review the early days of the corporation and its early purposes. Its principal purpose was that of uniting the nation and developing cultural interest in the country. I am in full accord with those principles. As I have said previously in this chamber, if it had not been for the existence of the C.B.C. in the early days of radio, and in the early days of television, it is doubtful whether Canadian culture could have been salvaged. Had it not been for the C.B.C. our culture could well have been submerged in American culture because of the great influx of U.S. television programs.

In passing, I wonder how many singers and artists have been discovered and encouraged over the years by the C.B.C. I wonder how many people across Canada have had their knowledge of public affairs broadened by the C.B.C. I wonder whether any broadcasting network in the world has kept a higher standard in news broadcasts than the C.B.C. No organization has done more to provide entertainment in the medium of sports coverage. But I do not wish to review only past accomplishments.

The C.B.C. has been frequently mentioned in this chamber in recent days and it would be well for us to remember how and why the corporation was established. The reason it was not made a department of government, that it was not made directly

responsible to parliament is tied in with the fact that in a country so large and thinly populated it would be difficult initially for private radio and television to produce the type of programs that all Canadians might well expect to see, and to do this at a financial profit. As a consequence there was a necessity for government ownership, and the objective was to have government ownership without government or parliamentary interference. Thus the C.B.C. was set up with a president and a board of 11 directors appointed from all across the country.

In 1958 the Broadcasting Act, repealing the Canadian broadcasting act, provided for the establishment of a board of broadcast governors, whose purpose was the provision "of a varied and comprehensive broadcasting service of a high standard. . . ." and which had the power to make regulations "respecting standards of programs." Regardless of what the B.B.G. has or has not done with this power, it must be remembered that the previous government gave the B.B.G. the power to make regulations regarding standards of programs, and it was the previous government which appointed the first members of the B.B.G.

Over the years frequent attempts have been made to interfere with the independence of the C.B.C., and in dealing with them the proper view has been that which was expressed so well by the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings in 1962, when he held the cabinet portfolio which embraced the C.B.C. As recorded at page 857 of *Hansard* for February 14, 1962 he said:

> —it has been the policy of this government from the beginning, as it was the policy of the previous government and as I hope it will always be the policy of federal governments, not to interfere with the programming of the C.B.C.... If we were to start interfering with the programming of the C.B.C. we would be laying the foundation for either a fascist state or a communist state.

I am sure we all agree with the stand which he took on that occasion, but I hasten to say that I disagree with some of the things that are done by the C.B.C., and in particular I refer to certain programs that may be held to be in bad taste. I shall not again take the opportunity to criticize the C.B.C. in this chamber because I do not think this is the proper place to do it, but since we are on the subject I think we should be most concerned about the showing of a film that is highly controversial in the United States just prior to the eve of the presidential elections. I am sure there would be great yelling and screaming on this side of the border if the Americans were to use their television facilities which come into this country, as ours go into parts of the United States, to put on controversial political material on the eve of a Canadian election.

Mr. Winkler: They did last time.

Mr. Regan: Despite the fact that sometimes we all disagree with the policies of the C.B.C. we are in such a situation that were we to interfere with the policies of that corporation we could destroy its independence. Every few years it is useful for a parliamentary committee to review the progress of the industry. At the present time an advisory committee is at work under Mr. Fowler, a committee made up of experts, looking into the development of the industry as a whole. Its report will be ready in the spring and would make an appropriate subject for consideration by a parliamentary committee. We would then have the opportunity to consider the report of this departmental committee and express the views of Canadians as their elected representatives. I think the meeting of a parliamentary committee now would be premature and without direction. I believe it would be used by many of the members of this house to indulge in program reviews, as they do periodically, reviews upon which they waste the time of the people here in the House of Commons. When this report comes before a parliamentary committee—and we have been told that such a committee will be set up next year—I believe it would be a good idea to have the officials come before us, in order that the general trend might be considered. But to hold meetings now would merely provide a platform for those in this house who want parliament to run the C.B.C. on a day by day basis. I would point out, also, that not only is it very late in the session but that we have a very heavy backload of business to attend to without taking on this extra responsibility now.

I wonder, however, whether the members who have spoken on this subject are really concerned at all about the general policies of the C.B.C. I think it more likely they are merely trying to establish a forum for their program reviews. Let us consider some of the things which have been said today. The hon. member for Edmonton West was very careful, when he spoke, to tell the committee he did not want to carry on a witch hunt or interfere with the independence of the corporation. But he did want to know, he said,

why certain individuals seemed to enjoy a predominance on certain programs. He wanted to know why these people were invited to appear. Was this not just the type of situation which parliament was concerned about when it first set up the C.B.C. as an independent corporation? The hon. member for Lethbridge also spoke. He said he was concerned about the number of reporters—he used that word first and then changed it to "personnel"—who were used to cover the Queen's visit, and placed the number at 400. He thought that was a terrible thing; but he did not tell us how many were used by other networks to cover the same occasion. He did not tell us how many were used by the B.B.C. or by N.B.C. in the United States. He did not tell us what all these 400 people did. He did not tell us because he has no idea in the world what they did.

An hon. Member: Do you?

Mr. Regan: This is the type of criticism we get so often, despite the fact that the legislation says the C.B.C. shall be independent and not run by parliament.

What was the criticism made by the hon. member for Medicine Hat, an hon. member for whom I have the greatest respect? He told us he felt a committee should be set up because he was disturbed about the distribution of political time; he was disturbed by the lack of objective reporting. Apparently he does not hear much about Social Credit. I would have a different viewpoint and, I am sure, so would many other members of this committee. It seems to me Social Credit does get a great deal of publicity. I hear statements very often by members of the Social Credit party; and these are given publicity. As I say, these things are all a matter of viewpoint.

I want to say that the objections to setting up a parliamentary committee in an attempt to run the C.B.C. are threefold. First, it would be contrary to the principle of independence of which I have spoken. In the second place, we would be using parliamentary time—as we are doing at the moment, I know—to discuss the internal direction of a crown corporation; we would be dealing, for instance, with the question of how many reporters were used to cover the Queen's visit. The third objection is, of course, the lack of expert knowledge by members of this house of the broadcasting art. Very few of us have worked in broadcasting and some who have done so are far from being experts. I realize we may have one or two experts present—

An hon. Member: Are you?

Mr. Fisher: Keep going; never stop.

Mr. Regan: One interesting question which occurs to me is this: Why has there been so little criticism of the private broadcasters? Is commercial television so much better? Are all the private broadcasters in Canada perfect in their programming?

Mr. Nesbitt: We do not pay for that.

Mr. Regan: The hon. member for Oxford says "We do not pay for it". So, despite the fact that broadcasting comes under the board of broadcast governors, a board set up by parliament to supervise the standards of broadcasting generally, the hon. member for Oxford says: We don't pay for private broadcasting, but since we provide the money for government radio it should be run on a day to day basis by the government.

Mr. Winkler: He did not say that.

Mr. Nesbitt: The hon. member for Halifax is very astute with his language, but I never said any such thing, and he knows it.

An hon. Member: May I be permitted to ask a question?

Mr. Regan: I would prefer that it should be asked at the end of my remarks, if that is agreeable. I will leave time.

We have dealt with this question of why there has been no criticism of private broadcasters. We are told this is because we do not pay for private broadcasting. But I would point out that all private channels in this country are controlled by the Broadcasting Act, which provides that we should be equally concerned with what goes on in any private station across Canada. No one should profess to be concerned only with what the C.B.C. does just because we happen to be paying for it. I disagree fundamentally and entirely with that principle.

We heard some words from the Leader of the Opposition on this subject, as we do from time to time. He has on a number of occasions objected to programs which the television network has carried, and he mentioned one today. I can only wonder whether the Leader of the Opposition was as concerned with the standards and programming of the C.B.C. when the directors of the corporation were chosen. I wonder whether he showed his present concern when the board of broadcast governors was set up. In my opinion there has been a trend in some of the C.B.C. programming which has caused a number of

us to be somewhat concerned, though not to the extent that we are prepared to interfere with the independence of the C.B.C. But if there is any question about the deterioration of C.B.C. standards, if the programming is not as good as it was two or three years ago, if it is more offensive to some people; if the corporation has producers who are giving them ideas which are "way out," it is not the responsibility of individual members of this parliament, because they know they should not interfere with the internal operations of the C.B.C. There is only one man in this House of Commons who is in a position to take responsibility, if the standard of services has deteriorated in the past three or four years. Who appointed the directors?

Some hon. Members: Who?

Mr. Regan: As I said earlier in my remarks, the whole principle of setting up the C.B.C. was to have independent directors, to give this organization independence from parliament. Therefore, of course, it was important that the directors be chosen on a basis of representing the different races in the country, the regional interests and the cultural interests; that they be people of good taste and of wisdom. I am not saying they are not, but I am saying it is important that the directors of the C.B.C., if they are going to run this vast organization, be chosen on that basis. It was certainly the responsibility of whoever chose them to see that this was the case. These directors run the C.B.C. the same as do the directors of any other corporation. They have full power—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Regan: Maybe they do not use it; I do not know about that. They do not have to, if they do not have the courage. But they, like the directors of any company, decide what the policies of that company will be, or have the power to do so. So I ask, Mr. Chairman, were these directors chosen with consideration for their wisdom, their good taste, and so forth? All but two of the present directors were appointed by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition during the days of his government. If the C.B.C. is falling down in good taste; if it is presenting bad programs, it is only the responsibility of the right hon. gentleman.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): You are away off.

Mr. Regan: I see. The only other thing is this. The government of the right hon. gentleman in 1958 also set up the B.B.G. with the terms of reference that I mentioned a little earlier. He set them up and gave them the power to make regulations with regard to programming. If hon. members opposite have become concerned about the standard and the type of programs that are being shown to the Canadian public, I presume those men on the B.B.G. were also selected by the right hon. gentleman with great care for their wisdom, good taste and national interest. One can only assume that if the B.B.G. has been concerned only with the Canadian content of broadcasting and has not spent enough time on the effective supervision of broadcasting in this country, there is only one man who is directly responsible, and that is the person who appointed them. He is the only man in this house who had any opportunity to do any of these things.

I do not believe anyone will really argue with the principle that if you have directors who do their job, if you have a B.B.G. that does its job, the C.B.C. is bound not to overstep the limits. I am not dealing with the question of whether they have or have not; I am just pointing out that if you condemn the C.B.C. and come to the conclusion that their programs have been in very poor taste, that is where the responsibility has to lie.

Mr. Grégoire: That is quite a joke.

Mr. Regan: In conclusion, Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Regan: —I want to say that, while the right hon. Leader of the Opposition bears that responsibility, at the same time his supporters in this house have used the time of parliament all day today to carry on this program review of the C.B.C. and bring it up again and again, while the people of Canada wait for legislation on minimum wages, on pensions, on railways, on unemployment—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Regan: When I conclude.

Some hon. Members: You are afraid.

Mr. Regan: Never. I want to say this: Next year, when the report comes in from the advisory committee, that will be an appropriate time for a parliamentary review, for a committee to review the general course of the industry and where it is headed. When direc-

tors come up for reappointment is the time to consider whether or not they have done a good job as directors, I would suggest; and I will be interested to hear the remarks of the hon. members on that side of the house at that time.

Mr. Winkler: You will get them.

Mr. Regan: In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, I tell you that Canadians are tired of this house being used as the forum day after day for small matters like this. The people of Canada want to see us get on with the job of running this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Regan: I say, Mr. Chairman, let us consider the nation's business; let us get on with it, and let us not gossip about t.v. programs.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will now permit a question, I wonder whether he really feels that $100 million of the taxpayers' money is sufficiently unimportant that we should not spend a couple of days debating this matter, or as much time as it takes to satisfy members of this house. That is my first question. Also, does this debate make any difference to bringing forth the labour bill either last Friday or today? I would ask the hon. member that question. It makes absolutely no difference.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. gentleman that the time to deal with the question of the C.B.C. is on the estimates of the C.B.C.

Mr. Winkler: You want to sweep $100 million under the door.

Mr. Regan: That is the first answer. I would say, further, that even at that time, if we are to save the independence of the C.B.C. we should not be dealing with its programming: we should be dealing with the general development of C.B.C. policies in broadcasting in this country.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. member a question. I listened very carefully to his remarks—

Mr. Regan: I am glad.

Mr. Olson: —and I think he advanced a very substantial argument, provided that one premise, the premise upon which his whole argument was based, is in fact a valid one. This premise, it seems to me, was that someone in this house is asking that the parliamentary committee in fact administer the day to day affairs of the C.B.C. First of all I would like to ask the hon. member, who has asked that this committee shall be in charge of administering the day to day affairs of the C.B.C.?

Mr. Winkler: He hasn't been here long enough.

Mr. Olson: If that premise is not present, his whole argument breaks down.

Mr. Regan: I want to assure my hon. friend that my whole argument does not break down, because the hon. member for Medicine Hat himself was suggesting that we need to deal with the C.B.C. with regard to the question of the objectivity of their news broadcasting among the political parties, and the question of the distribution of free time to air political views. He thus indicated that he wants to go into the internal management of the C.B.C. and wants to break down their independence. I also suggest that the general tenor of all the criticism of the C.B.C., not only today but at other times when the question of the corporation has come before the house, suggests interference in minor internal management, such as how many employees are necessary to cover the Queen's visit.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Regan: This is the one I am afraid of.

Mr. Greene: I was very interested in the hon. member's premise that the C.B.C. is the guardian and custodian of Canadian culture, and I wondered whether he could tell me in what guise such programs as Jack Benny, Danny Kaye, Ed Sullivan, and that great exponent of Canadiana, sheriff Matt Dillon, have added to Canadian culture.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member would not want to cast any aspersions upon Matt Dillon. But at the same time I say this, that if it had not been for the C.B.C. all television in Canada would have been Matt Dillons; it would have been all-American—because Canada was not in a position to develop a privately owned television network.

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my hon. friend from Halifax in talking about the C.B.C., even though he said before he spoke for 25 minutes on the subject that we should not be taking up any time at all on it. I want to open my remarks by mentioning a conflict he has resolved for me, in that he said the appointments to the C.B.C. board of directors were made by the

previous prime minister and that the right hon. gentleman must take full responsibility for what has happened because he made the appointments. This has resolved a conflict in my mind. Ever since Judge Meunier of Quebec was sentenced to two years in the penitentiary, and he was appointed by the Prime Minister, it has bothered me that there might be a connection here. It has bothered me that there might have been a connection in another regard, and that the Prime Minister might have had some responsibility. Furthermore, that other fine appointment of Mr. Landreville to the high court of Ontario was made by the present Prime Minister, and he was being tried as having taken part in an improper stock transaction. That has bothered me. However, I am now reassured by the hon. member for Halifax that these appointments of that calibre of men are a direct reflection of the attitude and convictions of the man who made the appointment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words about the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, because I represent an area of this country where life is not only basic but at times quite brutal. Most of us there do not have much time for indulgence in righteous indignation. I feel I have a certain amount of perspective for another reason.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether you would ask hon. members opposite to be a little more orderly.

I feel I may have a certain amount of perspective for another reason. Most of my constituents do not have access to even radio programs, and none of them receive television services. The words of condemnation that I intend to utter in respect of the C.B.C. and their programming—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether you would ask those heroes opposite to stand and make speeches, if that is what they are attempting to do.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Rhéaume: I have made these opening remarks because—

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Rhéaume: Surely no one can accuse me of attempting to give expression to a voter reaction within my constituency, since my constituents in fact are unable to receive television.

I am concerned about what has been described in today's Toronto *Globe and Mail* by a declaration known as the Declaration of Canadian women, in reference to propaganda spread for perversion, pornography, free love, blasphemy, dope, violence and crime. I feel that it should be a source of concern to those of us in this house when we are being asked to vote millions of dollars to underwrite this kind of operation.

I do not hesitate to speak, nor do I apologize to anyone in this house for standing in my place saying those things I believe to be accurate about the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and whether in my opinion it is doing a good or bad job. I am not afraid of any kind of retaliation. Everyone suggests that if you comment about the expenditures of a crown corporation you are engaging in a witch hunt. If by registering objections to pornography and perversion I am witch hunting, I say then, let us get on with this witch hunt. Furthermore if a witch hunt has been conducted anywhere in Canada it has been conducted on Canadian Broadcasting Corporation programming for the last few years.

There are those who believe that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has for some time been the darling of the Liberal party, and that it is dedicated not only to the spreading of pornography and perversion, but also Liberalism. The Canadian taxpayer has the right to have someone stand up in this house and ask questions. This question was raised once before. Was the doubling of the salary of the president of the C.B.C. from $20,000 to $40,000 per year anything more than an attempt on the part of the then secretary of state to ensure that the C.B.C. and its senior executives would be dedicated to the task of keeping the Liberal party in power in this country? It would not be the first time the Liberals bought the people of this country with their own money. One has only to think of the $500 bonus given toward the construction of a house, and the additional cost of $800, or more, because of the 11 per cent sales tax.

Mr. Chairman, I am not alone in my comments about the C.B.C. I could read from a current statement which appears in this declaration of Canadian women printed in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* today in a column written by Dennis Braithwaite. I do not intend to read this entire article but I should like to read one paragraph as follows:

> In its general preamble, attached to a petition form, declaration states that both radio and t.v. are being exploited to maintain a constant assault on character, to undermine faith in God and

respect for law and authority and to destroy sound home life and the knowledge of right and wrong. Noting that the C.B.C. last year spent $86,000,000 of public money, the document calls on members of parliament to make the corporation "answerable to the Canadian people."

I take no objection, Mr. Chairman, to any of these goals of the people who signed this declaration.

The article then continues as follows:

Lest anyone think this a demand for censorship the declaration insists that the present freedom of the C.B.C. is a form of censorship. "Those who kill the conscience of a nation dig the grave of freedom and prepare the ground for dictatorship. It begins when God-given standards are mocked and their proponents are belittled, bullied or silenced altogether.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to place on the record statements which appear in an article in a Roman Catholic newspaper which probably has the greatest circulation of any Catholic publication on this continent. The article appeared in the July 30 issue of *Our Sunday Visitor*, and appeared under the byline of Patricia Young. Patricia Young makes the general point that the C.B.C. has conducted a constant assault on character, patriotism and our accepted moral standards. To support her arguments she reviews a list of the programs that we saw last year on C.B.C. television. I should like to just sketch her remarks in this regard. First there was the program called "Two Soldiers" which was a drama in the "Quest" series depicting two servicemen returning from the army. Not only were they devoid of patriotism, but they mouthed the typical ban the bomb line and had become homosexually involved because of their army service.

The second program to which she referred was "A Second Look", which appeared on February 9 and featured Ralph Ginsburg of New York, publisher of *Eros* and other pornography magazines. He was allowed to defend his case on this program, using this corporation of ours, despite the fact that he had just been convicted on 28 counts, sentenced to five years in jail and fined $28,900 for peddling this filth.

The third program was "The Observer" which was produced in Toronto and appeared on February 13. Dr. Albert Ellis offered his view that premarital and extramarital sexual relations were not only normal but necessary, and the best thing for family life.

On May 13, the "Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner" appeared on the "Festival" series. This program gave a distorted conception of religion by showing a pious religious fanatic turn into a man who indulged in violence, rape, perversion, drunkenness and murder.

I could go down the list, Mr. Chairman, which includes a résumé of "The Open Grave", "The Trespassers", and the "Quest" series which blatantly showed a retarded man being seduced by his social worker, and which wound up by revealing that all of the previous social workers had done the same thing to him.

There are people, Mr. Chairman, like the hon. member for Halifax, who believe that members of parliament have no right to take objection to these things, and that to do so would be putting the brakes on the C.B.C. and its programmers. I say it is time that members of parliament put the brakes on this type of nonsense, which is being paid for by the taxpayers of Canada. I believe that this kind of independence has turned into arrogance and that there are times when the C.B.C. directors are even turning on their own benefactors in the Liberal party.

I was forced to come to this conclusion on the basis of events prior to the recent visit of Her Majesty the Queen. For the six weeks immediately prior to Her Majesty's visit to Quebec not a single member of the treasury benches made use of the public affairs facilities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to explain to the people of Quebec the meaning of the visit. I think of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, that cabinet minister from the province of Quebec, that fearless fighter for the rights of the Indian people even though he does nothing to bring in legislation for them. Where was he during all this time? Why did he not take to the C.B.C.?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Chairman, I am glad that this opportunity is given to me to make some comments on what the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) has already stated, as repeated tonight by the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Rhéaume), to the effect that I and other French Canadian ministers were not in Quebec city during the visit of Her Majesty the Queen.

I wish to point out to the hon. member that I was very happy, as a minister of the crown, and together with several other ministers of the crown from the province of Quebec, to accompany Her Majesty to numerous receptions in the city of Quebec and also on board the plane which carried her to Ottawa. That was the way for us, French Canadians, to

prove our true solidarity toward the Queen of Canada.

Therefore, I would ask the hon. member for the Northwest Territories, and also his colleague for the Yukon, to cease repeating those false insinuations which are intended to divide Canadians, for political purposes upon which the people will pass judgment at the right time.

[*Text*]

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to get into an argument with the minister. I said, where were the statements by these ministers from Quebec over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation prior to the Queen's visit? Where were they then? At any rate, Mr. Chairman, if the minister will hear me out I think he will find I am saying precisely what he was saying. But let me go on to the Minister of Justice, because he too said nothing.

An hon. Member: He is not here.

Mr. Rhéaume: Where was the Minister without Portfolio? He is no longer selling bumper stickers so he must have had plenty of time to prepare a broadcast for Quebec over the C.B.C. facilities. Where were these voices? Where was the minister of culture who is responsible for this crown corporation? Why was he not making use of the C.B.C.'s educational facilities months in advance of the Queen's visit? Where was the Minister of Public Works? I cannot believe that these men were cowards. I cannot believe that these men were just lying in the weeds to see how the visit came out before they said anything, just waiting around to see whether or not separatism might be a good thing to espouse. I have to believe that as bold men they wanted to make the people of Quebec anticipate and welcome the visit of the Queen and that somehow or other they were refused the opportunity to do so. I intend to raise these questions again when the estimates of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation come before the house. I want to find out whether these cabinet ministers went to the C.B.C. and attempted to make use of the educational facilities of that corporation in an effort to prepare the people of Quebec to welcome Her Majesty. I know it can be done.

Mr. Mackasey: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Rhéaume: You can wait until I am finished.

Mr. Laniel: What did you do as a French Canadian?

[Mr. Tremblay.]

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): What did you do as a French Canadian?

Mr. Rhéaume: I know it can be done because I was in Ottawa the night the Minister of Transport suborned the C.B.C. into allowing him to make a statement on civil aviation policy when, because of sloppiness, he had been denied the opportunity to do so in the house.

I want to speak a moment about programming. Last night I saw the program "This Hour Has Seven Days". I have a right to say what I think about it and I intend to do so. I am not ashamed of giving my opinion. Too many members of parliament look at crown corporations and expenditures on them and say: Our role is to say nothing; we must not say anything because we will take their freedom away from them.

I saw the program last night and I say it was in the worst traditions of third rate college high jinks. What was not in that spirit and taste was an outright and open attempt to whitewash certain people in the United States, particularly Walter Jenkins, the presidential aide. I was disgusted with the freedom that the C.B.C. gave the producers of the program to equate perversion of a homosexual nature with overzealousness in the public service. This is something I cannot accept. I was not amused, enlightened or even entertained by Mr. Rockwell, and the press reports of the reactions of great many Canadian people indicate that I am not alone in that view.

The sad part of all this in my opinion is that there is ample scope for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, with regard to whatever activities it wants to pursue, in keeping with its original mandate. Its mandate is by no means fulfilled and there is ample evidence that the corporation could come to parliament and secure appropriations of $80 million, $90 million or $100 million a year if it would carry out a positive program such as has yet to be enunciated. In other words, let the corporation get away from this nonsense of portraying perversion as though there were some kind of adolescent kick to it, and let it carry out the very necessary work that needs to be done.

I have some suggestions for the corporation. There are hundreds of thousands of Canadian people who are still without television service. There are thousands of Canadians who are not able to receive good radio broadcasts. I am thinking of the people who live in the northerly areas where the only station they can listen to is radio Moscow.

It is the only station that comes in consistently and it has good, impartial coverage of Canadian news.

These northerly areas are the areas of greatest isolation and insulation and if there is anywhere in Canada where the educational and cultural possibilities of radio and television are desperately needed it is in these northern areas where the people are remote from the mainsprings of Canadian life. However, every time I ask the C.B.C. to look into these things I get the answer that the cost of extending these services would be too great.

This afternoon I made a telephone call to a C.B.C. officer to find out about their new building program. I learned that they are expecting to build two new office buildings in Toronto and Montreal. The one in Toronto will cost $45 million, the one in Montreal will cost $60 million and together with a few smaller ones there will be a total expenditure of approximately $108 million. This is so that those who now plan C.B.C. programs can do so in more comfort. I am not so sure that producers of pornography should be allowed to hatch their perversions in air conditioned comfort at a time when hundreds of thousands of Canadians have yet to receive any kind of basic service. What else might the C.B.C. do instead of pursuing this bent they have today? I believe, and I believe this sincerely, that the programming of this agency, now that we are in 1964, requires a careful review. I do not believe that it would be necessary to limit this program review to parliament, although I would have no objection to parliamentarians being on such a committee. I believe a re-examination of this corporation is needed, and is needed now. I do not believe that a member of parliament getting up to register an objection to filth is destroying the independence of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. If in fact this kind of filth is being perpetrated on the Canadian people, then I want to know who else in this country is going to stand up and oppose this sort of thing if members of parliament, individually and collectively, do not do it?

I receive all sorts of requests in relation to the northern service from people who have comments on northern programming. They quite often do not deal directly through me, but directly with C.B.C. officials. I want to give you an example of their requests because this may come at a good time, right after Mr. Rockwell, the leader of the nazi movement in the United States, has been given hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of free publicity. This is a letter from the Reverend Frith who lives at Inuvik in the Northwest Territories where the Mackenzie river empties into the Arctic ocean. The Reverend Frith and his parishioners have been after the C.B.C. to allow the Sunday program of Dr. Billy Graham to be broadcast to the thousands of people who live in that remote area. This is what he was told when he contacted the officials:

> One official told me that C.B.C. was giving to the people of Inuvik and area what they felt was in the best interest of the people. We appreciate what the C.B.C. has been offering but feel with the abundance of time given to popular music and "soap" operas something could be cut somewhere to enable the people to hear the messages of one of the most outstanding evangelists of our day.

I do not want to read this whole letter and I doubt that it is necessary. However, I wanted to put it on the record at this time to positively suggest to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that they read the speech of the hon. member for Rosthern about the origins of the corporation and find out, if they can, what their purpose was when that body was set up by this parliament. I do not believe this is an unreasonable plea. I think it is long overdue. I would hope that the C.B.C. would be unafraid to come to this parliament and ask for $80 million if it meant extending services to all Canadians everywhere. I am sure this parliament would be quite happy to grant such a request rather than going on with the unending requests for money to finance programs like "This Hour Has Seven Days". I am not so sure their mandate was to make themselves comfortable in Toronto and Montreal in $108 million worth of air conditioned buildings, at a time when they had not fulfilled their mandate in substantial portions of this country.

Just last week, Mr. Chairman, the minister of northern affairs and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, speaking in Edmonton about the Canadian northland, said that communications and services were the key to opening this vast area; that the government is planning on doing this and they are looking for all these wonderful things. Well, here is something that the C.B.C. can do; it can rearrange this $108 million and put off air conditioning for another year. Let us see if they cannot suffer through the heat of Toronto and Montreal for just one more summer, so that the people who live all over the country will at least have access to these things. I suggest to them that it would be worth their while to do this.

In closing, I suggest to them that a great many other Canadians think the same way. I want to close by reading a sentence from an article I referred to earlier in the most widely circulated Roman Catholic magazine by Patricia Young. She says:

> Needless to say, Canada's taxpayers (and voters) will be carefully watching and listening. Many have already gone on record as saying: "O.K., you've gone far enough".

Mr. Greene: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Rhéaume: Certainly.

Mr. Greene: Can the hon. member inform us, if the C.B.C. programs are so terrible, so stultifying, to the people who hear them, why is he so anxious to spread the service to his constituents?

Mr. Rhéaume: This is the sort of Liberal sophistry I have no difficulty in answering. I suggested a two point program. I suggested, (a) eliminating the filth and garbage and, (b) those energies that are now being directed to perversion should be devoted to bringing good Canadian broadcasting to the people of this country.

Mr. Fisher: I hope the committee will forgive me for changing the topic. I would love to join in the discussion of the C.B.C., but the points I would like to bring up are really out of context with the debate that has taken place. It seems to me the questions about the C.B.C. that are most pressing are its relationship to commercial policy and its whole relationship to the board of broadcast governors. I am very much bothered by the lame duck status of the present chairman of the board of broadcast governors in relation to broadcasting policy. It seems to me that this type of approach and query that could be handled by a broadcasting committee would be more important in setting broadcasting and radio direction than in considering the perversions and pornography raised by the hon. member for the Northwest Territories. He will forgive me if I say to the house and to him that I really believe in assessing what he said he, himself, would have to acknowledge, that he was drawing a little bit of a long bow. I do not see how any of us, no matter what our contact with the C.B.C. may be, can fail to admit—I have had the kind of letters of complaint that have been mentioned—that the C.B.C. does not continually put out perversion and pornography upon the air waves via either television or radio. I do not believe it does those of us who are really critical of the C.B.C. any good to exaggerate in that particular direction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I wanted to speak to was the debate we had on Friday afternoon in connection with a situation on Canadian National Railways known as the run-through problem. Today the Prime Minister made an announcement that he was acceding to the request of the president of Canadian National Railways to set up a commission of inquiry. It would be under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, section 55, subsection (3). The commissioner would have terms of reference that would enable him to examine the situation in connection with run-throughs, arising particularly out of the situation at Wainwright and Nakina. Everyone may have assumed that once the Prime Minister made this announcement, everything would be over. The fact of the matter is that at this stage of the evening the railroad workers, in the main, have still not reported for work across much of Canada. I wanted to bring out some of the reasons for their hesitation, and why some of them are bitter about the situation. This was a spontaneous outburst that developed on Sunday without any triggering, I can assure you, by any third party as the president of Canadian National seems to allege in his telegram to the Prime Minister. Those who developed this spontaneous outburst are somewhat bitter over the fact the government and the Canadian National have not made a couple of points sufficiently clear.

The first point is the whole question about discipline and the kind of disciplinary action that may be taken by the management against the men. The reason there is bitterness is that last night, just at the most inopportune time in view of what happened today, across the system the railway forced letters upon employees informing them that if they were not back to work at midnight they would be out of service, and maybe on a permanent basis.

This kind of threat, coming as it did on the eve of what was imagined by the government to be a settlement, has left a bitterness that requires a very clear statement from the government that it has had an assurance from the C.N.R. that there will be no retaliation. I have received wires and phone calls from Kamloops, Edmonton, Melville, and places all over the country stressing this particular point.

I know the area vice presidents of the C.N.R., among them Mr. Gander in Toronto, have sent out wires to all terminal points

stating that the men can have this assurance, but one of the most telling commentaries on the bitterness in C.N.R. labour relations over the last few years is the fact that the men are doubtful of this word. Therefore one of the things that has to follow on this particular tie-up is a recognition by the Minister of Labour and the C.N.R. of the fact that the trust and kind of mutual regard that should exist in good Canadian labour relations has largely disappeared between the C.N.R. and its men. I only hope that this particular incident will give impetus to the development of that kind of trust, and will draw some initiative from the government.

I was tempted to review, as did the Leader of the Opposition on motions today, the somewhat sorry performance of the government on this occasion. On Friday the government argued against urgency of debate on the issue, and the minister got up and indicated the government's responsibility was merely to let representations go to the C.N.R. I say to hon. members, don't let what happened in terms of the wire from the president of the C.N.R. and the wire of the Prime Minister, kid you. Somebody on the government side must have made some representations over the week end. I think it shameful that we were denied an urgent debate on the question of urgency, solely because the government and one of its ministers made an argument that there was not any urgency. The reason the minister thought there was no urgency was because he did not understand there was going to be a blow-up on this particular problem.

The second thing that is bothering the men who are out of service across the country at present is the whole question of the scope of the terms of reference that the commissioner of inquiry will have. I want to put on record that I, as someone interested in the case, accept the assurance of the Minister of Labour and of the Minister of Transport that these terms of reference will be broad enough so that the whole problem of run-throughs can be examined and some solutions recommended to it.

What the men have campaigned for on run-throughs is some way of bringing the problem under contract negotiation so that there cannot be unilateral decision, as was the case last Saturday midnight, when the C.N.R. introduced this particular one. I know the Minister of Labour may not be in a position to give this assurance when he has set up this commission of inquiry, but I want to get very clearly on the record that if something like that does not resolve out of the situation, then the other kind of solutions had better be wonderful in their completeness, thoroughness and ability to satisfy the men.

The main factor in the development of all this bitterness was the fact that the men were never able to negotiate this major change in their working conditions affecting their homes and families. It has always been at the initiative of management who could say, "Whether you like it or not, no matter what little adjustments we are prepared to make, the change is going to be made."

Even as late as yesterday the management of C.N.R. was trying to insist there would be no kind of agreement of any kind unless the men on the local levels were prepared to accept the recommendation that within two years the home divisional point at Nakina would be abolished.

There is one other point in connection with this matter that should be met. On Friday the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre brought up, as did I, the question of the 1926 Montreal agreement. I have seen copies of this agreement over the week end. It is one of the matters I know will be brought before the commissioner, and I want to put a particular section of it on the record so that the Minister of Labour and the government will realize just how much worth and value there is in it.

In May 1926 the brotherhood of locomotive firemen and enginemen and the brotherhood of locomotive engineers entered into an agreement with the C.N.R. This agreement was to last until it was rescinded after 30 days notice on the part of the management, and the point that is particularly important in connection with this document is that it has never been abrogated in any way. The company has never approached the unions with the suggestion that it be thrown out, and I want to point to one of the sections of the agreement which it seems to me is fundamental in a situation where a home terminal is being wiped out. Section 9 says:

> Nothing in this agreement shall be taken to permit the company without prior conference with representatives of the employees to change existing home terminal stations of the employees affected thereby—

And it goes on to say that this will not apply when new facilities are created somewhere in the same city or community; but that part is irrelevant. Is there anything more clear so far as home terminals are concerned? This is one of the reasons why the men have felt all along that they have a justifiable

grievance in the Nakina and Wainwright situation. This agreement and the schedule attached to it has been overlooked and completely ignored by the C.N.R. management.

There is one other point that I think the Minister of Labour should make clear to us. It is something the railroaders have been asking him for some time. They also asked it of his predecessor, the hon. member for Ontario, namely whether there could not be an amendment to the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act so that they would have the opportunity of negotiating this kind of situation under that act; in other words, that any time there was a major change in their working conditions this would enable them to negotiate.

At present they do not have this protection under the act. As a matter of fact every time they have tried to enter into negotiations or objected to the changes, the company has always produced the threat contained in that section of the Criminal Code which requires them to honour the obligations they have entered into under their contract. This is the kind of assurance that would be fundamental and I would appreciate it if the Minister of Labour could make some comment on it.

Another point on which he or the Minister of Transport should speak concerns section 182 of the Railway Act which, if it was interpreted the way most of us think it should have been by the courts, or if it had been amended the way a parliamentary committee recommended last session, would give the railroaders and the communities concerned the protection they have been seeking.

The thing that I am proudest of in connection with this whole issue and the way it developed is the fact that the railroaders on the C.N.R. proved they are not mice, that they are not rabbits, as a lot of people thought. They came out in a magnificent display of the kind of solidarity which only comes when men are desperate. What I appreciate most about it was not that they thumbed the nose at the man who heads the C.N.R.—a man for whom I have not a great deal of respect—but what I am most appreciative of is the spirit shown by this little town in my constituency, a town which governments and railway managements tend to forget. These people persisted, though they had the devil of a time making their representations and getting them understood. And when the facts of the situation went down the wire on Saturday night, all I knew and all I could report was that the government would not take any action and that from this point of view, the situation was dead.

I should like to remind hon. members that these people are living hundreds of miles from any large city and that their means of communication are very scant. It is not like a metropolitan community where it is possible to get legal advice and all kinds of assistance from a host of politicans, agencies and authorities. They are very much out on a limb. But when the moment came, they moved. They made a response and withdrew their services. And up and down the whole system the reply went along; Nakina and Wainwright were supported from Vancouver right through the piece. I appreciate this. I have to express this kind of appreciation because these constituents of mine are now convinced that even though the government did not show a great concern for them, their fellow workers across the whole system did, and I think this brewing up of a spirit of consideration among fellow railwaymen in different parts of the country is the most significant thing which has happened in labour relations and on the railroads for some time. I believe it will be a long time before railway management considers it can push through changes of the kind attempted last Saturday unilaterally and at such short notice.

I should like, too, to express my appreciation to the ladies of the town of Nakina who were out on the platform for trains at three, four, and five in the morning with posters, handing out leaflets, convincing the passengers and crews, shaming the officials who were running the trains yesterday to try to make them see that in a sense they were helping to kill, or lead to the death of, the community of Nakina.

I should like also to mention one of the ironies I spotted during these developments. More than four years ago a group of railwaymen came down from Capreol, Hornepayne and similar places. They saw the minister of labour and got nowhere with their representations against the company bringing in run-throughs. The unions leadership said they could do nothing for them. They came to me and asked me what I would suggest. I said that if they believed in their cause strongly enough they should be prepared to go to jail for it. I said that if they were prepared to do that they would be prepared to withdraw their services. I was hectored and bullied about this later on in the parliamentary committee before which the president of the C.N.R. appeared. But there was

one man who rose to this. He lit a fire and declared there was to be a wildcat strike. He was a man by the name of Shortt. He was the one who got a story to the newspapers, and the C.N.R. changed its mind very shortly—within a day or so. This man was promoted soon after; he became an official. And on Saturday night, in identically the same situation, he was the official who was taking the lead up in that area to make the run-through possible for management. I think this was one of the ironies, that promotion of someone who had been so vigorous on behalf of the men could lead to a situation in which this same man ran through nearly five divisions in some 18 hours pulling trains for management.

The last point I want to touch on in connection with this situation is the way in which the C.N.R. used its officials. One of the contentions some of us have made with regard to the C.N.R. is that there are too many chiefs in comparison with the number of Indians. Well, the C.N.R. had officials scattered right across the country yesterday running trains. I want to know more about this because it is my belief that if the company has all these superfluous officials who know how to run trains so as to be able to cover up when trains are tied up all across the country it does, indeed, have too many chiefs. Obviously if they could trim some of the chiefs they would worry less about a few of the Indians at some of the smaller places.

The Minister of Labour has been very good in this situation, particularly today, and I should like to express my appreciation to him and to his officials. I hope he will be able to bring forward terms of reference broad enough to do the job, and that he will be able to help create the kind of atmosphere between union and management which will establish trust—because trust has diminished, and diminished very severely, on the Canadian National Railways.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: I wish to deal for a few moments only with the question which was debated during this whole day, that is, the C.B.C.

I was naturally surprised to hear the exaggerated statements made from both sides of the house. One side said that the C.B.C. was a den of corruption; the other, that it was a sacrosanct temple. One must nevertheless admit that both sides are exaggerating.

In my opinion, the C.B.C. is at present suffering from a growth problem which is normal in any modern enterprise. Television came to Canada some 15 years ago. Therefore, the technical field, the studios and the reception centres had to be developed, and today ever increasing attention is paid to the production of programs.

In view of the fact that radio and television must face competition which is getting stronger and stronger, the C.B.C. feels it necessary to revitalize its ideas, and that is normal. You cannot broadcast programs 12, 15 and 16 hours a day during 10 or 15 years without trying something new, because obviously if you do not do so, people will be dissatisfied and will quit watching television. In this effort of renewal, errors may have been committed and not only within the C.B.C. but everywhere else. We must understand that.

It is obvious that there have been tasteless programs. In my opinion, it was not mainly due to a lack of taste but because in certain fields untalented persons have been launched in such a considerable undertaking. This is when we witnessed unsuccessful programs.

However, we must not blame the C.B.C. as a whole, because when we consider artistic programs, on the French network at least, everyone will agree, I am sure, that in the province of Quebec the C.B.C. introduced some very talented artists whom we had never heard before.

After all, musicians of great talent and real ability have been made known, thanks to the C.B.C. both on radio and on television, and now they tour the province, the country and even foreign countries giving recitals.

There are playwrights and composers who were able to make themselves known throughout the country thanks to the C.B.C., on either the French or the English network.

After all, there have been amateur sport programs which helped our young people and opened new horizons for them.

Of course mistakes have been made, but it must also be recognized that everything was not bad in the C.B.C. There were also successful programs. At least, we should be proud of the success achieved by C.B.C. in contributing to the bringing into notice of our Canadian authors, actors, artists, musicians, athletes, etc.

Errors were made and I think that there were so many protests across the country that the C.B.C. must have known about it then, as well as it knows now, after the discussion in this house today.

When we ask for the setting up of a committee whose members could deal with C.B.C.

management, we are not asking to administer the corporation as suggested by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) a while ago. No, but we believe that such a meeting would be tremendously important and interesting both for the C.B.C. management and the hon. members. The C.B.C. is after all a government agency, and I agree that its directors must enjoy some independence as regards programming.

A short while ago the C.B.C. was compared with a business firm. Since the shareholders of a company meet the directors at least once a year and tell them what they think of their policies, I think that it should be the same with the C.B.C. whose operations cost the Canadian taxpayers between $80 and $85 million a year.

But the taxpayers' representatives have not even the opportunity of telling, once in a while, the officials of that crown corporation what the Canadian people think of them, while they can do it in the case of the C.N.R. As a matter of fact, we know that it had to be done, fortunately, with the administration of the C.N.R. in order that changes which we have noticed lately be made.

It was fortunate that hon. members could meet the president of Air Canada to tell him what they thought of Air Canada's service, for today we can see that its officials improved certain things. C.N.R. officials have also improved certain things.

The president of the C.N.R. may have found it hard during the few days he was a witness before the railways, canals and telegraph lines committee. The same thing can be said about the president of Air Canada, but at least they heard what the representatives of the people thought about those crown corporations and what changes they wanted made.

The presidents of those two crown corporations thought it advisable to take the members' representations into account, and even if changes were not made too quickly, at least some were made and the service was improved.

Why should we not be afforded the same opportunity to tell the C.B.C. officials what we think not only of the C.B.C.'s administration, but its programming, while not interfering with their independence, their freedom, in short, giving them, as before, a free hand in the administration of that agency?

Such an exchange of views would not be useless. In the past, it proved useful in the case of other crown corporations.

Political programs have been mentioned. In my opinion, hon. members, even those who sit on the government side, would have some rather bitter remarks to make in certain cases to certain C.B.C. officials concerning the anarchy and violence they helped spread for a while. Indeed, Liberal members were the first to complain about that.

Would it not be useful to bring some examples and concrete facts to the attention of C.B.C. directors and officers?

Even if a director is competent it does not mean that he is an authority in all fields such as programming.

Maybe the president is a good accountant—though I doubt it in view of his deficit of $85 million—but even if he is a good businessman, that does not mean that he has the ability to judge the character and atmosphere of poitical programs, cultural programs or the general programming.

Mr. Regan: Would you please speak slowly.

Mr. Grégoire: I shall try to speak more slowly, Mr. Chairman, to make it easier for the hon. member to understand, but after the arguments advanced a while ago by the hon. member for Halifax in his speech, I think that this will be hard.

In any event, such a meeting would be beneficial to everyone because, among other things, in the field of so-called political programs, they will have to admit that for some time now, the C.B.C. has been going astray and that there are in the service responsible for political programs individuals who are more interested in promoting certain ideas than putting forward ideas representing the average opinion of the Canadian people.

There are individuals—and this may be quite human—in the C.B.C., a crown corporation, who are only too anxious to please the party in office. Knowingly or unknowingly—and probably knowingly rather than unknowingly—they try to direct these programs according to a given policy rather than leave the corporation really independent, as some Liberal members were saying a while ago.

But, Mr. Chairman, over and above the C.B.C., there is today a more important problem in Canada. I refer to the economic situation prevailing in this country.

The Minister of Finance may tell us that Canada is prosperous because it has a surplus of $395 million but that is not a sign of prosperity; it means that taxes have increased and that more money has been taken from the taxpayers and the Canadian corporations.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. MacEachen) may tell us that unemployment is decreasing. Why? Because his statistics are inaccurate.

The Minister of Finance counts as jobless only those in receipt of unemployment insurance benefits, when there are others who do not work and are in receipt of social insurance; those people are also unemployed.

Unemployment did not decrease, it even increased. Statistics were falsified, altered.

The Minister of Finance speaks in turn about prosperity; maybe for the rich—

Mr. Knowles: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Grégoire: —but not for the population as a whole.

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

[*Text*]

Progress reported.

Business of the House

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask whoever is acting as house leader whether we will continue tomorrow with interim supply, or is the government bringing in some important legislation tomorrow for the consideration of the house?

Mr. MacNaught: Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of anything more important than interim supply. We will continue with the discussion of interim supply tomorrow. When it is concluded we will take up redistribution, and the labour code.

At ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

APPENDIX

TELEGRAMS EXCHANGED BETWEEN PRESIDENT OF C.N.R. AND PRIME MINISTER

Montreal, October 26, 1964

Various representations have been passed on to me by the Acting Minister of Transport with reference to the timing of the implementation of Canadian National operational plans for running through Nakina and Wainright. As the record shows we have made offers to purchase residences of employees who may move their homes from Nakina and have also undertaken moving expenses involved. Moreover at all times we have expressed willingness to very implementation timing or postpone inaugurations subject only to completion within two years.

We fully believe our discussions with employees affected and their union representatives would have reached amicable understandings as has been the case elsewhere and that present situation is due largely to intervention by third parties which has led to misunderstandings and distortions of actual situation.

We now wish to advise that if government is willing to appoint an independent and impartial person to examine into reasonableness of our proposals and plans for implementation Canadian National will withdraw run-through plans which were effective Sunday October 25 and withhold further action until report is made. We must assume of course that report can be made within reasonable period and respectfully suggest that three months should be ample. Will you please let me know if government is willing to give this assistance.

DONALD GORDON

Ottawa, October 26, 1964

I very much welcome the suggestion in your telegram. On the understanding that you will withdraw run-through plans and withhold further action, the government is moving at once to appoint an independent and impartial person to undertake the examination you refer to. In view of the deterioration in the railway situation I am announcing your proposal and the government's action immediately.

L. B. PEARSON

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, October 27, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO STUDY CURTAILMENT OF ELECTION EXPENDITURES

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, several months ago the government announced its intention to establish a committee to study election expenditures. This is a complex problem which affects the very basis of our democratic system. Moreover, it has become particularly important these last few years due to the increase of communication media, especially since the advent of television. It is now essential to take appropriate action so as to restrict and control election expenditures.

[*Text*]

Before proposing such measures, however, the government has decided to ask a small group of men with practical experience and expert knowledge to make a study of the problem of rising election expenses and make recommendations in the light of our own Canadian requirements and of the experience in other countries. The advisory committee will "inquire into and report upon the desirable and practical measures to limit and control federal election expenditures". These terms of reference are general, and we expect that the committee will give them a broad interpretation.

The members of the committee will be Mr. François Nobert, Three Rivers, president; Hon. M. J. Coldwell, P.C., Ottawa; Mr. Gordon Dryden, Toronto; Mr. Arthur R. Smith, Calgary and Professor Norman M. Ward, Saskatoon.

We are very grateful to all these gentlemen for their willingness to serve on the committee. When their report is completed it will, of course, be made public. It is the first time in our country that a study of this kind has been undertaken and that a government has declared its intention to take effective steps to limit election expenditures. As a result of those steps we hope that our political life will be improved and will reflect more faithfully our democratic ideals.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, naturally I had no advance knowledge that this announcement would be made; therefore I shall not go into any detail, except to say the object is one that will commend itself not only to members of the house and defeated candidates but also to the public as a whole. Certainly the trend in recent years, resulting from television and radio and other necessary media of information, has brought about such an increase in constituency and election expenditures that it renders it very difficult for an average Canadian to take his part in public life.

When I mention expenditures I think of an election in Montreal, I believe it was in 1925 or 1926 in one of the constituencies in your city, sir, when the expenditures set out in the election returns by the two candidates involved were between $80,000 and $90,000 each. That was before the days of radio and television. All were legitimate expenditures; none the less the story is indicative of a great danger that democracy faces, namely that parliament shall be a place only for those who are able to supply the necessary funds. This is a particular detriment to young men and women desiring to take their part in public life.

So far as the personnel of the committee is concerned I commend the minister. I think all of them, both individually and collectively, are recognized by Canadians as a whole as having the necessary capacity and ability to face this difficult problem.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Secretary of State and the government for the step just announced. It seems to me this is the very heart of the whole question of democratic government. If we come to the day when elections can be bought and can be won by parties which have large campaign funds, then we will have lost a very vital element in our democracy. We all know that elections cost a great deal more than they used to, particularly if you have to pay for truth squads and pigeons—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Douglas: —and comic books. An investigation of the whole question of election expenses, of what measures can be taken to curtail them, and I hope also disclosure of the sources of campaign funds, would be an extremely useful thing if we are to develop democratic government in this country.

The government has taken the first step toward what we ought to have in Canada, a democratic system in which members will be elected to parliament on the basis of their merit and not on the basis of the gimmicks they can afford at election time.

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, we in this party join in welcoming the announcement that has been made by the Secretary of State. We all know that for a considerable length of time efforts have been made to spur action in this regard. We only hope the deliberations and studies of the committee will be conducted with dispatch so that before long we will have concrete suggestions and recommendations placed before the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, we listened carefully to the statement made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne) to the effect that a committee will be formed to study the possibilities of decreasing election expenditures as much as possible.

If the work of this committee is directed with a view to allowing less wealthy candidates the opportunity to conduct an election campaign, then it will certainly be effective and will truly recognize the democratic principles which must prevail in a country like Canada.

Too often in the past we have deplored abuses during elections, and particularly during the last general election.

This study, Mr. Speaker, will not prevent the finance barons from supplying considerable amounts of money to the party in power and also to the official opposition party, which has always been done in the past. In many cases those large amounts have prevented able and serious persons from running, because they could not meet the extravagant expenditures of the major political parties of this country.

When some persons use, for instance, social legislation, family allowances, old age pensions, pensions for needy mothers, pensions for invalids, crippled and blind persons, under the pretext that those social security measures were granted to them by the party in power, then they lie deliberately and shamelessly to the people of Canada, and the same applies as concerns agricultural subsidies.

Parliament as a whole, and not just a particular party, is responsible for social security legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we accept the statement of the Secretary of State when he tells us that the chairman of the committee concerned is a well-known Liberal of the province of Quebec, and we hope that this study will enable those who wish to run for office to face up to the candidates who benefit from considerable amounts supplied by barons of finance.

An hon. Member: The sharks.

Mr. Caouette: The sharks.

[*Text*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

TABLING OF REPLY TO REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING PENDING LEGISLATION

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Yesterday I promised the hon. member for Regina City that I would make available to this house a representative copy of replies I have sent to representations received from the trucking industry regarding Bill C-126. With the permission of the house I would now table a copy of a letter to the Manitoba trucking association dated October 23.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): I wonder whether that copy could be printed as an appendix to *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house agree that this letter should be made an appendix to *Hansard*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For text of letter above referred to, see Appendix.*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INSTRUCTIONS TO RETURNING OFFICERS RESPECTING REVISION OF VOTERS LISTS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I would direct a question to the Secretary of State and ask him whether there is any significance in the fact that the chief electoral officer has sent written instructions to the returning officers asking them to revise the lists by December 15, at which time there would be a distribution of election material.

Had the minister any knowledge of this in advance; and what is the interpretation, if any, to be placed on these unusual circumstances in view of the fact that redistribution has not been proceeded with?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): The chief electoral officer did not communicate with me before issuing these instructions.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He must be a mind reader.

FINANCE

AUTOMOBILES AND PARTS—CANADIAN-U.S. NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING FREER TRADE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance with regard to an article which appeared in this morning's *Globe and Mail* by Hugh Munro entitled "Industry Gropes for Answers in Foggy Ottawa Plan on Freer Auto Trade". This article says negotiations are going on between the Canadian and United States governments regarding freer trade in cars and parts. It says that at the present time the industry is suffering from uncertainty because of its inability to get a clear statement from the government. I want to ask the minister whether it is his intention to make a clear statement in the house on this matter in the near future.

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, certainly when the government has anything specific and clear that should be announced, it will be announced in the house. I suggest to my hon. friend that I think the article to which he referred is somewhat exaggerated, because the automobile industry in Canada has never been so prosperous and there has never been so much employment in that industry.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. This has nothing to do, of course, with whether or not the industry is prosperous. I want to ask the minister specifically are the Canadian and United States governments negotiating to have freer access to the Canadian and United States markets for automobiles and parts? Does the minister intend to make any statement to the house regarding this matter? Third, does the minister intend at any time to introduce with such legislation, if it comes, some type of trade adjustment legislation that will protect both the workers and management against any dislocations which may take place?

Mr. Gordon: As has been stated in the house on other occasions, officials of the Canadian and U.S. governments have been discussing possible extenuations or changes in the present plan in case they are needed. This has been done at the official level and on an informal basis and does not represent negotiations, in any formal sense, between the Canadian and U.S. governments. If, as and when there are any changes in policy, they will of course be announced in the house.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question. May I ask the minister whether at the same time any consideration will be given to introducing some type of trade adjustment legislation, which has been suggested a number of times by the hon. member for Danforth, to protect both labour and management against the adverse effects of the dislocation which might take place if such a policy were introduced?

Mr. Gordon: It seems to me there are a whole set of hypothetical conjectures in that question, Mr. Speaker. However, it is my understanding that this is a subject which the Minister of Labour has under consideration; in fact I think he is having a meeting on it this afternoon.

REMOVAL OF TAX ON MACHINERY OF PRODUCTION

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. Inasmuch as the cost of food producing machinery to United States producers is some 41 per cent lower than the cost of such machinery in Canada, thereby reflecting directly on the cost of living in Canada, would the minister consider removing the tax on production machinery?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): I seem to have dealt with this question on several occasions, Mr. Speaker.

PENITENTIARIES

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL—EMPLOYMENT OF STAFF DURING CONSTRUCTION PERIOD

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Justice. Will his department

take appropriate steps to ensure that the hundreds of guards who are working at the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary will be given employment in the other institutions to be built?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Naturally, Mr. Speaker, no guard will lose his job following the steps we intend to take to improve our penal system.

One of the major problems remaining is to find enough guards who will accept to follow, in due time, the courses of the college set up for that purpose.

Mr. Caouette: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What steps will be taken to ensure that the economy of the town of St. Vincent de Paul, which is entirely dependant upon the penitentiary, will not be too affected? Will there be new buildings in St. Vincent de Paul to prevent chaos?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, the maximum security institution will be transferred from St. Vincent de Paul to Ste. Anne des Plaines. However, a unit in St. Vincent de Paul will look after the selection and distribution of inmates among the various institutions. Administration offices will also be established there and other buildings as well.

I should tell the hon. member who is concerned, and rightly so perhaps, about the future of people now working at St. Vincent de Paul that this aspect of the matter was considered during the study of the project and one of my main preoccupations will be to see that those changes in the system do not affect the town of St. Vincent de Paul.

Much as I would have liked to meet the mayor and the aldermen, I found it impossible to do so. Nevertheless, the hon. member can rest assured that here is one factor to which the department will give its utmost consideration.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice.

Could he report on the conditions he found yesterday during his visit and tell us more particularly if the conditions mentioned on the television program "This Hour Has Seven Days" are based on facts?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Danforth.

[Mr. Caouette.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Speaker, I believe the minister was about to answer my question.

Mr. Favreau: Of course, I had no intention, Mr. Speaker, of giving a detailed answer to that question apart from tabling a return. Therefore, perhaps my hon. friend could put his question on the order paper and I will endeavour to give as complete an answer as possible.

[*Text*]

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): A supplementary question for the minister. Is the minister in a position to confirm to the house that a decision has been made to set up a parliamentary committee to look into the whole matter of penal reform and penology in Canada and, if so, could he give the house the nature of the committee and its terms of reference?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I said that it was my intention to recommend to the government the setting up of two committees. I shall make my recommendation presently, and as soon as the cabinet has taken a definite stand on each of the two measures concerned I shall report to this house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martineau: During his visits, did the minister see prisoner Gaston Nicolas who was the subject of a telecast report Sunday night?

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice.

Now that he has decided that St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary should be evacuated within the next two years and prisoners transferred to other institutions, will he give the necessary instructions to build a medium security penitentiary at St. Pie de Bagot, as had been decided by the Conservative administration, a decision revoked by his predecessor?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is this a question or a statement? I suggest the hon. member put this on the order paper.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ with your ruling on this. I think it is a very urgent matter, and I am only taking the report and the statement of the minister—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Ricard: I know the Grits on the other side do not like to hear this, but the penitentiaries—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If each hon. member in turn were to ask about a penitentiary, if there was one, in his constituency we would never get on with the business before the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for recognizing me but the question I wanted to direct to the Minister of Justice had to do with the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary.

I could perhaps take this opportunity to ask him whether there is any basis to the rumour that he wants to relinquish his position as leader of the house?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, any decision to that effect will be announced before long.

[*Text*]

PROPOSED LOCATION OF NEW WOMEN'S PRISON

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Justice. On October 13, while he was absent from the house on business, I asked his parliamentary secretary whether any decision had been arrived at by the government in respect of the women's prison now located at Kingston. I wanted to know whether a decision had been reached to leave it in its present location or whether a decision had been reached to move it elsewhere. Because of the tremendous interest in this matter, can the minister advise the house in this regard?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, no decision has been arrived at yet. The position of the matter will be discussed in the course of consideration of my estimates, but no decision has been arrived at yet.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the subject of the moving of this prison could be discussed by the parliamentary committee on prison reform which the minister is setting up.

Mr. Favreau: Yes, Mr. Speaker. One of the two committees I have in mind, if my suggestion is accepted, will be vested with the study of penal reform and our correctional system as a carryover from the conclusions and the point reached at the time of the Fauteux report.

Mr. Fairweather: In other words, no decision will be made to move the prison until the report of the committee has been received. Is that correct?

Mr. Favreau: I thought my hon. friend was referring to the matter of penal reform and correction generally and in principle. As far as the other matter is concerned, I am in a position to state that it is not my intention to recommend a firm decision with regard to the women's penitentiary until such time as the parliamentary committee to be set up has been seized of the question.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the more or less piecemeal pronouncements that are being made here, at Niagara Falls and at St. Vincent de Paul, I wonder whether the minister would be kind enough to package all these developments in one statement which he might make on motions at some appropriate time within the next day or two so we can have a look at the whole picture.

Mr. Favreau: I think the proper time to do this will be when my estimates come before the house—

Mr. Woolliams: When are you going to bring them down?

Mr. Favreau: —and also when either of the two committees to which I have just referred is constituted by the government.

Mr. Howard: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister tell us when his estimates will be before the house?

Mr. Pearson: When are we going to get interim supply?

Mr. Favreau: I am not in a position to say when my estimates will come up, but they should surely come up in the relatively early future.

Mr. Howard: Will you consult with the government house leader about that?

AGRICULTURE

SEPARATE DEPARTMENT FOR EASTERN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

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

Would the right hon. Prime Minister tell us if the setting up of a department of agriculture for eastern Canada is still considered by the government as an urgent matter and if we

can expect the introduction and adoption of a bill to that effect during the present session?

Mr. Rondeau: An election is coming, he will promise it.

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have already dealt with this question two or three times.

NOTICE TO BANKS OF AMENDMENTS TO FARM IMPROVEMENT LOANS LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Since the house gave approval to amendments to the Farm Improvement Loans Act on September 15 and royal assent was given the following day, can the minister tell the house why the banks have not been informed of this and when we can expect them to be informed?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): I will be glad to look into the matter, Mr. Speaker.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

RECOMMENDATIONS TO PROVINCES RESPECTING SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare and is based on a speech delivered yesterday on her behalf in which it was stated that her department is making a study of the report of the royal commission on health services and hopes to have recommendations to place before the provinces by next spring. I should like to ask the hon. lady whether the review includes a study of the imminent and critical doctor shortage in Canada, and can we expect recommendations to the provinces in this regard before or by next spring?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first part of the question, yes; and with respect to the second part, yes.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

PAYMENT FOR INTERVIEW WITH LEADER OF U.S. NAZI PARTY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. L. Klein (Cartier): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State. Will the minister tell the house if George Lincoln Rockwell or the American nazi party received any payment from the C.B.C. or any of its departments for appearing on the program "This Hour Has Seven Days" televised on Sunday, October 25, 1964; and if so, the amount that was paid and to whom it was paid?

Mr. Speaker: This is a question for the order paper.

REPORTED COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF FRENCH NETWORK

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State.

Does he intend to order the holding of an inquiry so as to check whether the C.B.C. is loaded with communist sympathizers, as was asserted by the secretary of the province of Quebec, Mr. Bona Arsenault?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, that question was asked yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition, and I answered it.

[*Text*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

BRITISH COLUMBIA—STRIKE OF HERRING FISHERMEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. Can the minister inform the house about the herring fishermen's strike on the west coast, and what he is doing to help solve the problem?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram this morning advising me of the strike of herring fishermen on the west coast, but I wish to advise the hon. member that such problems do not come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Fisheries.

PENSIONS

CANADA PLAN—REQUEST FOR EARLY CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Now that the new resolution concerning the Canada pension plan

is, I am happy to note, on the notice paper and will be on the order paper tomorrow, and in view of the fact that under our new standing orders debate on a resolution preceding a money bill can take only one day, will the government arrange for the pension plan resolution to be debated at an early date so the bill can be introduced and we can thus have time to study this very important measure?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I hope it will be possible to debate this resolution under the new rules at a very early date.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

REPORT ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN ATLANTIC PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, based on remarks that were delivered for him in Toronto a few days ago. Does the proposed new policy announced in those remarks regarding direct grants to new industries established for the production of new products mean the adoption of the recommendations contained in Professor Wilson's report prepared for the four Atlantic premiers; and will the government be announcing the adoption of the recommendations of this report, as requested by Premier Stanfield?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, study is still being given to Professor Wilson's report, and until such time as the study is complete I would hesitate to give any forecast of what might happen.

TRADE

REQUEST FOR FURTHER STATEMENT ON U.K. IMPORT SURCHARGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Can he add anything today to the interpretation he gave yesterday of the likely effect of the new British 15 per cent trade levy, particularly as it may affect British Columbia pulp, sawn lumber and aluminum, with regard to which some concern is being felt?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I do not have very much to add to what I said yesterday, except to say that upon further examination the impact is probably going to be a little less than I indicated yesterday. As far as lumber is concerned, our understanding is that raw lumber itself is exempt from the charge, but we are not clear whether any other forms of lumber are exempt. It is our understanding, of course, that products such as plywood are subject to the charge.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REPORTED DELAY IN PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Can he tell the house why the unemployment insurance commission is delaying up to eight weeks in paying cheques that are due to some of the unemployed at the moment?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend will give me some specific instances I will be glad to look into what seems to be an excessive delay.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO SETTING UP OF COURT OF CLAIMS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is in a position to tell the house when the legislation concerning the Indian claims commission will be brought before the house.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, within a few days I will have a meeting with the officers of my department and then we will be in a position to determine changes in the legislation as all the representations from the Indians have been received and considered. We have now reached the stage of amendments to the bill, and the legislation will again be submitted to the house shortly.

[*Text*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

COLUMBIA RIVER—ABSENCE OF NATIONAL FLAGS AT SIGNING OF TREATY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to my affable friend the Secretary of State for External Affairs. He looks a little serious today. I

should like to ask him why the officials of his department considered it improper to drape the present official distinctive flag of Canada, the red ensign, and the flag of the United States of America as a backdrop to the ceremonial signing of the Columbia river treaty which took place in the railway committee room, which he signed and which the ambassador of the United States signed. Why was it considered improper to display the Canadian red ensign and the flag of the United States on this occasion?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): My hon. friend is somewhat late in posing this important question. I can only say that if there had been any deliberate effort to do what my hon. friend alleges, then of course it would have been a wrong course to follow. I am sure I have never heard of any such suggestion. It would have been appropriate, of course, for this to have been done particularly because of the accomplishment represented by the ratification of that treaty.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

VICTORIA, B.C.—EMPLOYMENT OF FEMALE LETTER CARRIER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. W. Groos (Victoria, B.C.): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General. Is it a fact that a female letter carrier has recently been added to the staff of the Victoria post office, and is this indicative of a new employment policy in the Post Office Department?

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure whether this is a pressing question, but it should be put on the order paper.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION—REQUEST FOR ISSUANCE OF COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): I have a question for the Postmaster General. I should like to ask him whether he has considered issuing a stamp to honour the meeting of the interparliamentary union which will be held in Canada in 1965.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Yes, serious consideration is being given to that suggestion. I may supplement that answer by saying that I think I have already written to the Speaker on the subject giving him an assurance, and that is almost as good as a promise.

[Mr. More (Regina City).]

PUBLIC SERVICE

SUPERANNUATED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—REQUEST FOR INCREASED PENSIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister, and I hope I can get the same kind of assurance from the Prime Minister as that just given by the Postmaster General. In view of press reports that the Prime Minister stated today that a study is to be made of the possibility of improving the pensions of retired civil servants, can the Prime Minister say if that study will include the possibility of legislation being introduced at this session?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): What I said to the delegation of superannuated civil servants, whom we were very glad to receive this morning and with whom we had a very interesting exchange of views, was that we would study their brief very carefully and very sympathetically, and I would be communicating with them within a fortnight.

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): Would such a decision be delayed until after the Canada pension plan has been dealt with, as the Prime Minister at one time indicated?

Mr. Pearson: It was the contention of the delegation that these two things were not related.

Mr. Knowles: Hear, hear.

SUPPLY

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

INTERIM SUPPLY

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $740,710,974.77, being the aggregate of

(a) two twelfths of the total of all of the items to be voted in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965, as reduced, except finance item 15, mines and technical surveys item 25, national research council item 10, and transport items 15 and 25 for which the proportion is one twelfth and atomic energy item 5, external affairs item 20, forestry item 25 and legislation item 20 for which no proportion is being released, $651,829,576.84;

(b) an additional two twelfths of the amount of public works item 70 (schedule A), of the said main estimates, $666,666.67;

(c) an additional one twelfth of the amount of fisheries items 5 and 10, legislation item 5, mines and technical surveys item 70, post office item 1 and public works item 40 (schedule B), of the said main estimates, $20,263,800.00;

(d) two twelfths of all of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (A), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, except national defence item 56a, and loans, investments and advances items L12a, L17a and L37a for which no proportion is being released, $20,612,522.50;

(e) an additional two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103a (schedule C), of the said supplementary estimates (A), $872,966.67;

(f) nine twelfths of the total of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (B), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, $46,215,108.75;

(g) two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103b (schedule D), of the said supplementary estimates (B), $250,333.34,

be granted to Her Majesty on account of the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, before the house rose, last night, I said that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) likes to refer to the prosperity we are supposed to have in Canada at the present time. As late as this afternoon, he mentioned the prosperity of the automobile industry in Canada. It seems to have become typical of the Minister of Finance to talk about the present prosperity of the Canadian economy.

However, there is one thing he overlooks. He does not tell us for whom there is prosperity in Canada at the present time. There is probably prosperity for tax collectors and gatherers. Indeed, that field is in fact prosperous. Collections are much larger than before. Taxes have gone up and so, the coffers of the government are better lined than ever.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: Order. May I bring to the attention of members of the committee the fact that it is rather noisy. In fairness to hon. members who are trying to listen to the speech may I suggest that conversation should be carried on sotto voce.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I agree with you that it is a little noisy on the Liberal side but that is because the Liberals are disappointed at the announcement made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne) to the effect that election expenditures would be cut down in the future. Since they never succeeded in getting elected without a healthy electoral fund, they are looking for new means of stealing elections now that their electoral fund has been cut.

In fact, they are holding a caucus to find how they could steal elections, now that they no longer have a fat electoral fund. And the "Prosper" hon. member for Mercier knows something about it, since his electoral fund has always beeen one of the most prosperous in Canada. If he had not had a healthy electoral fund in the past, I think he would have never been elected to this parliament.

Liberal members are now discussing how they could steal elections without an electoral fund.

In any event, we see that the truth hurts. It has offended some and it will be the subject of conversation among Liberals for some time, because they know that in future they will not be able to win an election so easily, if election expenditures are reduced, because they always had to pay large amounts to their organizers and to their poll representatives, while the Creditistes were able to do so by themselves—

The Chairman: The hon. member for Lapointe has been speaking for a few minutes on a subject which appears to have no relation whatever with the subject under consideration, and I would invite him to come back to our discussion.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that during a debate on interim supply it has always been customary for the chairman to leave the greatest freedom to the members. As a feeling of revolt and fear seems to prevail today among Liberal members, this surely constitutes a matter of current interest.

I was saying that prosperity, to which the Minister of Finance refers so often, is a tax collector's prosperity; it is a national revenue department prosperity.

But look at the people, look at the unemployed, the farmer, the labourer, the small businessman, the small manufacturer. They are not prosperous. Prosperity is found among tax collectors, not among the people.

The surplus of which the Minister of Finance boasts at the present time does not imply a period of prosperity but a period of tax increases.

I said yesterday that unemployment statistics indicate a momentary improvement only because they are inaccurate. Nowadays, for instance, only those who get unemployment insurance benefits are considered as unemployed. However, there are just as many Canadians who are no longer entitled to such benefits, but who are covered by social insurance. Those people are still unemployed, but they are not classified as such because they do not draw unemployment insurance benefits.

The situation is the same as in 1960, 1961, 1962 and 1963. The lot of the big fellows is improving but that of the little man is getting worse all the time.

What is the government doing in the circumstances? What legislation has this parliament passed to remedy Canada's present economic conditions?

According to orders of the day, 78 government orders have been put on the order paper during this session.

If you refer to order paper No. 177 for Tuesday, October 27, 1964, you will see that 52 of those government orders have been adopted by parliament. Among those 52, 14 were simply referred to a committee; therefore, nothing was solved, since those questions were referred to a committee for study.

There remain 38 orders, five of which dealt with supply or the estimates. In other words, this meant a two day debate which was nothing more than chatter, followed by a non-confidence motion at the end of those two days.

There remain 33. Five were also adopted on motions of approval of special measures which did not benefit the Canadian people. Among those five motions respecting special measures, there was the motion approving the sending of peace troops to Cyprus, a motion amending the constitution, that is, an address sent to the British parliament requesting the right to amend our constitution respecting old age pensions. There was also an address to the Queen of England after her trip to Canada.

All these motions concerning special bills have contributed absolutely nothing to the improvement of the economic situation in Canada.

So, we are left with 28 orders on the order paper which have been adopted by parliament.

Out of that number there were eight bills ordinarily called supply bills, four for interim supply and four for the supplementary estimates. The Canadian people did not get anything out of those either.

So we now have 20 bills which have been adopted by parliament. Out of that number, six were private bills and of minor importance from which the Canadian people did not get anything either. I might mention, for instance, the Blue Water Bridge Authority Act, the Judges Act and the Exchequer Court Act—simply to increase the number of judges—the Ste Foy-St. Nicolas Bridge Act and the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission Act.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Six such bills of very limited, special and secondary interest have been passed, with the result that there still remain but 14 bills, passed by parliament, which might have been of public interest.

Of those 14, three were based on budget resolutions brought forward when the Minister of Finance introduced his last budget. The sole purpose of those three bills was to increase taxes or change custom duties. Here again, the Canadian people did not get anything.

There are only 11 bills left which were passed by parliament, including five which merely served to amend other acts. One of them amended the National Defence Act, another the National Housing Act. Improvements brought to the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation could have been of benefit to the Canadian people if such advantages had not been completely nullified by the 11 per cent increase in the sales tax on building materials.

Of the six bills remaining, three concern agriculture and one the fishing zones. The only purpose of the three bills on agriculture was to run the Canadian people farther into debt: the first was to raise the amount of farm credit loans, the second to raise the amount of farm improvement loans and the third to extend credit to farm machinery syndicates.

Strangely enough, not one of those bills on agriculture is suitable to agriculture in eastern Canada.

There remains only two other bills passed by parliament this year; the first concerns a $10 family allowance to children aged 16 to 18 years, which will definitely not apply in the province of Quebec, since they are already getting it; the other, Bill No. C-111, concerns $1,000 loans to students, which will not apply to the province of Quebec either.

There you have the legislative program put through by this government to date. Result: nil.

This means, Mr. Chairman, that the surplus now showing on government books results from taxes and not from the legislative program of the government.

The government did not legislate in the right direction. It was aiming at balancing a budget which had shown a deficit for the past eight or ten years. It legislated in the interest of the big financial interests of the country, not in the interest of the people.

But when England needs help to maintain the pound at its current level, then, the matter is urgent. There is no need to pass legisla-

tion. The Bank of Canada, without even explaining the circumstances to parliament or to the Canadian people, makes a low interest loan to the Bank of England.

When the British economy had to be saved, legislation was not even passed. The Bank of Canada did it without any act, without even consulting parliament, and it lent money practically free of interest to the Bank of England.

Since such a thing is possible to save the economic interests of England, why does the Bank of Canada not act in the same way in order to help the Canadian citizen, the individual, the small businessman? How can the Bank of Canada do that in order to help England, but cannot do the same thing to help our municipalities, school boards and provincial governments?

When the defence of big financial interests of English or international capitalists is involved, then there is no need for legislation. The Bank of Canada takes direct action, as it did less than three weeks ago, by lending tens of millions of dollars to England. But when the economic interests of the Canadian people are involved, there is nothing doing. As suggested by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), no legislation is introduced or our time is spent on passing legislation only to push people into debt, instead of pulling them out of the debt situation in which they are at the present time.

The Bank of Canada can act in the absence of legislation in order to save England's economy. Why could it not act now to save the economy of the Canadian people? Emergency measures are needed to save the Canadian economy at this time.

An hon. Member: Demagogue.

Mr. Grégoire: Liberal members call that demagogy. One is asleep, the other one is reading his paper and there is another one who never did and never will understand anything. That is the contribution of certain Liberal members.

There was an emergency measure taken by the Bank of Canada to assist England and, in the same way, emergency measures must be applied in our country. Among those emergency measures, I should like to name four.

First, an emergency measure concerning every Canadian citizen. It involves three pieces of social security legislation to assist the individual where most needed.

The first step towards helping the individual would be to increase family allowances. The minister tells us that he has a surplus of $395 million. He should increase family allowances in order to give parents of large families, which number five, seven, eight and even ten children, the opportunity to send them to school, give them a decent and honourable life, and provide clothing, food and shelter for them during their studies. We should raise family allowances to $10, $18, or $20 per month in order that those children might attend school—not only primary school, but also secondary school or even university. It is the duty of the government to raise family allowances for all the young people of our country, so that everyone may take advantage of our educational facilities.

A second measure would involve old age pensions. Look at what is going on in the factories today. Come and see for yourselves what is taking place in the big factories in my riding, such as the Aluminum Company in Arvida and Price Brothers in Kénogami and Jonquière. You will see that the worker is retired at 65 years of age. While he is used to a decent salary, he must, at age 65 be retired on a pension that is not enough for him to live on.

As industry and factory workers retire at 65, it seems to me that the government should lower to 65 the age for old age pensions, instead of keeping it at 70. The monthly pension of $75 should be paid to all Canadian citizens 65 years of age, because nowadays factory workers are increasingly being retired at that age and are deprived of their salary, not at 70 but at 65 years of age.

The third point concerns social security. Today we notice that one of the greatest problems faced by the individual and the big family—I know that there is hospital insurance to pay for a public ward—comes from doctors' and anaesthetists' bills, and the price of medicine and operations. The government should pass legislation as quickly as possible with a view to organizing a system of health dividend, in the form of dividend coupons which would be sent to all family heads and to all single people over 21 years of age. Each head of a family and each single person could use these dividend coupons to subscribe to a medical care program with an insurance company of his choice, whether profit-making or not.

Private insurance companies in Canada are in a position to offer health insurance plans, and this would be an economy for the government. A greater number of Canadian citizens would be insured through this health dividend which would only be valid with a Canadian company.

Then the Canadian citizen would be in a position to pay his expenses not only for hospitalization in a public ward but also for a private room, when necessary, as well as the fees of physicians, surgeons, anaethetists and expenses for drugs, house calls and so on.

Those three measures, that is family allowances, old age pensions and health dividends would directly help the individual to live better under our present system.

The first point, the first piece of urgent legislation which should be enacted in Canada is a social security bill concerning family allowances, old age pensions at the age of 65 and a universal health dividend.

Second—

The Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I think I will be through in four minutes. I have been interrupted a few times at the beginning of my remarks.

The Chairman: Of course, the hon. member can continue if he has the unanimous consent of the committee. Does the hon. member for Lapointe have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Grégoire: I will need only three or four minutes to conclude my speech. In view of the delay you imposed upon me at the beginning and—

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member has already had an additional minute, in any case, but I should like to ask the committee once again if the hon. member for Lapointe has its unanimous consent to continue.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: Permission granted.

Mr. Grégoire: Here then, Mr. Chairman, is the second measure, and I shall refer to it very briefly.

It would be to provide work for each and every Canadian citizen. There are too many unemployed at the present time in our country, whether or not they are included in the statistics. By carrying out a vast program of public works, improving our public buildings, our roads, our bridges, building schools and universities and also looking after urban renewal, we should be able, by means of such a vast program of public works, to provide jobs for all our Canadian citizens.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

The third emergency measure essential to Canada is to find the solution to the problem of agriculture in eastern Canada. At the present time, agriculture in eastern Canada is in complete stagnation. Its reactivation would require emergency measures, and to these we would be ready to contribute. By so doing, we could save the farmer in eastern Canada, and especially in the province of Quebec, from ruination and bankruptcy.

The fourth emergency measure would be to reduce taxes so that the Canadian government would not take away from the Canadian citizen the salary he earns, as is done through taxes at the present time.

Let the government bring forward those four urgent measures and then, we are convinced, prosperity will follow, not a false or artificial prosperity that benefits tax collectors but prosperity for each and every Canadian citizen. It is the responsibility of all members of this house to promote the prosperity of all Canadian citizens and not only that of tax collectors.

[*Text*]

Mr. Klein: I should like to discuss for the next few moments the program which was broadcast on Sunday last in the series "This Hour Has Seven Days". I should like to read a statement made by the narrator, John Drainie, prior to the interview with George Rockwell on this program. It reads as follows:

In the 48 hours since we announced that George Lincoln Rockwell, leader of the American nazi party would appear on this program tonight—

The Chairman: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

An hon. Member: What is the matter, Mr. Grégoire, you are not able to make Mr. Boulanger angry any more?

[*Text*]

The Chairman: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, would you kindly call to order the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger). He is interrupting his colleague; if he was the least bit polite, he would let him talk.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Klein) has the floor.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. We want to hear the gentleman who has the floor, but the hon. member for Mercier talks too loud and in such a way as to interrupt his colleague. If the hon.

member for Mercier wants the floor, why does he not rise?

Mr. Boulanger: The leader of tomorrow.

The Chairman: May I call the hon. members to order so that the hon. member for Cartier can pursue his remarks?

Mr. Grégoire: He will be able to carry on if the other one holds his tongue.

[*Text*]

Mr. Winkler: I suggest these children should leave the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boulanger: Yes, let him continue his speech.

[*Text*]

Mr. Winkler: May I repeat my suggestion that these boys leave the chamber.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, you see the hon. member for Mercier is always talking.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Boulanger: He is really sick. At his age.

Mr. Grégoire: He is still continuing, Mr. Chairman.

[*Text*]

Mr. Klein: The statement continued—perhaps I had better begin again.

In the 48 hours since we announced that George Lincoln Rockwell, leader of the American nazi party, would appear on our program tonight the C.B.C. has received many phone calls demanding that he be withdrawn. The callers, some of them members of an organized group, argue that it is dangerous to let Mr. Rockwell advocate on t.v. the extermination of Jews since he might ignite the fires of anti-Semitism and enlist supporters to his cause. We disagree. We believe that Canadians will not take up arms against Jews, negroes or any other minority groups because Mr. Rockwell asks them to. We believe that the best way to deal with extremists is to expose them, not to pretend that they don't exist. We believe that Canadians, given adequate exposure to Mr. Rockwell, are competent to judge him for themselves.

These are the facts: there has been a significant growth in the power and influence of the far right in the past five years. The American nazi party claims a quarter of a million members; its work is well financed. Its message of hate is carried daily by a string of radio stations owned by a Texas millionnaire. Its literature is dispensed through secret postal boxes, and when one box is closed down another opens up.

Last week, in Texas, three men were arrested for violation of the federal firearms laws, for keeping a cache of weapons. They also had nazi flags and pictures of Hitler. The cache was discovered shortly before a visit to Texas by President Johnson.

In France, yesterday, Mrs. Collin Jordan, wife of the British nazi party leader, was charged in a Paris court with plotting against the French state. And in Canada Jews and others were still receiving hate literature although the government announced that post office box II—two or eleven—had been closed down.

Once before in another nation, now our ally, a man with views like Rockwell came to power unnoticed by forces that might have stopped him. By the time his nation was aware of the threat he posed, it was too late for he was already in firm control and could not be stopped.

We don't suggest that George Lincoln Rockwell is on his way to power, but we are convinced that to ignore his very real existence will not reduce the threat he presents and may in fact assist him.

What you will see now is not pleasant viewing.

He was speaking, of course, of the program:

Some of you will be frightened by it, all of you will be disturbed by it; but we believe that it must be shown; that only by exposing extremism in all its monstrosity can citizens be made aware of its dangers and society armed to deal with him.

This is the statement that preceded the television program in which Rockwell was pictured as the commander of the American nazi party, with a huge flag bearing the swastika, and bordered by some 20 or 30 stalwarts, strong-arm men. When we read this statement that was made before the program, in which Mr. Drainie said "We believe that the best way to deal with extremists is to expose them, not to pretend that they don't exist", I submit that the extremists he speaks of simply do not exist in Canada. Rockwell stated on the television program that he had only about 100 followers in Canada. The fact remains that the C.B.C. had to go to the United States with a crew, film and tape the program and import the problem into Canada. I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that this was not an exposé, nor for the purpose of exposure; it was for the purpose of exploitation. They wanted to exploit this film, and not to expose problems that do not exist in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Klein: Then Mr. Drainie said:

These are the facts: there has been a significant growth in the power and influence of the far right in the past five years. The American nazi party claims a quarter of a million members; its work is well financed.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I submit again that it is all very well to make these statements, and on its face it is a very excellent statement; but you had to see the program—I do not know how many did see it—in order to really get a good impression of what this statement tried to convey. Then he said in the statement:

Once before in another nation, now our ally, a man with views like Rockwell came to power unnoticed by forces that might have stopped him.

He does not say what forces might have stopped him; and to say that Hitler came to power unnoticed is, in my view, completely contrary to the facts; because Hitler was known for many years prior to his ascension to power in 1933. Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I may say that neither Hitler nor any other extremist or tyrant has ever been elected to power in any democracy. They have seized power in a democracy, but were never elected to power in a democracy. They were able to seize power through a systematic attack upon minority groups, with hate literature and so forth, with which they were able to destroy the nation by setting up one group in a population against another. In the last part of this statement Mr. Drainie says:

What you will see now is not pleasant viewing. Some of you will be frightened by it, all of you will be disturbed by it—

I state that the C.B.C. has acted contrary to the regulations respecting radio broadcasting. I read from part II of the Canada Gazette of February 12, 1964, page 178, where it states in article 12 (1) under the heading "Offensive promotional programs":

Where, in the opinion of a representative of the board, a promotional program broadcast by a station is of an offensive or objectionable nature, or is likely to create or contribute to any public disturbance or disorder, that representative may, by notice in writing, require that station to show cause, in the manner and within the time indicated in the notice, why the character of that program should not be modified.

If Rockwell had applied to the immigration authorities at any port of entry into Canada in an attempt to make a speech before the 100 followers he says he has in Canada, and had wanted to make that speech in some beer hall, as Hitler did in 1923, he would not have been permitted to enter Canada and he would have been, after the board of inquiry hearing, refused admission on the grounds of security.

Here we have the C.B.C. bringing Rockwell into every living room throughout the length and breadth of Canada completely in violation of the immigration regulations of this country. I believe, if my memory serves me aright, there is a standing order to every immigration officer across the country which advises that if Rockwell were to attempt to come to Canada through any port of entry he should be refused admission.

Rockwell vilified Dr. Martin Luther King. I will not dignify his statement by repeating what he called Dr. Martin Luther King, a man who has just received the Nobel peace prize. By permitting Rockwell to vilify Dr. Martin Luther King the C.B.C., I submit, violated another portion of the regulations. Here I am referring to the same issue, page 172, under the heading of broadcasting generally. Article 5 (1) says:

[Mr. Klein.]

No station or network operator shall broadcast—
(b) any abusive comment or abusive pictorial representation on any race, religion or creed—

I do not see how the C.B.C. can clear themselves of the implication of the violation of this article. If this television program was a preview of colour television I feel impelled to tell the C.B.C. that yellow is not becoming. Because we are now entering an era, if this kind of programming goes on, of yellow television; and may I suggest that moderation is still a virtue in this country.

One of the co-producers of the program is quoted in the Toronto *Star* for October 26, 1964 as having said this. The co-producer's name is Douglas Leiterman, who explained:

I'm all for sensationalism—but only if it is responsible sensationalism.

I submit that sensationalism is no substitute for responsibility. I say further that I do not believe many Canadians will agree with this statement to which I have referred. Perhaps the only one who would agree with it is Barry Goldwater, one of the candidates for the presidency of the United States. Therefore I submit, Mr. Chairman, that responsible people do not make irresponsible statements, and that irresponsible people should be held responsible for irresponsible statements. I submit that the C.B.C. has taken upon itself to do what the government does not want it to do by admitting into the living rooms of all Canadians this man Rockwell, who would be refused entry to Canada at any border point in the country; and in particular it has violated the provisions and regulations of the Broadcasting Act in the manner I have indicated.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say something about the C.B.C. along a somewhat different line than that followed by most of those who have spoken so far, whose remarks have been related chiefly to programming. In my view the complaints in this regard are the result of the organization of the C.B.C., the manner in which it carries on its operations and the lack of any real control over these operations by anybody.

As we all know, the C.B.C. is not accountable to the government or to any cabinet

minister for its operations. Theoretically control can be exercised by parliament itself. In actual fact parliament has been very loath to exercise that control. From the practical point of view the only way parliament can exercise any control is, first, by withholding funds for the operation of the C.B.C., something we have not been prepared to do largely because there is insufficient information available as to the amount which should be withheld and the purpose for which it should be withheld.

The second way in which control can be exercised is by the appointment of a committee of the house to look into the affairs of the C.B.C. There is no standing committee of the house on broadcasting, and special committees have been set up at relatively infrequent intervals. As a result they have not served as an effective means for parliament to exercise control over the C.B.C.

I think a great improvement could be made in this regard if a standing committee on broadcasting were set up and divided into subcommittees, each of which could pursue in detail the operations of a particular phase of the C.B.C.'s activities and thus be able to arrive at an appraisal of what was going on, with the result that the committee would be in a position to make specific recommendations as to the improvements which should be made and as to the course which should be followed.

More important even than the fact that parliament has had no practical means of controlling the C.B.C.'s expenditures or its operations is that it has had no means even of ensuring that the views and recommendations of the committees it has appointed are implemented. In many cases the C.B.C. has paid no attention whatever to the views which have been expressed in these committees and in this chamber itself. A good example of how little attention the C.B.C. pays to the only body to which theoretically it is accountable is the fact that there is no one here in the official gallery from the C.B.C. today paying any attention to the debate which is now taking place; and I doubt whether there is anybody from the C.B.C. in any of the galleries. In other words, what they say is "We don't care what parliament says about us. We don't care what parliament wants. We are going to run our show in the way we want and parliament can go ahead and talk as much as it likes; it will not affect us."

We all have in our possession a very good report on the C.B.C. produced by the Glassco commission—or to give it the full title, the royal commission on government organization—which was issued in January, 1963. In this report on the C.B.C. the Glassco commission made, I think, more serious criticisms of the corporation than of any other crown corporation or department of government. However, remarkably little has been done by the C.B.C. to correct the deficiencies which are pointed out in this report. I should like to quote to some extent from this report in order to indicate those things which the Glassco commission found were wrong with the C.B.C. as a result of its study. In their conclusions on page 49 they have this to say:

> —there can be no doubt but that the corporation is in need of extensive reorganization to secure efficiency and economy in its operations.

But that reorganization has not taken place, although two years will soon have elapsed since the time the report was issued. A little farther on they say:

> —it is apparent that substantial savings can be effected through the application of tried and proven principles governing the devolution of authority and by establishing the accountability of management in its various functions.

These remarks, of course, are particularly applicable to the financial operations of the C.B.C. The Glassco commission also found, as indicated in various places in their report, that the organization of the C.B.C. was not effective either from the point of view of controlling expenditure or controlling programming. With regard to the financial aspect the commission made a number of comments and as found on page 27 of their report stated:

> Each year parliament is asked to vote the funds necessary to bridge the gap between corporate income and outgo. The scrutiny of these budgets is carried out by the staff of the treasury board, the outcome being usually an arbitrary reduction in the operating budget of three or four million dollars.

This is the important part.

> No direction is given the corporation concerning the control of either revenue or expenditure.

In other words, from the financial point of view they in effect do just what they want to do. Treasury board chops off a few million dollars from the proposed expenditures which they submit every year. When we were dealing with this matter in the public accounts committee I said to the president of the C.B.C.: I presume you do what I have reason to believe a considerable number of the departments of the government do; you submit a somewhat higher amount in your estimates than you expect you are going to get because

you figure you will have three or four million dollars cut off. This statement was not denied by him and in my opinion that is undoubtedly the situation.

With regard to the financial affairs of the corporation, the commission went on to criticize the budgeting procedure and on page 47 and following of their report they have a number of things to say about this matter. They state:

—the budgetary procedures reflect an unsound approach. Budgets are based initially on broad estimates by head office, influenced by results of the preceding year, instead of being developed in the operating centres on the basis of firm program schedules. They are then submitted to the treasury board. Only after the total has been approved are target figures issued to the operating units as a basis for the preparation of detailed regional budgets. As a result, the final budgets are based on what it cost last year plus an estimate of additional requirements, with no searching analysis of last year's costs. They possess, therefore, little real value for purposes of planning as effective instruments of control.

In other words, what the C.B.C. does is to take it for granted that it is going to get an increased amount of money for operating purposes from parliament every year. It draws up a budget on that basis with the total being more than it thinks treasury board will allow. It submits a budget in that way and after it receives a lump sum it begins to decide how to divide up the pie. As a result there is no proper budgeting procedure and budgeting control.

Earlier this year, having been disturbed by the very serious criticisms of the C.B.C. in the Glassco commission report, I moved in the public accounts committee that the committee should look into the financial picture of the C.B.C. This was agreed to by the committee and was done. However, we were limited in our investigation to the consideration of the Auditor General's report for the previous year, 1962-63. The committee was not able to deal with programming or even with the present financial picture. While the work done by the committee was in my opinion very useful and disclosed a lot of interesting information, it in no way took the place of a regular broadcasting committee. In order to deal effectively with the C.B.C. from year to year there is no question in my mind that we need a standing committee on broadcasting, and a committee should be set up immediately to go into the affairs of the corporation forthwith. In that regard I would refer to the fifth report of the public accounts committee which dealt with the broadcasting corporation and contains this statement as found on page 962 of the proceedings of the committee:

[Mr. Harkness.]

The committee noted that the Auditor General raised questions concerning contents of report No. 19, volume 4 of the report of the royal commission on government organization—

Then it goes on to refer to this statement by the president of the corporation:

—the president stated that he did not agree with all the recommendations of the royal commission and explained that the royal commission had apparently failed to understand the nature of the problem.

This was the experience we had in the committee. With regard to practically every criticism and question raised about the operations of the corporation the president of the C.B.C. immediately fell back on the stock phrase, "We have a mandate from the Canadian people to provide a broadcasting service", or such statements as "I just do not agree with what the Glassco commission found" or "I do not agree with the criticisms that are being made". Never did we receive any really effective answer to our criticisms and there was an apparent determination on the part of the corporation to carry on in the same way as in the past. It did not matter what the Glassco commission had said or what the committee members said. In their report the public accounts committee went on to say:

The committee recommends that the Secretary of State table an official memorandum in the house presenting the corporation's views and its replies to each of the matters dealt with by the royal commission in its report No. 19, and that this be done before the estimates of the corporation are considered by the house.

I hope very much that the Secretary of State has secured such a memorandum from the president of the C.B.C. and that it will be available to us before the estimates are concluded. If not, we will have but another example of a recommendation of a committee of the house being set aside and no attention being paid to it. I think one of the things that the proceedings of the public accounts committee and their consideration of the C.B.C. did do was to show the need for a full inquiry into the capital expenditures planned by the corporation. It was made clear in the committee that facilities such as studios, offices and so on at Montreal and Toronto, which in the report we were considering were estimated to cost $83 million, were estimated just a short time later to cost $105 million. Some time before that the estimate had been $71 million or $72 million. So it is quite evident that the C.B.C. plans to expend a very large amount of money on

capital investment. Whether this is necessary, whether the amount they are planning to spend is required or half that amount or some other proportion, we had no means of finding out. Before any money is voted to the C.B.C. for its big capital expansion program, this is one of the things which I think should be looked into thoroughly by the broadcasting committee of the house. The exchange which I had with Mr. Ouimet in regard to this matter is found on page 486 of the committee report. It is rather illuminating and is also a good example of the difficulty we will have in getting changes made in C.B.C. procedure. I was asking Mr. Ouimet about this $105 million loan, and then I went on to say:

As far as the money for these two big complexes is concerned, I know this report says, "subject to appropriation by parliament" but I note that in this year's estimates there is provision for a $14 million loan to the corporation for capital expenditures.

Mr. Ouimet: This is for the consolidation requirements and for other projects.

Mr. Harkness: Under the $105 million?

Mr. Ouimet: It is for all our projects. The government has decided that prior to approval by parliament—because it has to go to a vote—it would finance our requirements as loans instead of grants as it has done in the previous years.

Mr. Harkness: How do you propose to pay back these loans?

Mr. Ouimet: We propose to pay back these loans from our income which will in great part be from public funds and in a lesser part from commercial revenue.

Mr. Harkness: In other words, how are you going to pay the interest on the loan?

Mr. Ouimet: The same way.

Mr. Harkness: In other words you are going to get a loan from the dominion government to build these things, then you are going to get a grant from the dominion government with which to pay the interest, and then you are going to get a grant subsequently to pay off the capital.

Then, I said this:

Perhaps then I had better ask Mr. Henderson who, as Auditor General, audits all these accounts, what he thinks of this type of financing which quite frankly I must say, seems to me to be ridiculous—

Then, Mr. Henderson states:

—I thought it to be a rather remarkable exercise in financing.

Mr. Harkness: That is a euphonious way to put it.

This is just one example, Mr. Chairman, of the way in which the C.B.C. goes ahead to spend money, one way or another, without any real control being exercised and without the money even having been voted by parliament for that purpose. There are many other examples which one could cite to indicate the same sort of thing but I will not go into them at this time.

Yesterday during this discussion the hon. member for Halifax said that the responsibility for any errors made by C.B.C. rests with the members of the board of directors. They are the people who should be held responsible and if there are any attacks to be made they are the ones who should be attacked. In fact, the actual control that the board of directors is able to exercise is not very good. The Glassco commission dealt with this matter and made it quite clear that, in their view, the board of directors was able to exercise very little real control. On page 34 of the report we find these remarks in that regard:

The board reviews—

That is the board of the C.B.C.

—and approves most of the activities of the corporation but its role appears to consist largely of ratifying decisions already made—

In other words, it is merely a rubber stamp.

—rather than initiating corporate policy. As presently constituted, the board cannot be expected to act as more than an advisory committee with indeterminate terms of reference and this situation is the indirect cause of much of the criticism of the management of the corporation.

In other words, this is one of the great weaknesses, that the board of directors cannot exercise the control which parliament quite evidently felt it should exercise when the C.B.C. was set up. I think there is no doubt this is one of the things that needs to be done so far as the reorganization of the C.B.C. is concerned, to increase the powers of the board so the board will be in a much better position than it has been in the past to lay down policy and to see that that policy is carried out.

When we come to programs the line of control, even by headquarters of the C.B.C. itself, is fairly general as shown by the Glassco commission. We have this particular matter dealt with at page 37 of the report, and I quote:

If it be accepted that the primary business of the corporation is to produce and broadcast radio and television programs, the most striking feature of the headquarters organization is that fewer than 20 people are directly concerned with programming while over 800 are engaged in ancillary operations. It is therefore difficult to resist the conclusion that the headquarters organization is excessively preoccupied with secondary matters, and that the generally high standard of the national program service is largely attributable to the enterprise and initiative of the network and regional managements.

The present massive Ottawa headquarters results in part from an observation of the 1959 special committee on broadcasting which

recommended that there should be an administrative reorganization, and the restoration of clear authority and responsibility to the central headquarters in Ottawa. Then the report continues:

> Action was accordingly taken by the corporation but there was no substantive reorganization; a whole new level of management was superimposed on the existing organization, but the effective management of broadcasting remained where it had always been—in Montreal and Toronto. The three general managers and the vice president—programming, were appointed with no clear demarcation of their respective areas of responsibility. Meeting together each week as a program council, they attempted to co-ordinate their policies, but have little or no real control over the planning and scheduling of network programs.

In other words, the people in the headquarters of the corporation itself do not know what is going on and have no means of controlling what is going on. I continue to quote from the report:

> In carrying out these changes the corporation failed to give assent to the recommendations made by both the Fowler commission and the 1959 Commons committee that a single executive be given clear authority over the broadcasting function.

Then, the report goes on to speak of this supervisory group of four vice presidents and a comptroller in these terms:

> No recognizable pattern or system is evident in the grouping of functions between these officers—

And farther down:

> One result of the present arrangements is that the ordinary business of corporation management is undertaken by a profusion of committees, which occupy much of the time of the staff at every level of management.

The result of this is that no real control is exercised over general programming so far as the headquarters end of things is concerned. For the most part, it is a waste of time.

A little farther down, the report reads:

> There is no effective central authority over broadcasting, and an overzealous control of secondary activities affords no compensating safeguards, while distracting much of the attention of senior officers from the principal business of the corporation.

This, I think, is perhaps the basic difficulty in the organization of the C.B.C. There is no real control over programming residing in the national headquarters of the corporation. That is delegated to the regional offices and it is doubtful how much control is exercised in them. In the committee we were given two or three examples showing the lack of control any place so far as programming and the money invested in it were concerned. One example was the film "Mr. Pearson."

[Mr. Harkness.]

Another was the Cuban scene film, both of which cost a considerable amount of money. Apparently nobody in authority knew what was being done or exercised control over the expenditure of funds.

We did not get the cost of the "Mr. Pearson" film because it was not made in the period we were dealing with, 1962-3, but the Cuban scene film cost some $40,000 odd, and of course it was not shown. Each year there is quite a list of films and programs known as write-offs. Apparently someone just decides to start making a film or a program, goes ahead and spends a considerable amount of money, and then a decision is made that the end product is not suitable for showing, and the costs are written off. Treasury board authority has to be secured for these write-offs, but in any event the money involved goes down the drain.

These are but a few of the criticisms of the C.B.C. which are to be found in the Glassco commission report. I do not have time to deal with the comments it made on the engineering and architectural staff, on the sales organization and many other matters. But there is another suggestion which it made that I think is of considerable importance. Among the commission's conclusions, as recorded at page 51 of its report, it says:

> No matter how strong or capable a board may be assembled—

This is on the basis that the powers of the board are going to be improved.

> —there will remain a need for policy direction from the government. This can normally be accomplished by informal means but, as a fundamental protection, the minister responsible should have the power of formal direction. Such a plan offers no threat whatever to the integrity of the corporation's program activities, for which the board of directors must assume full responsibility.

This is something which we have been loath to accept as part of the set-up of the C.B.C. because of fear of political interference with its operations, and particularly with its programming, but that is exactly the situation which exists in the United Kingdom so far as the B.B.C. is concerned, and the system appears to work quite well there. I see no reason why it should not work quite well here.

In any event the experience of recent years has indicated the fact that ultimate control of the C.B.C. must reside some place and must be capable of being exercised. It is possible it could be exercised by the means I have suggested, namely a standing committee on broadcasting, with subcommittees dealing

with specific parts of the C.B.C.'s operations, and meeting frequently to deal with them. However, I believe this a case in which the government must take the ultimate responsibility as it does in all other federal government activities. The exemption of the C.B.C. from this responsibility has not been a happy experience and for that reason I urge that we try the system which is used with the B.B.C. in the United Kingdom. This is something which would require much consideration by the broadcasting committee and by the house itself. At least it is something that should be seriously considered.

Statements have been made alleging a desire to interfere with the daily operations, conduct and business of the C.B.C., but I do not believe any one in the chamber has that in mind in any way whatsoever, just as we do not consider that we should interfere with the day to day operations of Polymer—

Mr. Nicholson: Hear, hear.

Mr. Harkness: I note the Postmaster General claps at that. I understand why he does; but to continue, we do not want to interfere with the C.B.C., just as we do not want to interfere with the operations of Eldorado, atomic energy and the numerous other crown corporations. We do not interfere with their day to day activities, but in turn they have somebody to whom they must report and who must accept responsibility for them. In that respect I believe we should have a similar situation covering the C.B.C.

One of the things we require is that the general policy to be followed by the C.B.C. should be laid down by parliament, and methods such as I have suggested should be used to see that the policy laid down is followed. There is no use laying down a policy unless there are means of ensuring that it is implemented. That has been one of the difficulties with the C.B.C. to date because there has been no effective means of doing this.

I know that to lay down a general policy in the field of programming would be difficult, but I do not see any problem in parliament laying down certain general rules which must be followed, for example that no pornographic material be presented and this has been the cause of much of the complaints we have heard during the last ten days. As another example no treasonable, semi or quasi treasonable presentations should be made over the C.B.C. I do not think there would be undue difficulty in ensuring such general rules were applied, without interfering with the freedom of operation which all of us want to see continued for the C.B.C.

However, I do not believe there is a person in this chamber, and I doubt if there are many people in Canada who believe it is just, reasonable and proper that the taxpayers' money be used to give the best platform in the country to those who are attempting to break down the moral and political system under which we live, to people such as Bourgault with his separatist activities, Rockwell with his ideas for exterminating the negroes and jews, and that other fellow whose name I have forgotten, the convicted publisher of a pornographic magazine in the United States who appeared on a C.B.C. program a few months ago. It is doubtful if anybody in Canada thinks it reasonable that people of that sort should be given an opportunity to disseminate their ideas to the great majority of our people.

I know the remarks which I have made will be interpreted by some as an attempt to weaken and destroy the C.B.C. but my intention is just the reverse. I have made them for the same reason as I asked a lot of questions about the C.B.C. in the public accounts committee, namely with the idea of improving the C.B.C.'s operation, making it more effective, making it more truly representative of the people of Canada, and making it capable of performing a greater service for them.

Mr. Mackasey: I listened with considerable interest last night and again today to the discussion revolving around the C.B.C. and its programming. I am sure members of this committee would not deny me the privilege of expressing my opinions on another matter which is of even greater concern to me than are the affairs of the C.B.C. I am referring to the question of national unity in general and to separatism in the province of Quebec in particular.

Recent events in this country, including the visit of Her Majesty to the province of Quebec, have focused the spotlight of public attention on the question of national unity and the growth of separatism as never before in the history of this nation. In discussing this subject it is not my intention to dwell at any length on the alleged brutality of the Quebec city police, other than to say we all deplore the use of violence, particularly in the name of law and order, nor is it my intention to speak of the events which led to the feeling of fear which permeated the city of my birth in the weeks and days preceding the royal visit. I am more interested at the moment in putting forward my views about the growth of separatism in Quebec.

I cannot approach the subject of separatism with the detailed knowledge of a Mason Wade—

The Chairman: It is my duty to interrupt the hon. member at this point in order to remind him that in some way his comments as we consider this resolution on interim supply must be related to government administration. I appreciate that what he has said up to now is introductory in nature, but I urge him to keep in mind that his remarks must be related in some way to one or other of the items of supply covered by this resolution.

Mr. Mackasey: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps by some stretch of the imagination we can consider the maintenance of law and order as being one of the functions of the government. A little later in my remarks I intend to deal briefly with matters concerning the C.B.C. Perhaps the committee would be patient for a while because, being an Irishman, it takes me a little while to get to the point.

As I said a few moments ago, I cannot discuss separatism with the detailed knowledge of a Mason Wade, nor can I lay claim to the title of a political scientist, nor have I majored in Canadian history. I can only discuss separatism and its effect on Quebec and on Canada, from the insight that 43 years of happy existence in Quebec has given me—43 years as part of a minority within a minority; 43 years in which I was never conscious until very recently that perhaps, as an Anglo-Saxon, I was not entirely welcome in the province of my birth.

I have mentioned before in this house, in glowing terms I might add, my feelings of respect and affection for the French Canadians with whom I have been privileged to live for so long. But I would be betraying that friendship and, indeed, insulting these same people if I did not stand here and say there have been many changes in Quebec. These changes, in many cases, are for the better—I have in mind the progress made in the fields of education and economics, for example. But one change I have not relished particularly has been the tendency of many of our political leaders to introduce racism into their political philosophies. Perhaps political instincts are such that it is not exactly wise for an English speaking person living in the province of Quebec to discuss separatism, particularly one who numbers French speaking Canadians among the majority of his electors. Then again, none of us was elected to this house to perpetuate his role as parliamentarian. All of us were elected to speak out on matters of importance affecting the unity of this country. It is in this light that I should like to discuss separatism and somewhere along the line tie these remarks in with the administrative problems of Canada.

There are misguided optimists, Mr. Chairman, who view the fact that bodily harm did not come to the Queen as an indication that separatism is limited to a few misguided youths, badly organized, a group that will disappear of its own volition. There are others who are very pessimistic because of the deplorable events that marked the Queen's visit to Quebec, people who see separatists behind every tree, people who feel that separatism is lurking around the corner, and who in their panic, judge every action, every word of the French speaking Canadian leaders with suspicion and mistrust. The truth, of course, Mr. Chairman, is that the separatist problem is much more serious than these optimists realize, but not nearly as insoluble as the prophets of doom would have us believe.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is in our best interests to analyse the make up of this movement, for only in understanding the motivation behind its leaders and its members will we be able to suggest the required solutions or decide upon a course of action. Perhaps the one fact that English speaking Canada does not understand, Mr. Chairman, is that the hard core of the separatist movement does contain many sincere people who fully believe in the separatist cause. Never mind whether they are misguided, according to our beliefs; what is more important is to realize that these people do not espouse violence. They do not necessarily hate the English. They simply believe that a new state of Quebec, independent of the rest of Canada, is the best solution for the frustrations and nationalistic feelings of many of their followers. They believe that a separate state will lead to unlimited opportunities for the expansion of their culture, to unlimited job opportunities, to a type of Utopia that seems very rational for those who are blinded by their devotion to a cause. But we must bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that these people, misguided as they may be, are entitled to their opinion, entitled to their movement, precisely in the same way as we provide freedom of expression for those who espouse liberalism, conservatism, socialism or even communism.

But unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, this hard core of idealists has attracted, as indeed all such movements do attract, a lunatic fringe. These misfits are made up of neurotics, of people who would be failures in any society, including, I might add, a new state of Quebec, if the movement were successful. They include those who revel in the false security of publicity, who delight in the prominence that their acts of violence provides them. They see in the separatist movement, not an ideal, not a dream, but rather a means to a degree of personal recognition which normally would be denied them because of their insignificant contribution to Quebec society.

The movement is made even more dangerous by the very fact that it has invaded our universities, that our young people, at the very moment that they are being introduced to the philosophies of great men, of Locke, and Montesquieu, of Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas, are being exposed to morbid separatist tendencies. At the very time when we look to the new emphasis on education in Quebec, to produce the leaders of the future, our young men and young women are being filled with the inward-looking theories of pseudo-intellectuals, who by their message of hatred and misunderstanding are prostituting their role as educators, are poisoning whole generations of young French speaking Canadians. And finally, Mr. Chairman, add to this collection those political leaders, those leaders in the field of communications, of radio, of television, those in the journalistic world, who take advantage of the movement to bolster sagging reputations, to gain some shortsighted political advantage, to seek the power that to too many politicians is the prime goal of their very existence.

Perhaps I sound like the pessimists to whom I referred earlier in my remarks. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that I felt precisely that way several months ago; I felt, then, that the apathy of Canadians outside this house to the question of separatism would in the end permit its growth to a point of no return. To generalize is very dangerous, but surely the efforts of some of our daily newspapers from outside Quebec have provided the very publicity upon which the lunatic fringe breeds. Not too long ago, Mr. Chairman, I bought a daily newspaper published in Ontario. Three quarters of the front page was devoted to an exclusive interview with a separatist who predicted violence to the Queen. He spoke of the movement of arms and all the elaborate preparations that were being made for the Queen's visit. Little wonder that a feeling of apprehension and fear spread out from Canada. But it was only on analysing that article very carefully that one was capable of noting that the so-called exclusive interview took place at two o'clock in the morning in a second-rate, east end Montreal night club, with some young punk, surrounded by his idiot friends, probably well reinforced with liquor. This was the person responsible for making disgusting utterances of violence to the Queen. This type of statement and the article did much to create the atmosphere of tension and fear that permeated Quebec city.

I cannot understand why the leaders of the C.B.C. and the leaders in the journalistic world insist, under the guise of reporting the news, upon providing the type of public exposure which the lunatic fringe in the separatist movement must have for survival. Why cannot the C.B.C. and, for that matter, other means of communication, declare a moratorium on the idiotic utterances of those who revel in the turmoil that their ridiculous statements obviously arouse in this country? One thing that must be emphasized is this. Fully 80 per cent or 85 per cent of the French speaking people of my province have so far rejected the separatist movement; have shown by their aloofness the high degree of responsibility and integrity for which the French speaking peoples of Quebec are justly famous.

Ten months ago, Mr. Chairman, I thought we would lose the battle, by default, for these people's minds. I realized, as no doubt many hon. members have realized, that the separatist movement had so far been confined to certain intellectuals, to young students, and to what I have already referred to as the lunatic fringe. I realized that the very acts of violence that were the responsibility of this lunatic fringe were in fact offsetting amongst the uncommitted the admitted emotional appeal of nationalism. Perhaps the extremist wing of the separatist movement did not realize, or perhaps did not care, that their acts of violence, their intemperate statements, were only impeding the message of the sincere, if misguided, nucleus who really believe in their movement and who hope to achieve it by democratic means.

In that period when I worried about this battle, Mr. Chairman, I longed for one intellectual—just one—from my province to stand up and tell those who advocated separatism that they have no right to confiscate the undeniable stake which French speaking

Canadians have in this nation; that these separatists could not turn back the passage of time or obliterate history by physical violence, to remind us of the Plains of Abraham. We can thank the Lord, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot obliterate history; for what a tremendous price French Canada would be called upon to pay. Because the history of Canada, particularly in its early years, is dominated by the contribution of French Canadians, not only Cartier and Champlain, not only Frontenac and Maisonneuve, but also the efforts of those explorers who pushed on and discovered lands well beyond their own province, and indeed in the part of North America that is now known as the United States.

Do these separatists feel they have the right to wipe the slate clean of the contribution of men like Cartier and Laurier, of Lapointe and St. Laurent? Can these separatists really believe that French Canadians who died or fought in the two great wars have no stake in this country? Can they not realize that this nation is as much theirs as it is mine; that Quebeckers are just as important to Canada as are the citizens of Ontario or British Columbia? Can these misguided people ignore the dignified and wonderful performance of our Governor General both in peace and in war? Have the extremists the right to obliterate the contributions of Triquet and Brilland and Thibault? Surely, Mr. Chairman, the right of French speaking Canadians to their proper place in the nation's affairs must be clear not only to those separatists but also to those all too numerous persons who refuse to accept fully the French fact across Canada.

I had hoped for one voice or more to express these views; for one politician to talk back, to explode the myths of Anglo-Saxon domination in Quebec, to lay the blame for some of Quebec's lack of economic growth squarely on the shoulders of the inward-looking policies of Mr. Duplessis. But the pendulum of separatism seemed to stop and the voices of reason did seem to speak back. On May 14 seven French Canadian intellectuals of international repute published what is known as a Canadian manifesto. It is significant that they called it a Canadian manifesto and not a Quebec manifesto. They published this historical document in a magazine known as *Cité Libre*, a magazine that led the way in Quebec for the emergence of freedom of thought and freedom of expression that was denied the intellectuals of Quebec by Mr. Duplessis. This document exposed separatism for what it is, an escape from reality, a move that would do nothing for French Canada but would relegate it from a strong, respected voice in Canada to a voice drowned out by the sheer numbers of a completely English speaking continent.

The question of separatism must be faced, and faced immediately. Those intellectuals of Quebec who espouse separatism must be challenged by those intellectuals of Quebec who espouse federalism. Our politicians must speak up; our students must be exposed to the fallacy of the separatist movement.

Several people in this house, Mr. Chairman, are doing precisely that. The Secretary of State's speeches six months or a year ago were treated with scorn in my province. Today they are being reviewed and reviewed again by those who are seeking ways out of our problems. The assistant to the Minister of Trade and Commerce has shown willingness to do verbal battle in Quebec on the question of separatism. The hon. member for Three Rivers has obviously been making a contribution, as recent events testify. The views of moderation expressed by the hon. member for Villeneuve a few weeks ago did much to reassure the people of this country of the sincerity, maturity and integrity of our Quebec politicians. Recent articles in *Le Devoir*, *Le Droit*, *Le Soleil* and *L'Action* all indicate that those who believe in federalism have many strong and vigorous allies in Quebec, allies who could mean the difference between a nation united and reaching out toward its great destiny or a nation so divided by petty quarrels that it must pale into insignificance and eventually disappear.

While I rejoice at the appearance of cracks in the armour of separatism I cannot but wonder what will happen when the separatist movement virtually disappears, as it will, by the efforts of the French speaking Quebeckers who once again will show the realism that has marked their fight for survival as a cultural group. What will happen, Mr. Chairman, to the separatists outside Quebec when our French speaking Canadians turn once again to Ottawa; when they express a desire once again to participate in the nation's business? Will the doors be closed to them in industry outside Quebec? Will they be expected to forget their own language and every day affairs? Can they look for some relief from the oppressive legislation which in many provinces denies them the rights to which they are entitled under the British North America Act? I refer to rights in the field of education, and education in their own language; rights which

I have always enjoyed as an Anglo-Saxon in the province of Quebec.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the appearance of Rockwell on the C.B.C. was not such a bad thing after all, for it emphasized in a vivid, incisive manner that we have no room in this country for hatred and racism. This obviously sick individual showed us the results of racism and provided us with some food for thought in this country of ours.

Those political leaders in Canada who introduce racism in their arguments—and make no mistake there are many—are either intentionally or unintentionally creating an atmosphere which leads to the type of hatred personified by Rockwell. What is the difference between Rockwell's contempt for the negro and those misguided Canadians who contemptuously tell French speaking people to speak the white man's language? What is the difference between Rockwell's evil, disgusting remarks concerning those of the Jewish faith and the utterances of those who condemn the French speaking people because of their religious beliefs? On that latter point, let me say that I have in my possession many articles on this very subject which have been written in well accepted magazines which are circulated in this country.

Let me say this: Our country will stand out like a jewel among nations by reason of our two cultures. They are cultures which do not detract from each other but which, by their contrast, emphasize the greatness of each. This is the dream we should all be striving for, the good life so ably outlined in the Canadian manifesto, required reading, I suggest, for all of us who are vitally concerned with national unity.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I say that I am sure of the disappearance of the French speaking separatist. Can anyone in this house guarantee me the disappearance of the English speaking separatist?

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I should like to begin by congratulating the hon. member for Verdun on his wise, reasoned, reasonable, very sound and very eloquent remarks which he has addressed to a profoundly important subject. In the manner of his delivery he demonstrated that he is indeed gifted, as are most Irish folk, with great felicity of phrase and it was a pleasure to hear him. I remember his leader, the Prime Minister, saying some months ago, when the hon. member for Three Rivers spoke eloquently in French on a similar subject, that the voice of moderation and reason must be heard in this house and in this country both in English and in French. I think today, Mr. Chairman, we have heard in English a most sound and valuable discourse on the subject to which we all must give our very best not only of attention but of effort.

If I were not a Scotsman, Mr. Chairman, I would probably carry on with the subject raised by the hon. member, who said he took a long time to get started. But being a Scot I am stubborn and I think I will continue with the subject I had in my mind before the hon. member made his speech. The question of the C.B.C., as with questions concerning all our crown corporations, is an extremely difficult one. On Friday the hon. member for Port Arthur discussed the question of control in connection with the railway. The hon. member for Calgary North in his very wise and valuable speech dealt with the same subject and the relationship between parliament and crown corporations. I know it is very easy for the Secretary of State or the Minister of National Revenue, almost as a conditioned response, to say they will transmit so and so's views to the management of the C.B.C. This has been the practice for a long time. Yet as representatives of the public we cannot divorce ourselves from our concern for this tremendously important medium.

In a very valuable document, the Massey royal commission on arts, letters and sciences, I find in the section dealing with broadcasting at page 276 of the report a most interesting elucidation of this very question.

> The state, having the right and the duty of issuing licences, must impose certain conditions on radio broadcasting. There are, it seems to us, two alternative views between which every country must choose. First, radio may be regarded primarily as a means of entertainment, a by-product of the advertising business. Such a view does not imply that it may not be used for education, for enlightenment and for the cultivation of taste; all these bring entertainment to many people. On the other hand, radio, as one of the most powerful means of education, may be regarded as a social influence too potent and too perilous to be ignored by the state which, in modern times, increasingly has assumed responsibility for the welfare of its citizens.

This welfare, of course, extends beyond the provision of food, clothing and shelter.

I am not going to join in any vendetta against the C.B.C. It is not my purpose in the few minutes allowed me to put that institution in the dock and fire verbal arrows at it. I would not want this country without the C.B.C. It is one of the things I miss most when I happen to be abroad. Nor would it be useful to me to indulge in discussing my tastes and preferences as to what should be heard over the C.B.C. or aired over C.B.C.

television. The old Latin expression, *de gustibus non est disputandum*, applies or, as they say in French, chacun à son goût. I suppose I have just demonstrated to you, Mr. Chairman, that I am a little worse in French than I am in Latin. But there is no accounting for human tastes, and we could all discuss at great length that which we like and that which we do not like.

What I am concerned about is that we seem to be in one of those phases where there is a widespread feeling of concern and anxiety about the C.B.C. among the public. This is not just something that has sprung up because of a program last Sunday night. We find all sorts of people and organizations taking aim at this time at the C.B.C. and it is not enough to reply that they are independent in management and independent in administration and so on.

I know it is a dangerous course to come even close to suggesting that points of view, however unpleasant, should be muffled, that some sort of censor should be appointed, because the question then is: How do you trust the censor and whom do you trust to become censor? Yet there is a very definite reason for people today asking, as hon. members have asked this afternoon, why we hear so often, so frequently, from the fanatics, the extremists, the oddballs.

We must be realistic and admit that sensationalism is seemingly the most valuable ingredient of reportorial journalism. There have been a lot of good speeches made today, a lot of good speeches were made yesterday and there will be a lot of good speeches made tomorrow, but the people of Canada will not hear too much about them. As a member of the house once said, if he made a good speech it might be reported on page 17 of some newspaper but if he stood on his head it would be flashed on the front page. This session has been so long, and even a young man like myself is so tired, that I would not dare try to do that because if I ever got inverted I might not get converted. But this is a fact that we must face.

It is unfortunate that there seems to be such a plethora of the off-colour, of the fantastic, of the "way-out". I thought today, as the Secretary of State was announcing the names of the members of his commission on election expenses, and a very illustrious group of names they were, of how much it would cost any of us as candidates to get the prime time that the leader of the American nazi party got over C.B.C. television.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

I would hope I will always be able to admit the need, indeed the desirability of airing stimulating ideas, even if they are disturbing to me and unpopular to the majority. In a country like ours we require a free market of ideas but in that market let there be some ample stalls for the stable and even the staid elements of our society. Let us hear more often the voices of those who cherish our contemporary political and social institutions. Let us give the platform more often to those who desire not to tear down but to shore up the bulwarks of the society to which we belong.

It is difficult to avoid the impression that mere appearance on a publicly owned television or radio network lends some status, sanction or authority to the views that are aired through those facilities. This of course is wrong, and if we have a moment to apply our rational processes we know it is wrong. In connection with the seemingly famous program of last Sunday night I commend the C.B.C. for their efforts to set the stage for that dreadful racist from the United States and to disavow in advance his evil utterances. However, while I have a high regard for the credibility of people I am afraid that not all viewers and listeners got the full import of the C.B.C.'s very proper disavowal and disengagement.

We only have to remember what happened a few years ago when Orson Welles' famous program, "The War of the Worlds", was aired over radio in the United States. Although not once but thrice it was clearly laid out that this was fantasy, that this was a drama, that it was not true, hundreds of people ran outside their homes fearful that missiles from outer space were going to crash upon them. This is one of the facts we must face.

Since we seem anxious to talk about this program—I might say this was the first time I had seen it—I think that while it is perhaps not a large matter the C.B.C. did commit an impropriety or an act of unneighbourliness in releasing a political film prepared for viewers in the United States which the leaders of the party in the United States who ordered the production of the film decided should not be seen. Our own Canada Elections Act, for instance, would prohibit any of us from using United States television facilities to beam in a program upon the voters in our own area. With a little careful thought I feel that the corporation would not have undertaken this sort of thing.

What do we do? Do we put the C.B.C. into shackles? Do we put it into receivership? Do we make it an agency of some government department? Do we put it under a minister? I say no, no, a thousand times no. As much as I think of the Secretary of State I would not think it would be a proper move to put the C.B.C. under his wing or under the wing of any minister of any government, because this is the very kind of control that we do not want and must not have in a free democracy. You cannot have a government controlling the media with the media becoming an emanation of any particular set of thoughts. We do not want thought control. Yet the canons of good taste, good judgment and administrative economy must remain operative. They must emanate from somewhere. They must be directed by someone.

Like the hon. member for Calgary North I am concerned about the apparent insensitivity of the C.B.C. president and management to the views of the public. No one would suggest that the C.B.C. must run for shelter at every expression of public opinion and that it try to prejudge popular reaction and go always to the side of the majority. If the C.B.C. had done this through the years, and had not done that which was unpopular and unprofitable we would have much poorer radio and television fare in this country today. I will never join those who would destroy the C.B.C. or who would turn the whole thing over to private enterprise. I have lived in lands where all radio and television were in the beneficent hands of private businessmen and more than ever I thought that the C.B.C. was a pretty good thing. I do not think I am being un-Conservative in this regard because I recall the whole thing began in the days of a very great Canadian prime minister, R. B. Bennett.

Mr. Macaluso: You would never know it now.

Mr. Macquarrie: Well, perhaps it is not as good as it was in the days of R. B. Bennett, but I do not have the time to go into value judgments of that kind. As we know the legislation certainly envisaged, as did that great prime minister, that it would be a vehicle for national education, for national unity. In this field it has grown to play an essential and valuable part in Canadian life. It is for this reason I am concerned and why I am taking a few minutes to enter this discussion.

The C.B.C. is such a valuable part of our life, so important to all of us in these days when there is such a plethora of idea coming in upon men's minds. It is extremely important that the C.B.C. not endanger its effectiveness or diminish its usefulness in the country. I am fearful that it might lose its effectiveness, both potentially and actually, if it goes too far in its disregard for the deep-seated anxieties of many Canadians. I was impressed by the group of women's organizations read out by the hon. member for Medicine Hat yesterday. This is not a group of narrow-minded Mrs. Grundys looking for notoriety. These are respectable, reputable and highly intelligent people. I share, in sorrow and in sympathy, the closing sentence in this article:

> How did the usually circumspect C.B.C. manage to alienate so many of those who should be its friends and supporters?

The C.B.C. does not have to win a popularity contest, but it cannot find itself in a position where the great bulk of Canadian people look upon it with distrust, suspicion and indeed with hostility. I believe that at this stage in its operation, and it is an important phase for it, the C.B.C. would benefit and Canada would benefit greatly from the establishment of such a committee as has been suggested by many hon. members. There are many known areas for administrative improvement. It is quite possible that many more would come to light. There are many suggestions which could be made. It is often alleged that there is a little too much centralization of thought in the C.B.C. We have very valuable public affairs programs with informed opinion from here and there. I do not belong to that great group of Canadians who believe that "hate Toronto" is a valuable motto. However, I do not see why so many of the informed people and ideas must emanate from Toronto. There are in other parts of the country people with ideas on contemporary problems from whom I should like to hear from time to time. In recent years I am happy that we have heard a great deal from informed, intelligent commentators in the province of Quebec whose major language is French. I hope that equal opportunity is given listeners on the French network to hear from the same type of people in the English speaking sector of our society.

There are things which we should look into. I was shocked yesterday to hear that a member of the Quebec cabinet suggested the C.B.C. was suffering from communist infiltration. The television reporters for the C.B.C. French network, I understand, have protested the statement by Hon. Bona Arsenault that the network was the scene of left wing

communist infiltration. I feel that this is a very serious allegation. I hope it is not true. Until I am convinced otherwise, I believe it is not true. This is another proper field for a sane, calm, cool investigation, followed by suggestions from a parliamentary committee. I would urge the setting up of such a committee. No one wants an outbreak of anxiety, reaching crisis proportions, about the C.B.C. We do not want this to become yet another trouble in the country which is allowed to develop into massive proportions. Then, to be followed by serious adjustments and retreats. Let us deal with it now. There has been a widespread expression of opinion, so let a move be taken and have the matter looked at by a committee.

It will not help Canada, it will not help any of us, if the C.B.C. is degraded and its effectiveness diminished. Let us move now. I join in support of those who have suggested the efficacy of a committee, not a witch hunting committee but a committee which will seek ways of improving the effectiveness of the C.B.C. or, to use a favourite expression, improving the image of the C.B.C., which is so valuable to all of us. None of us wants to see it reach a point where it is going to lose its great value in our society.

Mr. Prittie: Mr. Chairman, I would have been quite happy to leave any remarks I had to make about the C.B.C. until the estimates of that department were before us. Apparently, however, we are going to have interim supply for some time, the subject is up for discussion, so I am getting in at this particular point. I want to make my remarks about the general criticisms which have been made, and then later I have some particular remarks concerning the selection of the C.B.C. site in Vancouver.

The hon. member for Calgary North, speaking earlier, referred to the relationship of the British Broadcasting Corporation and the British parliament. He thought that was a good type of relationship and perhaps one that we should have here. I quite agree. I would remind hon. members that in the United Kingdom parliament, members are not up every day during the question period sniping away at the B.B.C. or asking questions about the programs. There is a properly established committee which periodically reviews the complete operations of the British Broadcasting Corporation and I believe also of the independent television networks which have been set up in recent years. It seems to me that much of the discussion which we have had here in the last few months has been out of order. It would have been much better to have discussed these matters at the time the estimates were before us. We will have a further opportunity when the committee, headed by Mr. Fowler, reports in a few months time. His committee is making a very thorough investigation of the broadcasting industry. I imagine this report will be the subject of intensive study by parliament itself and by a parliamentary committee.

There are many aspects of the C.B.C. operation, Mr. Chairman, which properly should concern members of parliament. They should be concerned about the operational budget of the corporation and about the building budget. We have heard a great deal about the sum of money that is being spent on buildings in Toronto and Montreal. Perhaps this is too much. We should be concerned, I think, about the lack of decentralization of the operations of the C.B.C. and the tremendous concentrations in Toronto and Montreal. All of these things should be of concern at the proper time.

One thing we should not be concerned about, as was stated by some hon. members yesterday, notably the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan), is the daily programming of the corporation. To show how ridiculous we might get I want to read briefly from an editorial which appeared in the Peterborough *Examiner* last spring at the time of the "Open Grave" controversy.

> We can imagine what would happen if the C.B.C. was directly responsible to parliament, instead of through its president and a minister of the crown. The Commons would hardly have time for any other business, so eager are its members to be broadcasting experts. The result might well be live programs from the Commons itself: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of our television audience, I am the Conservative member from Brassneck and the Islands and am about to give the government a severe drubbing..." What fun the public could have switching channels and corrupting itself with American programs while this was going on!

The type of activity that is being carried on in this chamber concerning programming was well described last April in the television column of the *Globe and Mail* written by Dennis Braithwaite in which he said:

> A case could be made for a full investigation of broadcasting (its public and private segments and the B.B.G.—not just the C.B.C.) and the corporation itself has asked for such an inquiry. What is not needed is another witch hunt in which the C.B.C. is asked to account for every hell and damn spoken by its actors, every unpopular or even scandalous opinion expressed by its commentators and every inch of leg shown by its dancers.

Most of all, let's not have a big hullabaloo about bringing the C.B.C. under the control of parliament. It must be made clear somehow, to backbenchers and to crusaders like Mr. Hogan that the C.B.C., although responsible to parliament in the ultimate sense, has always been and must continue to be entirely free to run its business under its mandate.

I agree that there is some clarification needed concerning its mandate. Perhaps something along the lines of the B.B.C. is what we need, but I am quite prepared to wait until the Fowler committee makes its report before dealing with that theory.

I was quite disturbed yesterday by some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Northwest Territories. He named a number of programs which appeared in the "Quest" and "Festival" series, and used such terms as "filth," "homosexuality" and "pornography." In fact he used these terms fairly frequently. I do not know what kind of authority the hon. member is on filth, pornography, homosexuality and other subjects. I do not know who is an authority on these matters. However I suggest that the average member of parliament is probably not a very good drama critic, and I further suggest not many programs that appear on the C.B.C. deal with these controversial subjects.

I do not think anyone would dispute the fact that the broadcasting medium from time to time ought to deal with controversial subjects.

Mr. Winkler: Would the hon. member permit a question? Did the hon. member for Northwest Territories not quote these expressions from a newspaper report dealing with a ladies organization which was raising objections? I believe that is the case.

Mr. Prittie: The hon. member for Northwest Territories did quote that as put forth by the ladies organization, but he used his own terms during the course of his speech.

My point is that most of the time on the C.B.C. television network is taken up with pretty standard broadcasting fare, and there is very little in this controversial field. Most of it comes up in drama broadcasts, but I submit that throughout the ages dramatists have brought in controversial material in order both to entertain and make the public think. Shakespeare did it, and any dramatist worthy of the name has done the same thing. There is not much real controversial drama presented on radio and television and I do not believe we should complain about the small amount that is broadcast.

I have with me a copy of the *C.B.C. Times* for the week October 31-November 6, and I suggest it would be a good idea to look at the programs on the English language television network for several nights between the hours of seven thirty and eleven o'clock. On Saturday October 31 at 7.30 the program is "The Saint". At 8.30 there is "Hockey Night in Canada," 10.15 "Juliette," and at 10.45 "The Quebec Scene."

On Sunday night at seven o'clock there is the "Patty Duke Show," 7.30 "Flashback," eight o'clock "The Ed Sullivan Show," nine o'clock "Bonanza" and at ten "This Hour has Seven Days."

On Monday, November 2 at 7.30, there is "Don Messer's Jubilee," eight "Show of the Week," nine "Dangerman," and at ten "Other Voices," which is a sort of public affairs broadcast. As will be seen most of these are purely entertainment.

Tuesday, November 3, is not a very good evening because it is the night of the U.S. election, but the "Jack Benny show" is to be broadcast before the election results.

On Wednesday, November 4, at 7.30 there is to be "Provincial Affairs (tonight: the Liberal party)". I do not know what category this comes under, whether entertainment, information or drama. Then at 7.45 there is "Mr. Fix-it," eight "Red River Jamboree," 8.30 "Perry Mason," and at 9.30 a documentary on China called "The 700 Million." Again on this evening that is the only program of anything other than an entertaining value, including the one at 7.30.

These are fairly typical of evening programs on the English language television network, and I submit very little of the time is taken up with the kind of program that tends to be controversial, drama programs such as in "Quest" and "Festival." We should continue to have that type of program, and if people are shocked now and then, what of it? You cannot please all the people all the time.

One person who is apparently quite highly regarded by our television audiences is Mr. Lorne Greene, the star of the program "Bonanza." Years ago he lived in this country and got his start on the C.B.C. When he visited Montreal earlier this year he was interviewed, and I quote from the Montreal *Star* of March 31 last:

Lorne Greene looked back proudly yesterday on his alma mater, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and spoke of its courage in maintaining its programming independence, as in the case of the controversial "Open Grave" program last week. Then, referring to U.S. television, which has made

him one of its stars, he said "this kind of courage is also becoming more frequent on the American networks, as we can see in such explosive programs as those on integration and other social and political conditions."

We have this type of exploratory, controversial program which arouses people and causes them to think. Mr. Greene suggests the Americans are now beginning to adopt the same idea, and I suggest this is something of which we should be proud.

Another Canadian actor who spends some of his time in the U.S., Mr. Lloyd Bochner, had this to say, and I quote from the *Globe and Mail* of March 13 last, at a time when he was back in Canada to do a program for the "Festival" series:

Few things they're doing in the United States can compare with the aspirations and standards of the Canadian t.v. scene these days. This role I'm doing now, for instance, is one of the toughest I can remember.

Mr. Bochner appears in many U.S. t.v. shows but they are usually of a very standard variety and he felt the "Festival" show was a challenge for him to develop a new acting role on the C.B.C.

My contention, Mr. Chairman, is that the amount of criticism we hear is not justified. Since yesterday's debate I conducted my own private poll among members of parliament. In fact I would like to know how much criticism is being directed to members from the public. I represent a constituency in the lower mainland of British Columbia. It is a riding which contains approximately 35,000 households, and since January 1, 1964 I have had one complaint about the C.B.C. Someone complained that a wrestling show on Saturday afternoon was cancelled. I checked with two other members from the lower mainland or greater Vancouver area, and neither had received complaints. I checked with three members from the Toronto area, the second most populous area in the country, and one admitted to having one complaint. I also checked with three members from the Montreal area and one of them admitted to having one complaint. I suggest that the widespread public criticism which is supposed to exist does not in fact exist and that members of parliament are not hearing from the Canadian people in any large numbers about the quality of the programs.

For my part I believe there is one other criticism which should be made in the field of telecasting in Canada. This is a subject to which I believe the Fowler committee could well direct its attention. I refer to the difference between some of the promises made by certain private telecasters when they were applying for licences from the board of broadcast governors and their performance subsequently. In the October issue of the ACTRA Newsmagazine, the publication of the association of Canadian television and radio artists, appears the proceedings at the hearing of the board of broadcast governors when Mr. Bushnell was making an application for a television licence for CJOH-TV here in Ottawa. We are given a verbatim report of what he promised, side by side with comments upon what has been done. There were great promises made concerning the amount of money which would be spent on Canadian talent and Canadian shows. These promises have simply not materialized. In fact, ACTRA says, since the station began broadcasting in 1961, members of the association have earned $180 for performing. Nevertheless, thousands of dollars were promised for Canadian talent. As I say, I believe this subject is worthy of investigation, bearing in mind the fact that the C.B.C. does spend very large sums of money providing a living for entertainers and artists of many kinds and making it possible for them to work full time in their occupations, supplementing their income from other sources. Without work for the C.B.C. it would not be possible for them to do this.

Mr. Moreau: If you got Doug Fisher in the organization it would probably cost more than it does now.

Mr. Prittie: Well, he is quite a performer.

Mention has been made of the controversial program in the series "This Hour has Seven Days". I saw the second half of the program during which the American nazi Rockwell was interviewed. The hon. member for Cartier took strong exception to this broadcast and I realize his feelings on this subject may well be different from mine. I did not have the impression, as he apparently did, that it was simply sensationalism. The hon. member mentioned the fact that Rockwell stated there were about 100 members of his group in Canada. But I suggest that anti-Semitism does exist in this country, latently in some cases and openly in others, and that this is a proper subject for inquiry. There are other Americans with whom I do not agree, people for whom in fact I have no liking. But I would not object to their being interviewed on Canadian television. Most Canadians are interested in the United States political scene. There is one group known as the Black Muslims who do not like the white race generally. It could

well be that members of this organization would be interviewed in the United States even if they were not allowed to cross the border into Canada.

I think the interviewers on this particular program did a good job of exposing this man. I can understand there are people who feel very sensitive about this and I realize their reactions could be very different from my own. But I do think this is the type of controversial, searching program the production needs and I imagine that if the producers do their work properly there will be a great many more complaints and a great deal more controversy in the future.

There is another aspect of this whole question of the continual sniping at C.B.C. programs, and this disturbs me. Even if the minister responsible does not actively interfere with programming—and he should not do so; indeed, I do not think he will—and even if the board of broadcast governors does not move against the corporation, I fear there will be a tendency on the part of management itself to listen to the large number of criticisms which have been made here and to begin to exercise some self-censorship. I know this is what the critics want, but I believe the corporation would be much the poorer if it were to take action along this line.

I wish now to deal with a matter of more local interest relating to the C.B.C. I am glad to see that the Postmaster General who himself comes from the city of Vancouver is present in the house because this has to do particularly with the C.B.C. in Vancouver. As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, there has been a controversy during the past few months between the Vancouver city council on the one hand and the corporation and the federal government on the other. The R.C.A.F. has given up certain facilities at Kitsilano park, Vancouver, and the parks board would like the whole site to revert completely to parkland. The C.B.C. wanted to take a small part of that site as a location for its studios during the next few years. At the present time the C.B.C. studios in Vancouver are scattered all over the downtown area. Radio facilities are in one place, in the hotel Vancouver—apparently they have to leave these premises—while the television studio, located in a former garage, is an absolute disgrace. It is amazing to me they can turn out good productions with such a poor physical plant. Since the opportunity arose for the corporation to go to the Kitsilano site there has been a long discussion among the city council, the parks board, the federal authorities and the C.B.C. concerning this move. The latest proposal is that the C.B.C. should go to downtown Vancouver. The city council is presenting a proposal for the redevelopment of the downtown area and it wants federal assistance to buy land, clear the land and redevelop it. The council wants the C.B.C. to spend a considerable amount of money putting up a fine headquarters in downtown Vancouver. I think I have the solution to this problem, Mr. Chairman, and I hope the Postmaster General will listen carefully.

In July the reeve of Burnaby sent a wire to the C.B.C. with the authority of the council to the effect that land would be available to the corporation at a nominal cost—I presume that means $1 a year—if the corporation would locate its British Columbia headquarters in Burnaby. The officers of the corporation have not, to my knowledge, gone into this subject thoroughly. Nevertheless I think the offer should be taken seriously. If a site in Burnaby were decided upon, the Kitsilano site would be entirely available for parkland and I presume the Vancouver parks board would be happy. There is some merit, possibly, in the corporation locating in downtown Vancouver, but it seems to me such a move would cost a great deal of money and, of course, one of the main criticisms we hear in this house is directed toward the amount of money the C.B.C. spends. The Burnaby site is one which is very close to the freeway from Vancouver to New Westminster. It is only a few minutes from downtown Vancouver and there are two other arterial highways close by. I might add that an important private television station is located in Burnaby somewhat further out than the proposed site for the C.B.C. This is a central location, geographically, in the population complex on the lower mainland. I suggest that the corporation could save a great deal of money and at the same time have all the space they want. I would urge particularly that this suggestion be considered seriously and not rejected out of hand, because it will cost the corporation and the government a great deal more to locate in the city of Vancouver and, as I said, they could have much more space at much less cost in this very central area of Burnaby.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, while the various parties are, on the one hand, criticizing the C.B.C. and, on the other, national unity, I think I shall mainly deal with the

farm question on the discussion of these estimates for a total of $740,710,974.

Very important things have been said about the C.B.C. and the national unity but, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that neither the problems of the C.B.C. nor those concerning national unity can be settled at this stage of the discussion.

Errors have been made, of course, within the C.B.C. Some provincial representatives, at least in one province, have charged that the C.B.C. was infested by socialists. There are no doubt crypto-socialists and even crypto-communists within the C.B.C., but to conclude that the whole administration is so infested is going a little bit too far. In the case of the C.B.C., I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the officials of that crown corporation, which is costing the Canadian people between $75 and $80 million in deficit a year, should be invited to appear before a standing or other committee of the House of Commons. As stated yesterday by my colleague from Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), every year officials or the president of the C.N.R., officials or the president of Air Canada do appear before a committee, but the C.B.C. does not, although this corporation is probably costing the Canadian taxpayers more money than any other crown corporation.

Mr. Choquette: They go before the public accounts committee.

Mr. Caouette: They do, but we cannot question them.

So, Mr. Chairman, the C.B.C. controls television and radio broadcasting in Canada. For instance, some private stations are affiliated with the C.B.C. respecting certain programs during certain hours of the day. Last week I realized that in my district station CKRN-TV, which is affiliated with C.B.C., could no longer grant us the period of time which we had enjoyed over the last ten years, that is, between 7 and 8 p.m., during a 15 minute period, because the C.B.C. has taken over all of this period; it had decided to take over the whole time from eight o'clock until the end of the evening.

In my opinion, more latitude should be granted private stations, especially when authorization is asked from the C.B.C. to change the time of the programs and broadcast them another day of the week; but the C.B.C. refuses this request, and it is difficult for us to obtain a broadcast period through the fault of the C.B.C. I think this is a lack and an injustice toward private enterprise, toward the freedom of these individuals or organizations that require time over television.

The C.B.C. should consider those requests and those requirements from organizations and other sources. That is the only point I wanted to make this afternoon concerning the C.B.C.

At the beginning of the afternoon, the hon. member for Lapointe mentioned the economic depression which prevails not only in one part of the country, but in several districts, especially those which we call underdeveloped regions. Instead of calling them underdeveloped regions, I would call them undeveloped regions which offer all kinds of possibilities for agricultural and industrial development.

We have reasons to be annoyed when we ask for expenditures by the government, when we ask the government to take a definite stand or when we suggest it should have more modern and more efficient directors to restore our Canadian economy and when we hear members, as I heard one this afternoon, call the hon. member for Lapointe a demagogue because the latter said that it was possible, through the Bank of Canada—without our knowing the amount or the rate of interest—to make loans with a view to stabilizing the pound sterling.

Mind you, Mr. Chairman, we are not against that if it can help the Bank of England or the British people. We have no objection to that but we do object to the government's refusal to do the same thing for the Canadian people and we cannot accept the word "demagogue" used this afternoon by a Liberal member. We cannot and we will never accept that.

As far as agriculture is concerned, the hon. member who spoke of demagogy this afternoon would do much better if he went around his riding to see what is happening.

Mr. Chairman, we are now being asked to approve supply in the amount of $740 million for two months. Considering that agriculture is in a state of stagnation, it is probably $1,740 million we would need.

And as I said before, farming is the basis and even the whole social and economic structure of Canada. If our agriculture is revived, the effects will be felt everywhere, but if it is in a state of stagnation, it will also be felt all over the country.

As far as western Canada is concerned, I wish to congratulate the western members for their steady and continuous effort for years, to achieve a modicum of comfort for the western farmer. Those members have

looked after their farmers, they genuinely looked after them, while in eastern Canada our representatives would not even give a thought to agriculture. This is the reason for the discrimination we notice between the eastern and western farmer.

Mind you, Mr. Chairman, we do not want to deprive in the least the western farmers. As a matter of fact, I would be the first to vote for further improvements to promote western agriculture. But it is about time that a government, Liberal or Conservative, carry out the promises made in eastern Canada, in the province of Quebec, in New Brunswick, in short, in all the maritime provinces and tackle the problems facing the farmers today, in the province of Quebec and in the other eastern provinces.

The condition of the eastern farmer regardless of the county is quite appalling, and we are not the only one to complain about the plight of the farmers.

Recently, as reported in *Le Soleil* of October 23, 1964, Hon. Paul Comtois, addressed the members of the Catholic farmers' union and the press report said:

The lieutenant governor of the province of Quebec, His Excellency Paul Comtois, stated last night that the unbalance and the unevenness of the farmers' purchasing power compared to that of people working in industry and various services is now obviously clashing with the common weal.

Hon. Paul Comtois is a former farmer. He operated a farm in the riding of Nicolet-Yamaska—I think he still owns it—and when he discusses agriculture, he undoubtedly knows what he is talking about.

According to him, the solution to the complex problem of increasing the farmer's income is certainly not an easy one, but it can be found, it is accessible.

Mr. Chairman, if we draw up a comparison, year by year since 1950, between the income of farmers throughout Canada and that of Quebec farmers, we note a vast difference. In fact, the answer given by the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska (Mr. Pepin) to a question posed by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Perron) clearly indicates this. We note a decrease in the farmers' income in the province of Quebec, from year to year, since 1950.

In 1950, in Canada, the farmers' income reached $1,219,750,000, as against $211 million in Quebec.

In 1951, in Canada, the farmers' income had increased by $700 million; in Quebec, there was a small increase of $50 million.

In 1952, the income of farmers was maintained in the whole of Canada but it decreased by $20 million in the province of Quebec.

In 1953, this decrease was $3 million in the province of Quebec.

In 1954, the decrease was $22 million in the province of Quebec; in 1955, a $228 million income; a decrease of $35 million in 1956, as compared to 1955. We see a decrease of income for the farmer from one year to another.

In 1962, the income was $179,668,000 as compared with $211 million in 1950. This is how the Quebec farmers are treated, while in 1950, in the whole of Canada, production was $1,200 million and in 1962, $1,630 million, that is an increase of $240 million over a period of 12 years.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that all members of the house will understand that the requests we make in the house on behalf of farmers, of farm organizations and of the family farm are justified.

The battle we have been fighting for three years on behalf of Quebec farmers is not the first to be staged. We have already had—

Mr. Choquette: We have fought too in our party.

Mr. Caouette: The hon. member for Lotbinière tells me he has fought too. I admit it, but we had a representative in the riding of Bellechasse who no longer sits in the house and who was a member of the Ralliement. He fought strongly to obtain feed grain for eastern farmers.

We are reading today the requests put forward by the Catholic farmers' union during their 40th annual convention.

They are as follows:

The Catholic farmers' union has therefore advocated the following policy as far as feed grain is concerned:

1. That the union should protest vigorously with the federal government, following its inaction in this field, at a time when agriculture in eastern Canada is going through a critical stage; and

2. That the federal government should take the necessary steps so as to:

(a) Set up, throughout the country, the same farm cost price as regards feed grain;

We are not asking something for ourseleves but for the whole country, something that will assist agriculture as a whole.

(b) Within the context of equalization of the cost price of feed grain in this country, to abolish immediately the free trade of feed grain in the west and thereafter entrust to the Canadian wheat board all the feed grain trade in the prairie provinces;

(c) To create a feed grain board for eastern Canada with the following powers:

1. The application of an assistance policy for transportation;

This is a burden for eastern farmers.

2. The application of an assistance policy for storage;

Such a policy is now carried out by the Liberal government as it was by the previous Conservative government for the storage of grain in western Canada.

3. The storage of feed grain in public elevators in eastern Canada at the proper time and in sufficient quantities;

4. Importation of feed grain in a period of scarcity; and

5. The purchase, sale and distribution of feed grain in eastern Canada.

Mr. Chairman, may I call it six o'clock?

[*Text*]

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned for dinner, I was referring to a request from an organization recognized throughout Canada, the Catholic farmers' union. I was talking about section 5 of the request they presented at their 40th annual convention which was held recently.

Section 5 refers to the purchase, sale and distribution of feed grain in eastern Canada. I was then saying that Mr. Bernard Dumont, the former member of parliament for Bellechasse, in 1962, on behalf of the farmers and the Catholic farmers' union, made a strong plea in favour of the distribution, sale and purchase of feed grain in eastern Canada.

The union states the following:

The policy of assistance to the transportation of feed grain should become statutory when the proposed board is created.

This matter of transportation was modified this year in order to help the farmers. We were very happy about this. However, together with the Catholic farmers' union, and in order to help it, we are requesting that the policy of assistance to transportation—by rail as well as by truck—be made statutory.

The particular problem which is raised in the province of Quebec and draws wide publicity is that of the dairy industry. On September 10, 1964, the premier of the province of Quebec, Mr. Jean Lesage, made the following statement at the banquet of l'Ordre du mérite agricole—he did not make the same statement when 10,000 farmers marched on the Quebec legislative buildings—as reported by the daily newspaper *Le Soleil* in its September 10 issue:

—that one of the main characteristics of farm production in Quebec consists in its being too largely centred on dairy products.

Even if we should try to diversify or widen the field of farm activities in the province, the lack of outlets would prevent farmers from looking for sources other than that from which they derive their best income, and that is dairy production.

But when the premier of Quebec states that the dairy industry occupies too big a place in the province and that we should concern ourselves with something else, he is not quite of the same opinion as the president of the national council of the dairy industry, Mr. J. M. Hartwick, who said, at the annual meeting held at Murray Bay last September 9, and I quote:

[*Text*]

"No acute shortage of dairy products is imminent", he said, after warning that "this year in Canada we will not produce sufficient milk to meet the domestic and export demands for dairy products."

[*Translation*]

This statement was made in Murray Bay on September 9. This means evidently that the Quebec premier, even if he stated that in 1960 he did not have complete data on Quebec agricultural problems, is certainly ill-advised by his experts in 1964, when he suggests that dairy production is too high and that farmers should change or diversify their production to make it more profitable.

Mr. Chairman, dairy production in the province of Quebec decreased, in 1963, by 4 per cent. Yet, in such small provinces as Prince Edward Island, the same industry increased by 12 per cent; in Nova Scotia it remained stationary; in New Brunswick, 105 per cent, which represents an increase of 5 per cent as compared with 1962; in Ontario there has been a 3 per cent increase; in Manitoba, a decrease of 3 per cent; in Saskatchewan, an increase of 5 per cent; in Alberta, an increase of 8 per cent; in British Columbia, one of 3 per cent; and in Quebec, a decrease of 4 per cent. And now the premier of Quebec province tells us that the dairy industry is producing too much in that province.

Mr. Chairman, agriculture is very important to our province, as it is to all eastern Canada. We have statistical data which, from time to time, are handed to us by the various departments. The Minister of Agricul-

ture (Mr. Hays) and the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé), now responsible for ARDA, often refer to the French development program, what planning is done in France with a view to helping the farmers, etc.

In his speech to the Montreal economics association, on September 22 on the necessity of economic planning, the minister made a point of speaking about this French planning, using as an example its 15 years of experience. This is what the French minister of agriculture, Mr. Edgar Pisani, had to say in the October issue of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture:

We have chosen to encourage the widespread development of family farms—

In some places where farming is not profitable, farmers are paid to stay on the farm as a public service. We follow that policy, just like other countries. France does so and England also tries to do it. Other countries of the world try to keep farmers on the farm.

There are no community farms as suggested by the Minister of Forestry under his ARDA program, but rather family farms where farmers may enjoy the social security they are entitled to, like any other class of society. Thus, the farmer can live with his family as a human being can and must do in a country as great as Canada.

Yesterday I noticed that the hon. member for Lapointe mentioned in his remarks our capability to assist the countries of the world with the potential and the actual assets available to us in our own country. We simply ask for the Canadian people the same treatment as we provide for some countries of the world.

Some will object by saying: where are we going to get the money? For 30 years at least we have been expounding in this house the means of getting the money, of getting the new credit, that is, at the Bank of Canada by granting or giving an adjusted discount to the Canadian consumers, paid to the farmer or the producer in order to enable the consumers to further promote production. We have also asked, so that the farmers may market their products, for an increase in the consumers' purchasing power. We have talked about a national dividend distributed to each and everyone.

The Liberals and the Conservatives find that funny. However, during elections they make promises to farmers, but once the elections are over, they forget about the consumers they praised so much at election time.

Mr. Rondeau: They forget.

An hon. Member: What are your promises?

Mr. Caouette: We promise to give justice instead of injustice.

Mr. Chairman, when we ask that finance be put at the service of the Canadian citizen, we hear immediately people talking loudly about demagogy, crying shame and the utopia of Social Credit without knowing its elementary principles. Those people do not even understand the application of the present system and they are dazzled by the light that hits them in the dark.

For many years Social Credit has offered solutions to the problems of agriculture, to the problems of workers, to all the problems facing the human person at all social levels.

Instead of laughing it off and turning it into ridicule, let us try to understand it. Let us see the situation as it is for the Canadian farmers and for all social classes.

There are unemployed people in all spheres of economic activity in our country, and here again we stumble on the same question, and on the same replies from government ministers: We have no money, we have no money, we have no money.

It is amusing, Mr. Chairman, to note how much faster the government acts when it is required to send Canadian soldiers to Cyprus or to take part in some extraterritorial war. Then, the monetary question has no importance and we find all the money needed to equip a whole army and completely eliminate unemployment in Canada. Why in peacetime, when everything has to be done over, roads, development of natural resources, etc., is everything so complicated? Why does not the Minister of Forestry, who is now sitting in front of us, suggest to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) of this government to put at the disposal of his department the money needed to look after the development of our country's forest and other resources?

The whole matter boils down to the monetary question and the minister, instead of tackling that monetary question, would rather diversify the tasks and try all other solutions, try to enlist farmers in ARDA, try to enlist farmers in some other programs, try to enlist all classes of society in another field, try to nationalize medicine, nationalize this and that.

But the monetary system is not touched, that sacrosanct system is held in respect since confederation. And as soon as someone rises to protest against the abuses of that system, people try to ridicule him, instead of trying to understand what we are claiming, not for

us, but for all the people and the citizens who make up Canada and who have built it.

Mr. Chairman, I see that my hon. friends of the Liberal party opposite think that is funny. But the question is always: Where could we get the money? Where did we get the money during the war? To whom do we owe the national debt of $23 billion on which we are paying over $1 billion in interest alone this year.

Let a Liberal member or a minister get to his feet to tell me how, with the present system, when the government borrows $100 million, it will be able to repay $200 million in 20 years, when only the chartered banks in Canada have the right to create the credit of the nation. Who can prove to me that the present monetary system can contribute to the development of our natural resources? The purpose of economics is not to provide employment but to satisfy all Canadians.

So let us fight against what prevents us from attaining this objective, in this case, the question of finance. Let us give to Canadians what belongs to them, Canada.

[*Text*]

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, I should like to take a few moments of the time of the committee to comment on a situation that has arisen in the Department of Transport. I am exceptionally pleased that the Acting Minister of Transport is here tonight; whether or not he is listening does not matter. I have complained in the past of the practice of granting monopoly franchises to the ground transport services at national airports such as Toronto, Dorval, Winnipeg and Vancouver and now the city of Ottawa.

On Friday last I received from the government a return airplane ticket to Toronto on the 4.55 flight. I want to show you some of the niceties that these monopolistic organizations can enforce upon individuals, and I wish to protest. The plane on which I was booked was to go at 4.55 p.m. I showed up at the Chateau Laurier hotel at 4.02, just 53 minutes before the plane leaves. I have always been told by T.C.A. to allow 50 minutes from the Chateau Laurier to the airport. When I arrived at the transport depot at 4.03 I was told the bus had already left for the airport and I was late. The time I was told was 4.07. The starter produced his wrist watch to show me, 4.07. I pointed to the peace tower and asked him if he paid any attention to the time on the peace tower clock. He said, "We go by my wrist watch, my friend." I said, "It is 4.03 and I am told by T.C.A. I am to allow 50 minutes for the transfer service."

At that moment a businessman came out of the Chateau Laurier and asked where the bus to the airport was. He was told it had gone. So I said to the starter of the Red Line that has this monopoly contract, "Here's another man that is here before 4.05 and your bus service has gone." I said to the businessman, "If you and I grab a cab together we will be able to split the $4 between us which the Red Line is trying to make out of each of us." The starter informed me that it would not cost $4 for a taxi, and I said, "I have paid it in past years."

I got into the cab with the businessman. The peace tower clock was reading 4.05 and just then another member of the house, not from this side, came swinging along with his bags. He also thought 50 minutes was all he needed to allow. I got out of the cab; I was now shilling for the Red Line. I said to this other member of parliament, "They are running this service on the wrist watch of the Red Line starter. The peace tower clock means nothing to them. Would you care to climb in with me?"

The second member of parliament got in and the three of us, two members of parliament and the businessman, rode out to the airport. The charge was $3.65. As the starter said, it would not be $4. However, normally when I am forced to ride single, I pay the taxi operator $4—35 cents for himself and $3.65 for the monopoly.

These monopoly contracts should be thrown open for public tender if they are going to continue monopoly practice, but I do not believe in the monopoly practice at all. This service should be open to every taxicab service in the city of Ottawa, and this applies to other communities across Canada.

Many of you may realize I have strong feelings on the liquor question. I am sorry that last week, in walking home up Bank street, for the first time in some years I saw a customer being ejected from a Bank street hotel. It was not any too pleasant a sight and a free-for-all fight developed on the corner. It was a little upsetting and the language was pretty vile.

I began to look for a policeman, as I often see these police cars going up and down the street, and as we always say, when you look for one there isn't one. However, in a couple of moments a police car came by. I hailed the chap and I said to him, "It is pretty rough at that ladies' entrance to the hotel one block

down the street. One chap"—I described him —"is the centre of the group, I think you should break it up." To my surprise the policeman whistled away faster than a Canada goose, and I thought to myself that this was a pretty funny thing for the Ottawa police department. Suddenly I realized, however, that no doubt this man was radioing for extra help. In 60 seconds there were four police cars there, the one with the officer I had spoken to, and three more police cars with two men in each, so that seven policemen stepped out at that hotel and the fight was broken up in a hurry.

I refer to this for one reason. The police cannot get in touch with each other any more quickly with the radio in their cars than can the taxicabs in Toronto, and all this balderdash shot about, that you have to give a monopoly contract to a cab firm to have 24 hour service to and from an airport is meaningless in this day and age when taxicabs can communicate with one another as speedily as police cars. If there is a cab shortage at an airport they can summon cabs through the radio-telephone system faster than you can say "Jack Robinson," which is an old time expression.

I do not believe in these monopoly practices in the letting of contracts. They should advertise if they are going to continue the monopoly, but there should be no monopoly. I would like to ask the Minister of Transport to see that the clocks in the parliament buildings are set to keep in step with the wrist watch of the starter of the Red Line taxi cab company so that we will get to the airport at $1.10 instead of having to get a taxicab to the airport at $4.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Chairman, I will only speak a moment or two on the estimates before us.

Of course, I intend to be brief as far as the C.B.C. is concerned. I think it is superfluous at this time to discuss that matter, since a committee was set up for that purpose and will report to the house. When it does, it will then be in order to appoint a committee of the house to make the necessary recommendations.

I will not speak on monetary theories either, Mr. Chairman, because the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) is quite familiar with such matters. As a matter of fact, during the last election he was saying that the money supply was $8 billion, while in fact it was $15 billion; he was making an error of $7 billion, a small mistake, for there are only 1,000 million in a billion.

In any case, Mr. Chairman, I will deal today with a controversial matter. A commission was set up by the federal government and another one by the province of Quebec, to consider expenditures of the federal government. I think that one of the difficulties which the experts are up against, is that they are not aware of the way government expenditures are distributed among the provinces.

I have noted, since I became a member of parliament, that one of the flaws of this government—

Mr. Grégoire: There are many.

Mr. Chrétien: —this system—flaws which have been there for a long time—is that purchases are not centralized in the federal government.

If there were a sort of department of purchasing or supplies, we would have a better idea of the way in which government purchases are distributed among the provinces.

For instance, there exists in the United States a defence secretariat, a system which determines exactly, each year, how much money was spent in each state. Such information may be readily obtained there, whereas it is very difficult to get here.

That is the reason why, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the government to centralize the purchases of all the departments in a single department, which would enable all the members to know if the distribution is done adequately throughout the country and in each of the provinces. Such centralization would also serve as a tool in the hands of the government to help some areas which sometimes suffer from economic stagnation.

If we were able to determine quickly what expenses are necessary for government purchases, we could, in some instances, depart from ordinary practices and direct the purchases so as to stimulate the economy of certain provinces.

These are the only remarks I wanted to make. I believe this would help clarify the situation and improve the present state of union in Canada.

[*Text*]

Mr. Simpson: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to many of the speakers in this debate on interim supply, particularly those who have dealt with the operation and policy of the C.B.C. Despite the opinions expressed by the hon. member from Hali-

fax (Mr. Regan) and some of his colleagues, who have felt that members of the opposition are wasting the time of parliament by bringing to the attention of the committee many of the complaints which we have received from our constituents about the operation of the C.B.C., I feel it is my duty and responsibility to bring some of these complaints to the attention of the government.

We have heard a fairly good discussion about some of the programming and financing of the corporation, and about the lack of extension of its services. This is one of the subjects I would like to mention briefly. I may say I am pleased to see there is not complete unanimity on the government side in relation to the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax. I was interested to listen to some of the criticism of the corporation which has been expressed by the hon. member for Cartier and on other occasions by the hon. member for York-Humber. No doubt we shall be hearing from those members on this subject in the future. It is primarily with regard to the extension of the services of the corporation that I should like to speak this evening.

It may surprise some people to hear that many of the complaints I have received are not solely with regard to the extension of the television service but are with regard to the extension of the C.B.C. radio service. In these days when television has become the accepted thing, some may not know that there are places not in the far north but in northern parts of provinces which do not yet have adequate C.B.C. radio coverage. The corporation knows this. I have spoken to its officials on many occasions and they have said for years that places such as Thompson and Lynn Lake in northern Manitoba do not as yet have adequate coverage in the field of C.B.C. radio. There are many more complaints with regard to television. This is simply because there are far more people in the area which I represent who do not have the advantage of television service than there are those who do not have the advantage of radio service. I might say at this juncture in regard to C.B.C. radio coverage in this area that there are two local stations affiliated with the C.B.C. and that at Churchill there is one C.B.C. station. We have had fairly good co-operation to some extent regarding requests for such things as a land line service to bring in such events as the world series this fall, and this has been greatly appreciated by the people. However it has been a long, hard battle to get these things, and for the station at Thompson this was the first opportunity to bring to the people of that area live broadcasts of a world series. A land line service is the only way in which the people can receive such broadcasts because the coverage of other stations carrying these broadcasts is not available.

[Mr. Simpson.]

At the present time parliament is being asked to grant a sum of money in the neighbourhood of $88 million to enable the corporation to carry on for the current year. One thing I feel is surprising is the fact that in these estimates there is no breakdown whatsoever of this figure. It is just a figure of $88 million and there is very limited explanation of how this huge sum of money is to be spent. Parliament never receives any accounting for this expenditure until the following year when the corporation puts out its annual report. We on this side of the house have repeatedly asked that the government convene a committee on broadcasting so that parliament might examine fully the affairs of the corporation. However we have not yet reached success. The government has not seen fit to set up such a committee, but its spokesmen have said that an advisory committee on broadcasting has been set up and this will be reporting some time in 1965. This may be so; but at the present time, long before this advisory committee is due to report, we are being asked to approve expenditures of $88 million. To me, this does not appear to be good business. Some of the financial commitments of the C.B.C. should certainly be open for inspection by members of this house. This subject was covered last night fairly well by my hon. friend from Edmonton West and again today by the hon. member for Calgary North who went into many aspects of C.B.C. finance. I shall have something to say about that matter in a moment or two.

One thing that interests me is the devious and conflicting way in which answers have been given to questions asked by members of the opposition in relation to the C.B.C. and its operations as well as to the setting up of a committee. The Secretary of State has said on many occasions that the C.B.C. must be entirely free from government interference. The hon. member for Halifax said the same last night. Both these hon. gentlemen said the government had no intention of interfering with the operations of the corporation. However, on August 6 I directed a question

to the Secretary of State based on reports which had come out to the effect that the C.B.C. was considering the expenditure of many millions of dollars for the consolidation of facilities in Toronto and Montreal, as opposed to the extension of the service to areas which are not now served. At that time I asked the Secretary of State whether the government would not take the necessary steps to set up a special committee on broadcasting so that parliament could be given an opportunity to study this very serious situation. It is interesting to note the answer given by the Secretary of State at that time. He said he had not seen the report referred to but all he could say was that there had been no government decision. This indicated to me that either the government intended to make the decision whether this money would be spent, or they had not yet done so. And as I said, at other times when we bring our complaints to the attention of the Secretary of State and of the government they advise us that they are in no position to interfere in any way with the affairs of the corporation. Then again, on October 6, I directed a question to the minister asking him whether the government would direct the corporation to prepare an up to date report, an up to date study, in relation to the extension of services. At that time the question was taken as notice. On October 21 I asked whether the government had a reply to give me and I was told by the Secretary of State that a decision with regard to the extension of service or alternate services would not be made until the advisory committee on broadcasting had presented its report, which it was hoped would be early in 1965.

So we get back to this question of a committee set up by the government as opposed to a committee consisting of members of this house to look into all aspects of broadcasting. I know there is a great deal of merit attached to the setting up of an advisory committee. That committee will, no doubt, come up with a report which will be of great value to parliament. However, we would like to have been able to look into some of these aspects of the corporation's affairs before being obliged to approve these large expenditures. As things stand, the areas which are not now served can more or less sit back and accept the position that nothing whatsoever is to be done with respect to providing services until this advisory committee on broadcasting reports to the government or to the corporation or to whomever they are going to report.

Looking at the annual report of the corporation for the year 1963-64, first of all I would like to point out some of the purposes of the corporation as set out in the Broadcasting Act. One of them, as acknowledged by the corporation itself, is:

> To be a complete service, covering in fair proportion the whole range of programming; bringing things of interest, value, and entertainment to people of all tastes, ages, and interests, and not concentrating on some aspects of broadcasting to the exclusion of others.
>
> To link all parts of the country in two ways: (1) through the inclusion of a wide variety of national and common interests in its program services; (2) by using its physical resources to bring the national program service to as many Canadians as finances allow. Whether Canadians live in remote or heavily populated areas the national system should serve them as adequately and equitably as possible.

These sound like very interesting and commendable words until we look into the question of finances, as mentioned earlier today by the hon. member for Calgary North. However, let us look at what the corporation has to do, in regard to their views on the extension of services. We find here, under "Coverage policy":

> At the present time the corporation's planning and radio takes into account all areas of Canada with a population of more than 500 which could be served by one transmitter. In television because of higher costs, the minimum population figure is 2,000. All areas which, on the basis of the latest available d.b.s. figures, have this many people are entered on the corporation's planning lists. At this present time there are approximately 122 communities on the radio planning list and about 60 on the television list. The possibility of bringing service to each of these areas and the costs involved have been given preliminary study and priorities established.

Here is another reason why we have wanted the government to set up this committee on broadcasting—so we could in some way find out from the corporation just what this priority list looks like; because I am sure that members of this house whose areas are not serviced adequately by television and radio would be very interested, and the people they represent would be particularly interested, in having some idea of the priorities of the corporation. In their annual report the corporation goes on to say:

> The system of priorities outlined above has been followed by C.B.C. for some years and is in line with the proportion of the over-all budget which it is felt can be devoted to this aspect of development. On this basis it is clear that the needs of these communities cannot all be met at once without seriously neglecting other phases of the national service. In fact, at the present rate, the communities mentioned above will not all be served for perhaps ten years.

This is not what we were led to believe when the committee on broadcasting met formerly. I believe the last time was in 1961. It sat for at least three years in succession. At that time we were more or less led to believe—at least, I was—that it would not be too long before 98 per cent of the population of Canada was covered by corporation service. However, we learn now, three years later, that perhaps these communities will not be serviced for at least ten years. But the interesting thing which I would like to mention at this time—and again I read from the annual report—is this:

> The capital cost of extending service to these communities over a 10-year period starting in 1964 would probably be upwards of $15 million. Strong suggestions from many quarters, however, have caused C.B.C. to study the cost and time factors in other possible methods of meeting the problem.
>
> It has been suggested that this program be accelerated as a matter of national importance. If, for example, parliament were so to decide, and to provide the financing in the form of a special grant, it would probably be possible to shorten the time factor to a few years, with the co-operation of equipment companies. The aspects of this are being explored.

Again we come to another question which I and many others in this house have asked the C.B.C. on other occasions; namely why don't they ask for this money? They ask for $80 million, $85 million, $88 million every year, but they are the ones to decide how this money is going to be spent. Two or three years ago they could have asked, or even now they could ask for this additional $15 million to accelerate this policy of the extension of services to all parts of Canada. They seem to have no hesitation whatsoever in asking for a special loan of $14½ million—the hon. member for Edmonton West pointed this out last night—for capital expenditures to be spent, again, as they decide. So, Mr. Chairman, it is quite exasperating to the people of the areas which are not now serviced and to members representing them when those on the government side and on the treasury benches rise and say that parliament should not interfere in any way whatsoever with the affairs of the corporation. Here parliament is going to be asked for a loan of $14½ million and, as the hon. member for Calgary North pointed out today, in a year or so we are probably going to be asked to grant $14½ million to the corporation so they can pay parliament back its own money.

This is a funny money policy if I have ever heard of one. I say, Mr. Chairman, that if the C.B.C. are going to continue to operate their financial structure in this wheeler-dealer manner, I think it is time parliament had some say in how they should spend this money, particularly with regard to the subject which I am now bringing to the attention of the committee, namely the extension of services. I think this is one of the most important aspects of this whole question. When we get into the subject of programming, everyone has his own views; 50 per cent of the people say there should be no interference whatsoever, and the other half say, yes, parliament should have some say on programming. So we have a 50-50 split there. But I would defy any member in this house to rise and say that parliament would not be justified in approving immediately an expenditure of $15 million by the corporation, if the corporation could assure parliament that the areas in Canada which are not now serviced would be serviced as quickly as possible, and if they specified some reasonable period of time in which they could do this job. They advise us that there are no technical difficulties which cannot be solved and say it is strictly a matter of money. Since I have been in this house, a matter of only seven years, I have yet to see the C.B.C. come before parliament and ask for an outright grant which would be spent in this particular manner.

We have also heard that the C.B.C. are quite interested in colour television. While I agree that no one should stand in the way of progress I am particularly pleased that the board of broadcast governors decided to suspend the hearing which was set up in relation to the subject of colour television because, according to what I have heard in the United States, colour television is a particularly costly project. I am sure that there would be quite a march on Ottawa by people resident in unserviced areas, were parliament asked for many millions of dollars to develop colour television. A good number of people in this country are not yet receiving black and white television service. In the area which I represent at least 50 per cent of the people do not have any television service.

I was particularly interested in certain statistics put out by the C.B.C. in relation to the population a town would require to be considered eligible for radio and television services. The C.B.C. say that a population of 500 is required for radio service, and 2,000 for television. In the constituency I represent the town of Thompson, Manitoba, has 8,500 people and although there is a private cable system of television in the town the people there have no C.B.C. television what-

ever. In Snow Lake there are approximately 1,500 to 2,000 people, again with no television service whatever. Over 2,000 people at Lynn Lake and over 3,000 people at Churchill are still waiting for television service from the C.B.C. Along the Hudson Bay line there are numerous communities over the 500 population mark which the C.B.C. considers necessary for radio coverage, but which have no adequate radio coverage at all. At The Pas and Flin Flon the C.B.C. have been operating over the past two years a kinescope television service, and by this means the programs are projected one week after they have appeared on the network system. These people feel quite fortunate at having some means of television. However, at Flin Flon there are over 15,000 people. It is an energetic community, but as yet there is no indication whatever from the corporation when network television service will be made available. So again I say that when the C.B.C. comes before parliament and repeatedly asks for approval of sums of money up to $88 million, and then produces reports indicating that upwards of $100 million is required to consolidate their services in the cities of Toronto and Montreal, but refuses to ask for the $15 million which we are informed would complete television service to at least 98 per cent of the population of Canada, then I say that parliament should have a far greater control over the spending of this corporation.

Very shortly we are going to be asked to approve this expenditure. When members of the opposition get up in this house and ask for some answers to the questions we have posed, members on the government side of the house are going to say, as did the hon. member for Halifax last night, that we have no business interfering with the operation of this corporation. I should like him or any other members who feel that way to make a little trip around my constituency and try and tell the people there, who in many cases are paying a much higher per capita tax than is paid by the people in the rest of Canada, that they have no business to complain to their member of parliament about the lack of television service on the part of this crown corporation. I should like to go on record now as telling the ministers on the treasury benches that when the estimates of this department come before the house they can be prepared to receive some very strong statements from many hon. members on this side of the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words concerning the administration of justice.

I want to take advantage of this preliminary remark to point out that if all members could do their utmost to summarize their thoughts, to synthesize their remarks, we could save a lot of time. Some members speak at length nothing but absolute nonsense. I think we could synthesize our ideas. That is what I intend to do tonight in dealing with the matter of justice.

Mr. Chairman, the respect of justice, of the judicial institutions and of those whose duty it is to interpret and administer the law, is a categorical imperative in every well organized society.

When the reputation of justice or of those whose duty it is to administer justice, is compromised, anarchy is liable to develop.

We have been recently aware of events where the integrity of the judicature has been impaired.

One has only to remember, Mr. Chairman, the Coffin case to confine to oblivion events which it is preferable not to mention.

I believe that our judicial system ranks above that of our neighbours to the south, since in Canada, none of those exercising judiciary functions have to be elected to do so.

However, it is obvious, whether we like it or not, that since confederation the appointment of judges has too often, unfortunately, been an instrument of patronage.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that our courts, and more particularly our superior courts, should be above all reproach as far as their efficiency and integrity are concerned. That is the reason I advocate, concerning the appointment of superior court justices, a special piece of legislation which would include strict provisions and require, as an obligation, consultations with the bar association and the bench of the provinces where appointments are to be made. In my opinion, every province—and this should be done upon the initiative of the federal government—should have a committee of the bar association and a committee of high ranking judges which would look into and oversee the appointment of judges. I believe that, should this committee of the bar association and the committee of high ranking judges, whose creation I suggest and which would be advisory bodies, object to the appointment of a certain lawyer to the bench, then the minister of justice would have to consider this opposition as a

right of veto. This would prevent the appointment of judges who do not possess the qualifications required to fulfil their duties.

Mr. Chairman, by all means we must reestablish the prestige and integrity of the bench. There must be an end to this system of giving sole consideration to partisanship. The appointment of judges should be based on standards of competence and integrity and not solely on partisanship considerations. Let us restore the prestige of justice and the prestige of those who administer justice. We must strengthen the people's confidence in the administration of justice, a confidence which has been shaken by incidents better left unmentioned.

[*Text*]

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I should like to participate in the debate this evening because of some additional points that have been brought forward by some other members of the house although I also wish to say a few words about the subject which has been foremost in the discussion, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Possibly I might be quite remiss if I did not say in my initial remarks that as one of those in the official opposition who have been labelled by a certain journalist as being in a certain category I am not endeavouring to measure up to any mark, but words have been spoken today about sensationalism and with the greatest of restraint I must say it sometimes puts fear in my heart when I hear people who are considered prominent in the journalistic field acting so irresponsibly, while at the same time trying to charge other people with irresponsibility.

Mr. Nesbitt: That guy is just a nut.

Mr. Winkler: This bothers me somewhat, of course, but I hope that you, Mr. Chairman, and other members of the house will see fit to bear with me this evening and consider that my contribution is indeed a responsible one. The hon. member for Lotbinière referred to his philosophy with regard to the appointment of judges, but surely he has sufficient confidence in the federal Minister of Justice that he would not think the minister would need support or, if he needed it, would not consult with the provincial authorities in regard to appointments of this type. If he has a condemnation to make of the system, I wonder if he is making that condemnation in regard to appointments which he regrets were made by older people other than himself and the present government.

I also listened with great interest to the hon. member for York-Humber. Indeed I expected other comments from that hon. member this evening, because if my memory is correct he has a case against the C.B.C. before the courts at the present time. Before this debate ends I should like to hear from the hon. member for York-Humber with regard to his feelings about the C.B.C., particularly in the light of the charges he has made. I think he could make a valuable contribution to the debate at this time, and I do not say that in a derogatory fashion, because the subject is certainly topical. I think he could make a worth-while and, in fact, necessary contribution. I hope the hon. member for York-Humber will see fit to let us have the benefit of his wisdom in regard to this question.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, may I assure the hon. member for Grey-Bruce that I will give him a statement tomorrow in the house.

Mr. Winkler: These are words of great comfort, and we will look forward to his contribution to the debate. I should also like to refer to the contribution made by the hon. member for St. Maurice-Laflèche in which he referred to what he said was the anomaly in the method of purchasing by the federal government. He referred to the government generally, but I presume he had the C.B.C. in mind particularly. However, he went on to make some remarks with regard to eastern feed grain policy, and this is a subject about which I wish to say something. I realized that it might not be possible for me to do so at any other time prior to the conclusion of this session, although at the present rate of progress one cannot say for sure. There is a very serious problem in regard to eastern agriculture and certainly the feed grain policy is part of that problem.

One of my main reasons for participating in the debate is that I have before me a letter I received from a farmer in my constituency. I must say immediately that the letter is not written from any political point of view. I could read the entire letter into the record but I do not think that is necessary. It is necessary, however, for me to refer to certain facts contained in it. I know this farmer very well. I know what his previous political affiliation was. I do not know whether he is still of the same mind in that regard but certainly he was not a supporter of mine. In his letter he has this to say:

> I have 200 acres and am in mixed farming. First, let us look at the beef situation. I bought 50 good western steer calves last winter for 24¾ cents per pound, figuring I got a good buy. They cost me on an average of $145 each. After feeding them for nine months, if I sold them now

I would probably make $25 a piece. I have no choice but to stable these cattle and buy corn and concentrate and finish them and hope the price goes up. At today's prices the banker will have more money out of them than I will.

I shipped eight good shorthorn heifers this fall and the price I got ranged from 18 cents to 20 cents in Toronto. It is a long time since cattle have been below 20 cents per pound.

Let's take a look at hogs. A few years back we got between $50 and $60 per pig with hog grower at $45 per ton. Today we get around $40 per pig and pay $78 per ton for feed. Buy a pig at $12 and feed it 700 pounds of feed at that price and you see what your profit is.

Now for poultry, the real moneymakers. I keep 40 hens. We got 23 to 25 cents per dozen most of the summer for eggs. The government is giving us a deficiency payment on the three top grades of eggs, but what about the lower grades? It costs just as much to produce those small eggs as the large ones. How are you going to make a hen lay all large eggs?

I house my pullets and wanted to sell the year old hens. All I could get for these birds was 5 cents per pound. A four pound hen would bring 20 cents. With prices like this and the high cost of labour, machinery, taxes, (etc.), which you know as much about as I do, how in the world is the farmer going to exist?

Now, listen to this, Mr. Chairman:

Surely, our Minister of Agriculture and farmer members must realize this, or are they all millionaires?

We know that is not the case, of course; but it seems so to the average farmer in eastern Canada.

I hope you will present this situation to whom it may concern, and trust that something will be done before the small farmer falls by the wayside.

Now, Mr. Chairman, perhaps this does not seem very important in the course of this debate. I do want to get to the C.B.C. before I conclude, but the important thing is that this question was raised this evening and I took advantage of the opportunity presented to me. I want to say this to you, Mr. Chairman, and members who are present in the house this evening, that ever since the Conservative government left office all that has happened to the eastern farm prices has been that they have gone down, down, and down, and the costs of operation for the eastern farmer have gone up, up and up. If you do not believe me, ask the man who wrote this letter—and I can tell you he has never been a supporter of mine. Ask my hon. friends across the way and see if the situation is not precisely the same in their areas.

I know there are members like the hon. member for York-Scarborough who talks about rural tyranny. Where is the rural tyranny? Is it from these millionaire farmers? Is it from the representatives they have in this house? The hon. member spoke in glowing terms of how one member can represent more people in a rural area. Of what use is it to represent rural people if the government brings forth nothing but policies to destroy these people? Have they no place in our economy? Are they finished? What is the future for them? It is a very dull outlook so far as I am concerned. I am sure the hon. member for St. Maurice-Laflèche knows this is true in his part of the country as well. There is no argument across this country because when you bring people together on common ground you will find that they encounter the same problems in connection with this government. I do not know what the policy is, but the closest we got to it tonight was a little word about feed grain. I am grateful to the hon. member for bringing it up.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Never at any time have I referred to feed grain, as the hon. member is saying now. Of course, he should have paid more attention to my remarks. I only spoke of purchases being centralized in a single body. I never referred to the grain problem, where the situation has greatly improved under the present government.

[*Text*]

Mr. Winkler: Well, there is no question about it; if you did not talk about it, you should have.

Mr. Moreau: Is the hon. member aware that when I was referring to rural tyranny I was not referring to rural tyranny as practised by the small farmer, but rather to rural tyranny as practised by the hon. member.

Mr. Winkler: I do not know what is inherent in those words, but I can tell you they are very weak. I hope my hon. friend—or perhaps he is not so honourable—reads the Toronto *Star,* and looks at those words tomorrow, to see who is the more responsible. I will let him be the judge.

I am thinking also this evening of the words expressed by the hon. member for Verdun. I regret that it is all too seldom there is some recognition on the opposite side of the house when the truth is spoken by members about the area they represent, and particularly about the problems with which we are faced today. I think the hon. member for Verdun did a very commendable job this evening in presenting a sane, fundamental argument with regard to the problem that is

before us. He did not over-emphasize it; he did not underscore it. He did not make it a sensational thing, he just brought the seriousness of it to the attention of the house. I feel that perhaps, in so far as this problem is concerned, this is the approach that we should take. I say again that I am pleased the hon. member for Verdun made that contribution this evening. There are no bricks in this bouquet. Up until this time I have not heard any words in connection with this problem from members across the way, with the exception of the hon. member for Villeneuve. I hold in my hand a newspaper report of his comments. In my opinion therefore this is the first time a government member has risen to place the problem squarely before us in a responsible manner, and for this we must be grateful to him.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will turn to the matter of the C.B.C. It may be that the C.B.C. has been discussed at length. This evening the hon. member for Lotbinière made some remarks about wasting time. As a matter of fact the hon. member has spoken twice in this debate, but that is of no concern to me. I am grateful for the contributions that have come from Liberal benches. I know hon. members feel as sincerely as we do about this matter because the people we represent are no different from the people they represent. Since when are we wasting time when we, as members of parliament, discuss the estimates of the C.B.C.?

Mr. McIlraith: Would the hon. member agree that those estimates are not before the committee now?

Mr. Winkler: I agree, Mr. Chairman; the estimates are certainly not before the committee right now. Surely it is our privilege to discuss this specific question, the budget of the C.B.C. I beg your pardon, sir, if you want to be technical; I meant the budget and not the estimates. This evening the minister is becoming very technical, and I regret this fact. If we have no right to discuss the expenditure of $100 million of Canadian taxpayers' money by the C.B.C., then I think there is something wrong with the duty which has been imposed upon us.

Mr. McIlraith: Would the hon. member permit a question? The point I was making clear was that this is not the point at which to discuss the item. Of course it is an important item and properly discussable, but it is properly discussable during consideration of the estimates of the department.

[Mr. Winkler.]

Mr. Nesbitt: We have never seen them.

Mr. Olson: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The minister says the C.B.C. estimates are not before us at this time.

Mr. McIlraith: This is right.

Mr. Olson: I should like to ask him if two twelfths of the amount for the C.B.C. is not before us in paragraph (a) of the resolution, amounting to $14,316,666? Does not two twelfths of that item include part of the C.B.C. estimates?

Mr. McIlraith: No, what is before the committee now is whether or not the government should be given permission to expend two twelfths of the amount of supply—there are one or two minor exceptions to that percentage—pending parliament's discussion in detail of each one of the estimates and everything related to them. If hon. members are interested in following it, this is the reason the commitment is always given when interim supply is presented to the house, that the passage of this interim supply will not in any way limit or abridge the right to discuss the item when the estimates are called. Therefore even if twelve twelfths were passed in the interim supply bill, parliament would still retain its right to discuss the matter fully and debate it at the appropriate time on the estimates. That is the point I wish to make.

Mr. Winkler: Probably the minister is quite right. We on this side will bear that in mind when the estimates of the Secretary of State come before us. But I wonder if the minister bore that in mind when he sat on this side?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes he did, and I will tell you what he did discuss. I have all the statistics here on what the opposition of that day did and the number of days it took on interim supply. The sort of thing that opposition discussed was grievances against administration. One of the major ones was the failure of the then government to bring down a budget for the house to consider.

Mr. Winkler: It is better in some cases not to bring budgets down than to produce something of the sort we have had. But I think the minister put his finger on the nub of the matter. This is something that is important to the present administration and I do not think he can argue that the matter before the committee is out of order.

I have here quotations that were supplied to me by the hon. member for Grey North, but before proceeding, Mr. Chairman, may I ask you to take note of the lengthy interjections during my humble intervention. As I say, I have been supplied with some valuable quotations by the hon. member for Grey North who, because of very serious family matters regrettably could not be with us today. Otherwise he would place these on the record himself. However, I must tell the minister I would be ashamed to read these quotations into *Hansard,* so that they could be on the record. They are quotations from a C.B.C. program of about two weeks ago, which I think was one of the lowest things ever to come across the air waves.

It is not for me to say, as has been repeated so many times during the last few days, that members of parliament should not be concerned with programming. Maybe this is so. I do not believe it is quite the case, but maybe these other members are right. They may be more accurate than I in this regard, but I do say the time has come for the expenditures of the C.B.C. to be placed before parliament each and every year, the same as the expenditures of any ministry, not for the purpose of considering programming but for the purpose of considering the expenditures themselves.

We have received a large number of letters from good, sound, sensible, Canadian families. They have sent letters to their respective members of parliament, and these people are burdened with the expenditure of $100 million a year for something that they deplore. When that happens there is something wrong with our system. If that is not so, then probably I am wrong in being on the floor or occupying my seat, but I believe we should stand up for the people who object to the money the government spends through the C.B.C.

Incidentally I do not always have the opportunity to listen to all the broadcasts of the C.B.C., but I have not heard the C.B.C. say one word today about the objections that have been raised here. Do the orders for this type of attitude come from the top? I do not believe these attitudes originate below the top level. They originate with the policy people, and it is not fair enough for anyone on the other side of the chamber to reply, "You appointed these men who have the authority. Why don't they act?"

The point is that if the Canadian taxpayers have a problem surely they have the right, through their duly elected members, to place their objection before the authority concerned. I venture to say that if the truth were known the budgets and the expenditures of the C.B.C. that appear before us are much greater than we actually see because I believe—I might be wrong here—that there is not a division between the capital and operating budgets of the C.B.C., and I believe this should be made available to parliament.

As I said previously, this type of expenditure by an agency of the government should be examined by members of parliament, the same as the expenditures of any other government department. It is not good enough for the Secretary of State to rise in his place and say to me, "I will take this as notice and bring it to the attention of the president of the C.B.C." I certainly do not feel I have the qualifications to stand in judgment on matters in regard to programming, but again I say I have quotations here that I would be ashamed to place on the record of parliament; yet these things were broadcast to Canadian t.v. viewers not two weeks ago.

Do we pay these people to give us an uplift in our society? It was stated by the hon. member for Churchill that the philosophy in programming is one of interest, value and entertainment. If it is of interest and value, do we make our people look down instead of up? Are the traditional teachings of family life in Canada to be cast aside? Are we to make our young people think that the things which are held dear in decent family life should be mocked and are in fact wrong? If they are wrong then I think somebody should tell us the whole world is wrong, because we have been revolving around the concept of a basic family unit and the things people hold true in their homes.

Is it any wonder we have trouble in our universities, with the movements that fly off to the left, when we are given leadership such as this and our young people can see it for what it is? These new things then become commonplace and are considered commonplace. I believe the words that were spoken last evening by the hon. member for Northwest Territories were quite correct. I believe the adjectives and the terms he used were correct.

It is not within the competence of any one group, acting as an agency of the government, to take a unilateral position on the type of entertainment to be shown to the public. Consequently the only way we can have this matter properly reviewed and considered is through a committee. Once again I suggest that such a committee be empowered to review both the operating and capital ex-

penditures of the C.B.C. from year to year, the same as with any other ministry of the government.

Mr. Regan: Would the hon. member permit a question? The hon. member specifically in his remarks takes exception to the programming and then suggests a committee to review the expenditure. What is he suggesting specifically? Would he suggest, if the minister was to be placed specifically in charge of the C.B.C., as he is in charge of a department—

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Regan: Would he suggest that each program before it was shown on the air should be censored and examined by the minister? Is he suggesting that if a program goes on that the minister does not fully approve, the next day the full executive of the C.B.C. should be fired? How specifically would the hon. member's proposal apply?

Mr. Winkler: If I were to place the hon. member in charge of the C.B.C. he would be in charge of comedy; it would eliminate the entire problem. I would say this to him. We only learn in this particular field by the experience we have had. I believe the present situation of control at the top in C.B.C. has been created possibly by a previous parliamentary committee, where a certain fear existed in the areas of authority of the C.B.C. I am told that people come to their offices today and wonder what they are supposed to do—people in the administration—simply because one man has his hand on the valve at the top. One man has this control of the C.B.C. I say to the hon. member that these estimates are the only way members of parliament can get at the corporation in regard to the representations that are made to us. I hold this in front of the committee again. If we are to get at it for the benefit of Canadians and our constituents, this is the way it is going to be done. We shall only work out a system with regard to the programs and of knowing who the people should be that direct the affairs—

An hon. Member: How?

Mr. Winkler: I am saying right now that the people at the top are wrong.

Mr. Regan: Then should we not have new directors?

Mr. Winkler: Maybe they should be changed. What do we get from the Secretary of State? He says he will take notice of our questions and they will be sent on to the president of the C.B.C. He writes back. We have had hundreds of similar answers: "The matter will be taken under consideration." That is about what happens, and it is not the answer. I will inform hon. members by saying that I do not think there is any man in the administration of the C.B.C. who would not listen if we had him before the committee and I read these out to him—as I would do if he were here tonight. But I will not read them and put them on the record of parliament because they are too base, too vile. However, I would certainly read them if he were here, and any man with an ounce of common sense would know he was wrong.

An hon. Member: Is this not a call for a change of directors?

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Cameron, High Park): I was about to congratulate the hon. member for Grey-Bruce for having completed his remarks within the time allotted to him, without an interruption. I permitted a question. It was a long question and there was a long answer, and I think we should now call on the next speaker.

Mr. Olson: On a point of order; a few minutes ago the President of the Privy Council maintained that the estimates of the C.B.C. were not before us. On page 54 of the main estimates which were given to all members earlier in the session there is an item, vote 1, in the amount of $85,900,000. Then the first paragraph of the resolution before the committee this evening includes these words:

> (a) two twelfths of the total of all of the items to be voted in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965—

Then there are some exceptions; but the C.B.C. is not included in any of those exceptions. The government is asking for two twelfths of this $85,900,000 mentioned in the main estimates; that is, if my arithmetic is correct, $14,316,000. I wonder whether the President of the Privy Council would agree that by passing this resolution we do in fact grant that much money to the C.B.C. for its operations and therefore, at least to this extent the estimates of the C.B.C. are before the committee.

Mr. McIlraith: If that is a question directed to me, let me say I would agree that the committee does authorize the government to make this advance, but I would also point out to the hon. member that the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, were passed many

weeks ago, yet he will find a reference to them in the resolution as well.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): I do not intend to make any ruling on the point of order raised by the hon. member. If it should be necessary the chairman will make a ruling upon his return. It would seem to me, however, that the discussion so far has been in order, and if I were to make a ruling that would be my ruling.

Mr. Otto: I am glad you made that ruling, Mr. Chairman. This seems to be a take-a-whack-at-the-C.B.C.-week, and I do not want to change the topic. However, I do not intend to take a whack at the C.B.C. although I think you will recognize, Mr. Chairman as most members will, that there must be something wrong with the C.B.C. to have aroused the ire of so many members of this house.

An hon. Member: On all sides.

Mr. Otto: On some sides and in some corners of this house. After all, what can you expect when you have a body which is really not responsible to anyone? It is no more the fault of members on this side than of members on the other. I recall listening to my hon. friend from York-Humber about a month ago when he spoke about the origin of the C.B.C. and the wonderful work it had done at that time. Since those days the needs of the country have changed and the C.B.C. has changed, but because there is a lack of communication of responsibility between the C.B.C. and the shareholders, who are the people of Canada, is it any wonder that some problems arise? As to programming, I do not think anyone in this house would venture to say that he would take the responsibility for programming although, like everyone here, I like to see whether I am getting my money's worth.

During the dinner hour I went through the weekly programs of Toronto television stations. Members may recall we have channel six, which is the C.B.C.; then we have two others, nine and eleven, one of which is in Hamilton. They are private stations. I averaged out the private stations, the two of them, and the C.B.C. station and I more or less designated the programs into certain areas such as drama, variety, public affairs, and so on and we find that at the end of the week the C.B.C. did provide two hours more of drama than went out from the other stations, or the average of both of them; it provided three and a half hours more of imported programs such as Beverly Hillbillies and so on. It put out another three and a half hours extra of local variety programs, another nine and a half hours of sport programs, an extra four hours of public affairs, and three extra hours of educational programs. And that is what the corporation has done. I doubt the value of the imported programs.

The question which comes to my mind is: Is that worth $1,500,000? Is it worth as much money as we are paying out—roughly $2 million a week? Granted, all these programs are very good, very beneficial—drama, education, and so on. But is it worth $2 million? For this reason I cannot see anything wrong with either a committee or any other body studying the whole concept of the C.B.C.

Is it still in the interest of the nation to have the C.B.C. decide by itself what is to be the cultural destiny of this nation? Are they fulfilling the function they are supposed to fulfil? Can it not be done by private television? Could it be possible that the C.B.C. should not be in competitive television, or in the business of trying to make money at television? All these questions could be decided by either such a committee, or a very deep study as to what terms of reference we are going to give the C.B.C. from now on. It is not enough to stand up in this house and say, "The C.B.C. did such and such. The program was wrong. We want to control this," or, "we want to control that". I believe we have to go deeper; we have to find out what is the future of public broadcasting. Is it still necessary? How much of it is necessary? In what direction will it go? I believe this should be a subject of detailed study by a committee and I urge the government to take into consideration the requests that have been made for the seting up of a committee to study the whole problem of the C.B.C., or public broadcasting in its entirety.

Mr. Webster: Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable discussion of the C.B.C. during the past two days. Most hon. members have been critical of this crown corporation. However, a great deal of the criticism has been constructive and justifiable. Especially has this been true of the remarks today of the hon. member for Calgary North and the hon. member for Churchill. There are also many others who are appreciative of the work of this important national service.

I think it is interesting to recall the early stages or the beginnings of television in Canada. A late prime minister, R. B. Bennett, said in this House of Commons in 1932:

> This country must be assured of complete Canadian control of broadcasting from Canadian

sources, free from foreign interference or influence. No other system than that of public ownership can ensure to the people of this country without regard to class or place, equal enjoyment of the benefits and pleasures of radio broadcasting.

The Liberal opposition wholly endorsed this view and the act of 1932 was adopted without a single dissenting voice. Throughout the years this great national service has developed in many directions. As we examine the C.B.C. we should in fairness remind ourselves of its admitted achievements. I wish to summarize briefly five areas of interest and accomplishment.

1. Both radio and television programs are presented daily to Canadian listeners and viewers in both English and French.

2. A great variety of attractions is provided, from popular sports and entertainment to public affairs and grand opera. The high standard of these programs is recognized annually by C.B.C.'s success in receiving an impressive series of awards in competition with American networks.

3. The C.B.C. provides a rare opportunity for the training and employment of musicians, artists, writers and commentators; not just a few in Toronto and Montreal but approximately 20,000 across Canada at the many production points. In one year approximately $16 million is paid to these talented people.

4. The C.B.C. helped to create Canada's image to the world by operating the international service; broadcasting by radio to a hundred countries in a dozen languages. Program offices are maintained in London, Paris and New York.

5. Free time on radio and television has been allocated to all political parties during and between election campaigns. This policy of using public funds to prepare the electorate for voting day has been widely appreciated.

Over the past 30 years there have been three royal commissions and 14 parliamentary committees which have all been charged with the responsibility of having a good look at the C.B.C. Each of these commissions and committees has arrived at the same conclusion; that Canadians want a national broadcasting service and they want it to be of a high standard. The most recent examination of the administration was made by the Fowler commission in 1957, which concluded its report with these words:

We must be prepared to spend public money in quite large quantities. The Canadian economy is just not big enough to support a broadcasting system on commercial resources alone. At least it would not be one we would want to have or one that would be anything more than the scattered outposts of American networks. The central factor in a Canadian system is the C.B.C. supported by money out of the public treasury for both its capital and operating needs.

[Mr. Webster.]

The Chairman: Shall the resolution carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to offer any vigorous criticism of the C.B.C. tonight, except to offer a word of caution to them. I think they must have recognized by now that the people of Canada are in fact alarmed about some of their programs. I am not one who has been too disappointed with the C.B.C. I think some of their programs are excellent; they compare very favourably with any t.v. programs in our modern western world. But I think the least they could do would be to give warning and state that these controversial subjects are going to be broadcast, so that at least those parents who have any control over the television in their homes—and most of us still have some—could encourage their children to look at something else.

I think some of these programs are educational and the motives behind putting them on are not pornographic or even to be very sensational. However, Mr. Chairman, I believe some care should be taken to make sure they are screened to the extent that they are not suddenly forced upon us in the middle of family viewing. If this is beyond the intelligence of the C.B.C. perhaps we will have to institute some form of screening. I am afraid of anything approaching government interference in this regard; in fact my main complaint about the C.B.C. is the fact that in our efforts to put them above interference we have made it possible for some people to use this medium as a very definite channel of political propaganda. I do not use the word "propaganda" accidentally, because I think it is an abuse of our privileges and freedoms when a member of any party can get on the air and give very, very controversial views and ideas, unless there is at least some balance, some opportunity for opposition to it if another party wishes to refute it at the time it should be refuted, which is right away. If you get on the air and give a lengthy statement on any subject, you can never withdraw it; it has gone out to the four corners of the country and it is impossible to undo the damage by merely saying a day or two later that you did not mean it, or something like that.

If on the particular program itself—and we have had some very good arguments brought before the public—views are expressed by all parties through representatives on the program, I think this is educational and should not be stopped. But the idea of using the air waves, especially at the expense of the taxpayer, to brainwash people is an abuse of our freedom which I for one am certainly dead against. That is my main criticism of the actual programming of the C.B.C.

I have another complaint to make. I do not think it is fair to spend all the taxpayers' money in one particular city. If we construct buildings in Montreal or Toronto costing $45 or $60 million it is going to be hard to sell the idea to the people living in sparsely populated areas that we are not putting all our eggs in one basket. As I said before I think C.B.C. programs are good but there are still many people in Canada not receiving them.

Therefore I should like to see the C.B.C. budget their expenditures, first of all to try to provide coverage to everyone in Canada before we go into the super luxury field. I think that $45 million or $60 million spent on one building is providing perhaps a little too much luxury for us at this particular stage. I am only giving an amateur's opinion of course; but the people in my sparsely populated district are not adequately covered by the C.B.C.

In view of the fact we are on interim supply I should like at this point to make a general complaint. I do not think that the members of this house are consulted enough in matters affecting their own ridings. If in the past governments have refused to consult with members of parliament this is a mistake, and let us not duplicate the mistakes of the past. For example, at the present time western Canada is largely represented in this house by the members of one party. Are we to ignore forever the needs of the people in the rural areas of western Canada merely because they are represented by only one party? To say that that is the way R. B. Bennett or Mackenzie King did it is not good enough for 1964.

We are being criticized both in the press and on television for not doing our job. If that is true it is because we are not keeping up with the problems of the day, problems which are new. We require greater co-operation and the government in power, particularly when it is a minority government, should be only too pleased to ask our opinion on matters. We cannot force them to do this but we do represent a cross section of the people; and as the present government only represents only one third of the constituencies in Canada surely something would be gained from consultation.

Some hon. members have suggested changing our committees system. We are now in committee of the whole, and I would suggest to this government that they or any other government which might take over might well use the intelligence and well thought out planning of other party members to enrich the life of our nation.

In the northern part of Alberta the C.B.C. are trying to set up booster stations to supply some television coverage, following along the line I have suggested of providing more coverage for our people before spending most of our money in one particular area. The rumour I have heard—it is only a rumour; I have had no official notice of this—is that a booster station will be erected at Slave Lake, northern Alberta. There is already a good booster station at Grande Prairie. This will cause overlapping of service, with double coverage in the Peace River area in the west end of my district and very little coverage in the central or eastern part. In cases like this a little consultation might have helped. If this station were constructed in the town of Athabasca rather than Slave Lake twice the area would be covered. The areas already covered would not suffer at all and television service would be provided to another 20,000 people who need it badly. It is probably the only television station they can tune into. I submit this is a fair way to spend some money; it is using it wisely and spending it where it will do the most good.

Not only in C.B.C. matters but also on agricultural questions and in other departments I think hon. gentlemen opposite could well use the information and the local knowledge which we have and which we are only too willing to give. I would even suggest that the government should not be allowed to spend more than $5,000 in any hon. member's constituency without first warning that hon. member. Then if he is not to be in any way affected by the administration of that money he should certainly have the right to say what he knows about the local conditions, and an alert government would be glad to hear it.

I have mentioned this before in matters affecting the post office. I do not think that anyone would want to deny people the proper delivery of Her Majesty's mails, yet during the

last 18 months I have never been consulted on the postal requirements in my district in any shape or form. I am not at all satisfied with the excuse that R. B. Bennett did not do it so this government will not do it. If that sort of thing took place there would be no progress whatever. This same reply has been given on more than one occasion. It is said that ministers 20 years ago did not answer questions so these ministers are not answering them.

This gives credence to the criticisms we are getting. I would warn the Liberal party that this sort of criticism usually comes from the longhairs or splinter parties. I think it would be a good idea if we smartened up and gave the kind of leadership which the two old parties are better qualified to give.

Mr. Knowles: Too late.

Mr. Grégoire: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Bigg: You can tell from the heckling, Mr. Chairman, that I am drawing some blood down there in the corner. They know what I am saying is true. There is a long and arduous campaign to discredit the older parties so as to assist one particular group of members in the house, and we all know who they are. They are members who never make a positive contribution themselves.

Mr. Grégoire: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Bigg: The handout programs are always their remedy because they do not have to raise the money. It is easy to ride the white horse when you do not have responsibility. In the six years I have been here I have never heard these people make any suggestions concerning how to raise more money. Their free money or give-away programs will never accomplish this. May I call it ten o'clock?

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Starr: I should like to ask the acting house leader whether the government intends to continue tomorrow the discussion on interim supply.

Mr. MacNaught: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Tomorrow we will continue this discussion of interim supply, and when that is completed we will take up main estimates, departments of citizenship and immigration, forestry and national revenue.

At ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

APPENDIX

LABOUR CONDITIONS—LETTER TO MANITOBA TRUCKING ASSOCIATION

Ottawa 4, October 23, 1964.

Dear Sirs:

This will acknowledge with thanks your telegram of October 21, referring to Bill C-126, an act respecting hours of work and minimum wages, annual vacations and holidays with pay in federal works, undertakings, and businesses.

At the present time this bill is being reviewed carefully by a committee of the whole house. The effect of the legislation on various industries within the federal jurisdiction, including the trucking and cartage industry, is now being closely examined. I can assure you that your representations in this connection will be carefully considered.

Yours sincerely,

Allan J. MacEachen

Manitoba Trucking Association,
Winnipeg, Manitoba.

20220—602½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, October 28, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

SPORTS

DESIGNATION OF HOCKEY AS CANADA'S NATIONAL GAME

Mr. Jack Roxburgh (Norfolk) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-132, respecting the national game of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Roxburgh: At this time it gives me real pleasure to ask parliament to give consideration to this bill to make hockey Canada's national game.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Roxburgh: Hockey is indeed a wonderful game, clean, fast and exhilarating. More than any game in Canada it has caught the imagination and enthusiasm of thousands upon thousands of people and has given them, and still gives them, great moments of enjoyment either as players or as spectators.

More especially is it favoured by the youth of Canada. Hockey with its dash, crash and smash truly represents the very tempo of our Canadian youth. Today hockey is recognized throughout the world as Canada's national game. During the period between the two world wars and for a long period after the second world war, when a very limited number of Canadians went overseas as tourists, or on business, or as politicians—

Some hon. Members: Carried.

An hon. Member: Time.

Mr. Roxburgh: Just a minute—if it had not been for the game of hockey being played throughout the countries of Europe, Europe would never have heard the name of Canada. And this is something very, very important. Outside of war at that time—not now, but at that time—the only time they ever heard the name of Canada mentioned was when our hockey team played in their countries.

I should like to say this to the sports minded people of all these countries and also of Canada. The words "hockey" and "Canada" are synonymous. Hockey is Canada; Canada is hockey.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. W. H. Jorgenson (Provencher): Now that we have heard those very interesting remarks, I wonder if the hon. member would mind telling us the purpose of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PENSIONS

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTRIBUTORY PROGRAM

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution, which has been recommended to the house by His Excellency:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure, to be known as the Canada pension plan, to establish in Canada a comprehensive program of retirement pensions payable to contributors; to provide for the payment of supplementary benefits, including benefits for the widows and orphans of contributors and benefits to contributors who become disabled; to provide for the co-ordination of pensions payable under the Old Age Security Act with benefits payable under the Canada pension plan and for the payment of adjusted pensions under the Old Age Security Act beginning at any age from 65 years; to provide for the adjustment of pensions and other benefits in line with increases in earnings and the cost of living; to provide that funds arising from the operation of the Canada pension plan shall be invested in securities of the provinces, provincially guaranteed securities of provincial crown agents, and securities of Canada; and to provide further that all expenditures under the Canada pension plan, including cost of administration, shall be financed from contributions by employees and employers and from contributions by persons in respect of self-employed earnings.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ARMED FORCES—SENIOR OFFICERS RETIRED

Question No. 1,727—**Mr. Harkness:**

1. Since January 1, 1964, how many officers of the rank of commodore and above in the navy, brigadier and above in the army, air commodore

Questions

and above in the R.C.A.F. have ceased to be members of the permanent forces, or have been given notice that they would be retired, or have sent in their resignations?

2. In each case, what is the name of the officer, the appointment held by him, his age and, where applicable, the number of years and months he would have to go to normal retirement age?

3. In each of the above cases indicate whether the officer retired on reaching normal retirement age, whether he put in his resignation of his own volition, or whether he was asked to retire?

4. How many officers of the ranks indicated in part 1 have been promoted in rank, what are their names, and ages as of the date of promotion?

5. What will be the total amount of their pensions from the date of their retirement until their normal retirement date?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1. From January 1, 1964 to August 18, 1964—26.

2 and 3.

Name	Rank	Age	Appointment	Length of time to normal retirement age	Remarks
R.C.N.					
H. S. Rayner.....	Vice admiral	54	Chief of the naval staff	9 mos.	Normal retirement—having completed normal time of duty as CNS.
T. B. McLean.....	Surg. rear admiral	54	Surgeon general Cdn. forces and Her Majesty's honorary surgeon	5 mos.	Normal retirement
J. V. Brock.....	Rear admiral	51	Flag officer Atlantic coast. senior officer in chief command, Atlantic. commander Atlantic sub-area and maritime commander Atlantic.	3 yrs. 2 mos.	By notice
H. L. Quinn.....	Commodore	55	Naval member—directing staff national defence college	—	Normal retirement
A. B. F. Fraser-Harris..	Commodore	48	Asst. chief of naval staff (air and warfare)	6 yrs. 7 mos.	By notice
Canadian army					
A. E. Wrinch.....	Major general	56	Major general survival	—	Normal retirement
J. P. Bernatchez.....	Major general	53	Vice chief of the general staff	11 mos. 14 days	Normal retirement. Position abolished.
J. E. C. Pangman.....	Brigadier	56	Commander—Manitoba area	—	Normal retirement
J. R. B. Jones.....	Brigadier	55	Chairman—army rank and trade structure committee	—	Normal retirement
J. B. Allan.....	Brigadier	50	Vice quartermaster-general	3 yrs. 11 mos.	By notice
G. L. M. Smith.....	Brigadier	55	Deputy surgeon general (admin.)	—	Normal retirement
A. F. B. Knight.....	Brigadier	54	Commander, New Brunswick area	—	Normal retirement
W. J. Moogk.....	Brigadier	54	Commander, Camp Borden and target area headquarters Toronto	—	Normal retirement

Questions

Name	Rank	Age	Appointment	Length of time to normal retirement age	Remarks
R.C.A.F.					
C. R. Slemon	Air marshal	59	Deputy commander North American air defence	—	Normal retirement
R. A. Cameron	Air vice marshal	54	Military advisor Cdn. delegation Paris	—	Normal retirement
M. M. Hendrick	Air vice marshal	54	Air officer commanding air defence command	—	Normal retirement
W. A. Orr	Air vice marshal	53	Air member for personnel	6 mos.	Normal retirement
G. S. Austin	Air commodore	48	Chief of plans and intelligence	4 yrs. 6 mos.	Voluntary retirement
R. H. Bray	Air commodore	54	Deputy air member technical services	—	Normal retirement
G. D. Caldbick	Air commodore	54	Deputy surgeon general	—	Normal retirement
S. G. Cowan	Air commodore	53	Chief of materiel	—	Normal retirement
E. L. Gerow	Air commodore	55	Chieff of finance	—	Normal retirement
R. J. Gray	Air commodore	49	Chief—organization and management	3 yrs. 1 mo.	Voluntary retirement
E. C. Poole	Air commodore	53	Chief of telecommunications	—	Normal retirement
N. W. Timmerman	Air commodore	51	Deputy commander 29 region NORAD	—	Normal retirement
J. A. Verner	Air commodore	52	Chief staff officer training command Winnipeg	2 mos.	Normal retirement

4. Nine, Vice Admiral K. L. Dyer, 48; Lieutenant General J. V. Allard, 51; Lieutenant General R. W. Moncel, 47; Air Marshal C. L. Annis, 52; Rear Admiral R. P. Welland, 46; Surg. Rear Admiral W. J. Elliott, 50; Air Vice Marshal M. P. Martyn, 51; Acting Air Vice Marshal M. Lipton, 48; Acting Air Commodore C. W. Burgess, 49.

5. $217,044.98.

DISABLED PERSONS ALLOWANCES TO MENTALLY RETARDED

Question No. 1,913—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. In each province, and in Canada, how many mentally retarded persons are currently in receipt of allowances under the Disabled Persons Act?

2. In each province, and in Canada, what is the annual disbursement to mentally retarded persons under the Disabled Persons Act?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. The international classification of diseases is used in classifying the disabilities of recipients under the Disabled Persons Act. In this classification the designation mentally retarded is not used and therefore no data are available. There is, however, a designation of mentally defective in the classification which is used by the physicians in determining the type of total and permanent disabilities under the disability allowance program and data are available concerning this group of recipients.

Based on an analysis of the total case load as at March 31, 1961, the number of mentally defective recipients as at August, 1964, is estimated as follows:

Newfoundland	550
Prince Edward Island	260
Nova Scotia	924
New Brunswick	798
Quebec	6,865
Ontario	4,299
Manitoba	599
Saskatchewan	731
Alberta	698
British Columbia	748
Total	16,472

2. The estimated total of federal and provincial expenditure for a 12 month period based on the above figures is as follows:

Newfoundland	$ 488,000
Prince Edward Island	231,000
Nova Scotia	820,000
New Brunswick	708,000
Quebec	6,091,000
Ontario	3,814,000
Manitoba	531,000
Saskatchewan	649,000
Alberta	619,000
British Columbia	664,000
Total	$14,615,000

NATIONAL PARKS—LAUNCHING FEES FOR BOATS

Question No. 1,949—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

1. Do all national parks in Canada charge launching fees for boats?
2. Under what regulations are these fees charged and when were these regulations passed?
3. In what national parks are launching fees charged and what is the fee per day, and/or week?
4. What is the reason for the launching fee?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. No.

2. The national parks business regulations, passed on April 12, 1962.

3. Only in Prince Albert national park, where the department spent to date since 1961 $526,625 on construction of a marina. This project has virtually been completed this year except for landscaping. The marina has been let to a concessionnaire and the purpose of the fees is to recover costs of operating the marina from the public using this facility. The approved launching fee is $1.50 per launching, in-out charge, or $5 per season, any number of launchings during the boating season.

CENTRAL PURCHASING AGENCY FOR INDIAN RESERVES

Question No. 1,992—**Mr. McCutcheon:**

1. Is there now a central supply purchasing agency for all Indian reserves?
2. Is this a change in procedure?
3. Does this agency call for tenders for the supply of materials to be used on Indian reserves?
4. Are local businesses no longer invited to tender?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1, 2, 3 and 4. No. Purchasing of supplies for Indian reserves is undertaken by the Department of Defence Production, the chief purchasing agent of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, and field officers of the Indian affairs branch, in accordance with the government contracts regulations. Local businesses are invited to tender where the circumstances warrant.

PROVISION OF AIRPORT FACILITIES, SAWMILL BAY, N.W.T.

Question No. 2,018—**Mr. Rhéaume:**

Has the Department of Transport reviewed the volume of traffic to and from the airport at Sawmill bay during the past year and, if so, does the department intend to resume responsibility for the operation and maintenance of this airport and, if not, will the department undertake such a study immediately with a view to providing adequate airport facilities at Sawmill bay, N.W.T.?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Air traffic at Sawmill bay, Caywood field, during the past summer season consisted of one weekly charter flight by TransAir from Winnipeg, one weekly charter flight by P.W.A. from Edmonton, several additional charter flights by P.W.A. in support of mining operations and a variety of light private aircraft traffic generated mainly by five active fishing camps in the area.

This airport was built by Eldorado Mining and Refining Company in 1946 and has been operated and maintained by this company until leased recently to Great Bear lodge. The Department of Transport has no present plans to assume this responsibility.

PLANS FOR TOWNSITE, BAKER LAKE, N.W.T.

Question No. 2,053—**Mr. Simpson:**

1. Has a contract been awarded for the preparation of plans for a proposed townsite at Baker lake, district of Keewatin, N.W.T. and, if so, what firm of engineers has been appointed to do this work?
2. Were tenders called for this work and, if so (a) from whom were bids received (b) what was the extent of the advertising of same?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. No.

2. (a) No; (b) N/A.

BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION, ALMA, N.B.

Question No. 2,065—**Mr. Bell:**

Have discussions taken place between the federal government and the government of New Brunswick regarding responsibility for the bridge at the eastern approach to Fundy national park at Alma and, if so, with what result as to both responsibility and the commencement of construction?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): In August, 1958, the federal government concluded that since this bridge was on provincial land it was a responsibility of the province of New Brunswick. The Department of Northern

Affairs and National Resources was authorized at that time to carry out repairs on the existing bridge because of its close relation to the operation of Fundy national park. However, the scheduling of construction of a new bridge at the eastern approach to Fundy national park at Alma rests with the province.

CREDIT POLICY OF BANK OF CANADA

Question No. 2,089—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Has the Bank of Canada the power to grant credits to foreign countries and, if so (a) at what rate of interest (b) on what terms?

2. Has the Bank of Canada ever used this power and, if so (a) what countries benefited by such credits (b) in what years (c) at what rate of interest?

3. Can the Bank of Canada allow provincial and municipal governments to benefit by the same credit policy?

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1. Under sections 18(1)(d) and (e) of the Bank of Canada Act, the bank may buy and sell short term securities issued by the United Kingdom having a maturity not exceeding six months from the date of acquisition by the bank and may buy and sell treasury bills or other obligations of the United States of America. Under section 18 (1)(m) of the Bank of Canada Act, the bank is authorized to place funds on deposit with foreign central banks.

(a) and (b) Interest rates and other terms are not specified in the act.

2. (a) and (b) Aside from deposits with foreign central banks which have been used solely for working balances and securities of the United States of America acquired in the ordinary course of business, the following special arrangements have been made: In June, 1962, the bank entered into a reciprocal currency arrangement with the federal reserve system in the amount of U.S. $250,000,000 and at the same time the Bank of England placed an amount of U.S. $100,000,000 at the disposal of the Bank of Canada. These credits were fully availed of and had the effect at the time of increasing the Bank of Canada's exchange holdings by U.S. $350,000,000. These transactions had been reversed by December, 1962. At that time the arrangement with the Bank of England lapsed and the one with the federal reserve system was placed on a stand-by basis. In November, 1963, at the time of the assassination of the President of the United States, the stand-by arrangement with the federal reserve system was, on the initiative of the latter, implemented to the extent of U.S. $20,000,000 for a short period. In September, 1964, the Bank of Canada, in conjunction with a number of other central banks, agreed to place an amount of U.S. dollars on deposit with the Bank of England if the Bank of England so requested.

(c) Not a matter of public record.

3. Under section 18(1)(c) the bank may buy and sell securities issued or guaranteed by any province. Under section 18(1)(i) and (j) the bank may make advances to provincial governments under certain conditions. The Bank of Canada Act does not authorize the bank to maintain deposits with provincial or municipal governments.

[*Text*]

REPRESENTATIONS BY NIAGARA FALLS COUNCIL ON MEDICAL CARE

Question No. 2,099—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Has the government received representations from the Niagara Falls city council deploring the increase in P.S.I. insurance rates, and recommending the early implementation of a national medicare plan and, if so, what has been their reply?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, the Minister of National Health and Welfare received a letter dated October 7, 1964, from the clerk of the city of Niagara Falls.

On October 15 the minister replied indicating that as Physicians' Services Incorporated is a private organization, the question of increased P.S.I. rate does not come within the purview of federal jurisdiction but that she had made particular note of the view of local 536 of the united electrical, radio and machine workers of America regarding the effect on their members of such increased rates.

The minister also drew attention to the recent report of the royal commission on health services and to the wide financial and program implications requiring considerable detailed analyses and stated that careful studies are now being made by the government. A copy of a summary of the recommendations of the royal commission was attached to the minister's letter.

WRITE-OFF OF SEED GRAIN DEBTS

Question No. 2,107—**Mr. Lambert:**

1. What is the amount of the write-off of seed grain debts incurred by western farmers between 1876 and 1925 as recently announced by the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources?

2. What was the amount with respect to each of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?

3. Can an estimate be made of the land involved in each of the three said provinces and, if so, what

Questions

is the respective amount of land cleared of liens by this action in each of the prairie provinces?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. $716,743.15. This amount includes $33,442.15 in book debts for which there is no security by way of liens against land or the personal covenant of the borrowers.

2. Manitoba, nil. All Manitoba accounts were settled in 1955. Saskatchewan, $431,602.51; Alberta, $285,140.64.

3. Manitoba, N/A. Saskatchewan, approximately 5,300 individual properties were cleared of liens. Alberta, approximately 4,800 individuals properties were cleared of liens.

AIR CANADA UNIFORMS FOR STEWARDESSES

Question No. 2,121—**Mr. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke):**

1. What will be the cost to Air Canada of outfitting their stewardesses with new uniforms; broken down to show the cost of designing, promoting and any other costs to the company and the cost to the stewardesses?

2. How many designs were submitted to Air Canada and who submitted them?

3. Whose design was chosen and for what reasons and how much was paid the designer?

4. Is there a contract for making these uniforms and, if so, were tenders called, who bid on them and who holds the contract?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): The management of Trans-Canada Air Lines advises as follows:

1. The total cost of the new uniform is approximately $160,000, including purchase, design, etc. By agreement with the flight attendants, the company will pay about 75 per cent of this cost. No specific proportion of recent advertising of the company's new look can be attributed to promotion of the new stewardess uniform.

2. More than a dozen designs were submitted to Air Canada by three firms; M. Robichaud of Montreal, Tip Top Tailors of Toronto, and B. Reig of New York.

3. The uniform chosen was designed by M. Robichaud. It was chosen because it was considered to be the most functional, fashionable and economical. Designer's fee is included in 1 above.

4. Tenders were called for manufacture of the uniform; five firms submitted bids, and the contract was awarded to Tip Top Tailors of Toronto.

DEATHS IN HUNTING ACCIDENTS

Question No. 2,129—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

In each province, in each of the last ten years, how many shooting deaths have occurred in hunting accidents?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Attached is a table showing the number of fatalities due to accidents involving firearms, 1954-1963. Of these, it is not known how many involved hunting accidents.

FIREARM FATALITIES IN CANADA AND THE PROVINCES, 1954-1963

—	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
Canada	166	176	163	166	170	167	216	176	189	150
Newfoundland	2	3	2	6	2	3	6	6	4	6
Prince Edward Island	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—
Nova Scotia	12	16	8	6	15	8	8	7	18	8
New Brunswick	13	7	12	9	4	9	14	7	9	6
Quebec	40	44	37	41	31	40	56	49	46	37
Ontario	38	54	47	43	61	57	71	49	48	44
Manitoba	13	14	12	13	12	10	11	12	12	9
Saskatchewan	14	11	13	12	6	8	19	12	14	12
Alberta	15	11	13	14	14	13	17	16	17	11
British Columbia	17	13	17	21	21	18	12	16	18	16
Yukon	1	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—
Northwest Territories	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR MOUNT HOPE AIRPORT, HAMILTON

Question No. 2,130—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. Now that the Hamilton city council has agreed to take over Mount Hope airport, have federal funds been made available for the development of this airport?

2. How much has been given, and for what specific purpose or purposes?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

2. For rehabilitation of essential aircraft manoeuvring areas, including a portion of the aircraft parking area, the taxiway along hangar line, a portion of runway 16-34, and certain other patching and repair work. Final cost has not yet been established but it is expected that total expenditures may be something over $200,000.

DEATH RATES RELATED TO INCOME GROUPS

Question No. 2,133—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Has the government ever conducted a study of Canadian death rates relative to income groups and, if so, what were the results of this study?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The government has not conducted a study of Canadian death rates relative to income groups.

UNION DUES REMITTED TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Question No. 2,134—**Mr. Muir (Lisgar):**

Questions

1. For the years ending December 31, 1962 and December 31, 1963, what is the total amount of union dues collected in this country remitted to foreign countries?

2. What is the total amount of such dues remitted to the United States?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1 and 2. Information on the total amount of union dues collected in this country and remitted to foreign countries for the years ending December 31, 1962 and December 31, 1963, is being obtained under the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act. This information will be contained in the annual report which, it is hoped, will be available before the end of the year.

STUDY OF LIVING COSTS OF AGED PERSONS

Question No. 2,135—**Mr. Muir (Lisgar):**

1. Has the government made a comparison of the income and the living costs of the aged as between those residing in urban and rural areas and, if so, what are the findings of such study?

2. If no such study has been made does the government intend to initiate such a survey?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. Information is not available on living costs of the aged. Total income, by size, for the non-farm population, 70 years of age and over, by sex, for Canada, rural and urban, for the year ended May 31, 1961, is as follows:

	Males		Females	
	Rural No.	Urban No.	Rural No.	Urban No.
Without Income	213	1,464	681	5,561
With Income				
Under $ 500	994	2,428	2,111	13,418
$ 500-$ 999	55,220	94,279	61,373	195,623
$ 1,000-$1,499	13,589	42,322	7,125	37,661
$ 1,500-$1,999	7,712	29,002	2,121	18,969
$ 2,000-$2,499	4,369	19,347	1,342	11,463
$ 2,500-$2,999	2,723	14,525	551	6,678
$ 3,000-$3,499	1,912	11,754	456	4,086
$ 3,500-$3,999	1,301	8,258	217	2,841
$ 4,000-$4,499	816	6,115	337	3,510
$ 4,500-$4,999	692	4,237		
$ 5,000-$5,999	780	6,237		
$ 6,000-$9,999	1,191	9,091	415	6,083
$10,000+	564	5,951		
Total Number*:	91,863	253,546	76,048	300,332
Average $*:	1,382	2,321	888	1,221

*Persons without income not included.

Source: 1961 Census of Canada, catalogue number 98-501, volume IV.

2. Studies such as indicated are not contemplated at present.

RADIOACTIVITY LEVELS IN MILK

Question No. 2,146—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

What have been the average levels of Strontium 90 and Caesium 137 in Canadian milk in each month of the last three years?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare):

	Average levels of Strontium 90 in milk			Average levels of Caesium 137 in milk		
	1962(a)	1963(b)	1964(b)	1962(a)	1963(c)	1964(c)
January	7.1	19.2	43.1(d)	19.7	—	254
February	7.1	19.1	41.3	19.6	63	250
March	6.9	18.7	40.6	15.6	53	251
April	9.4	17.4	41.5	20.3	80	246
May	13.7	24.5	46.4	35.6	112	245
June	20.2	45.2	42.5	77.8	187	227
July	26.5	46.4	37.9	125.0	239	209
August	26.0	52.7	32.5	106.5	260	175
September	25.9	52.3	32.7(d)	83.8	232	147(d)
October	32.0	45.0	—	90.9	203	—
November	32.7	42.3	—	90.3	230	—
December	27.1	40.5	—	102.0	245	—

(a) Powdered milk samples, results expressed as picocuries per gram calcium.

(b) Fluid milk samples, results expressed as picocuries per liter. (1 liter contains approximately 1.2 grams calcium).

(c) Fluid milk samples, results expressed as picocuries per liter. (1 liter contains approximately 1.5 gram potassium).

(d) Preliminary estimate.

POST OFFICE CONSTRUCTION, MEGANTIC CONSTITUENCY, QUE.

Question No. 2,151—**Mr. Langlois:**

With reference to the construction of post offices for the municipalities of Notre Dame de la Guadeloupe, Coleraine Station, Leeds village, Garthby Station and St. Méthode, in the constituency of Mégantic (a) to whom were the various contracts awarded (b) who submitted tenders (c) what was the price for each of the various post offices, and (d) what were the dimensions of each of the post offices?

[*Translation*]

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): The only contract awarded to date was on September 25, 1964, for the construction of a new post office building at La Guadeloupe.

(a) La Guadeloupe Construction Engr., La Guadeloupe, Que.

(b) La Guadeloupe Construction Engr., La Guadeloupe, Que., Herve Lessard & Sigefroid Labrecque, East Broughton, Que., Claude Bourassa, Victoriaville, Que., Maquis Freres Limitée, Sherbrooke, Que., Girard Frere Engr., Chicoutimi, Que.

(c) $24,477.

(d) 37 feet by 38 feet—one storey.

[*Text*]

IDENTICAL TENDERS FOR ROCK SALT, HAMILTON, ONT.

Question No. 2,163—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. Has the restrictive trade practices commission investigated, within the past three years, charges of identical tenders for rock salt submitted to the city of Hamilton, Ontario and, if so, what were the results of such investigation?

2. Was legal action taken on the basis of these findings?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1. Yes, complaints were received from a number of cities, towns and other municipalities in Ontario, including the city of Hamilton, and the inquiry dealt largely, but not entirely, with conditions in Ontario. As the facts fell short of establishing collusion between the two Canadian producers, the inquiry was discontinued by the director of investigation and research in March 1964 with the concurrence of the restrictive trade practices commission. The discontinuance of the inquiry is reported in the annual report of the director for the year ended March 31, 1964, at pages 27-28.

2. Answered by 1.

NATIONAL DEFENCE BUDGETS

Question No. 2,173—**Mr. Prittie:**

1. What was the total amount of the budgets of the Department of National Defence for the fiscal years 1949-50 to 1962-63 inclusive?

2. What was the total amount of actual expenditures by the Department of National Defence for the fiscal years 1949-50 to 1962-63 inclusive?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1. $22,180,643,239.

2. $20,773,247,021.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

*LOUISBURG, N.S., HISTORIC SITE

Question No. 2,102—**Mr. Fisher:**

1. What are the plans for the establishment of an archives and library at Louisburg, Nova Scotia, including an estimated cost, the estimated space proposed, the number of books and documents to be housed, the scale and qualifications of the staff, the number of exhibition cases and tables, the kind of provisions made for the use of scholars, and the structure of the management in relation to other government departments?

2. How much money is now being spent on research in England, France and the United States with regard to the Louisburg project?

3. What historical data is being collected and how relevant is the data in so far as the reconstruction project is concerned?

4. What are the names of the persons carrying out the research, their academic qualifications and experience and the amount and method of payment of their salaries and expenses?

Return tabled.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, motion 178 is acceptable to the government. Would Your Honour please call motions 176, 177, 179 and 180. I ask that motion 170 be allowed to stand.

USE OF WHARF, PORT SIMPSON, B.C.

Motion No. 178—**Mr. Howard:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, and other documents exchanged between the Department of Transport or any agency or branch thereof in British Columbia, and any person, group, or organization, since January 1, 1964, relating to the wharf at Port Simpson, B.C., and relating to the loading and/or unloading of freight thereat.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE CONSTRUCTION, NOTRE DAME DE LA GUADELOUPE, QUE.

Motion No. 176—**Mr. Langlois:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and letters exchanged between the Minister of Public Works, the Postmaster General and the municipality of Notre Dame de la Guadeloupe in the constituency of Mégantic, concerning the construction of a post office and the acquisition of land for this purpose, since January 1, 1958.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, when this motion came before the house last week, in the absence of the hon. member for Mégantic I asked that it stand for two weeks. I have since talked with the hon. member and have cleared up the point that was disturbing me. He has asked for the production of all correspondence, telegrams and letters exchanged since January 1, 1958, between the Minister of Public Works, the Postmaster General and the municipality named in the motion. On the understanding that it is agreed by the hon. member that correspondence between the municipality in question, the Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General will be produced, but not correspondence between ministers, the motion is accepted.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservation as expressed by the minister, is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES BY PROVINCES

Motion No. 177—**Mr. Grégoire:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of the report prepared by officials of the Department of Finance concerning federal expenditures in each of the provinces of Canada.

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should say that there is no such report as suggested in the motion. At the same time I should add that work has been done by the officials, and is continuing, to provide information for the minister with which to answer the large number of questions that have been asked on this subject matter. In view of the circumstances I would respectfully invite the hon. member to withdraw the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, the report we would like to have tabled is the one which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) promised October 7 last, when he denied certain figures mentioned in the motion. We believe that the Minister of Finance could at least table what he promised us October 7 last.

[*Text*]

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the precise answer given by the minister,

but I respectfully suggest that the hon. member put his question upon the order paper and I undertake to see that it is given attention.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the explanation of the parliamentary secretary I wonder whether it would serve any useful purpose to demand the production of privileged material. It seems to me that no particular purpose is being served, and I wonder whether in the circumstances the hon. member would care to withdraw his motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I would request that this matter be discussed at five o'clock, Thursday, in view of the fact that those are not privileged documents, but material prepared by the officials of the Department of Finance and which the Minister of Finance said he would communicate to this house at the appropriate time. If those documents are too incriminating for the government, let him say so; otherwise he should produce them, since he told us on August 7 last that those documents existed.

[*Text*]

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to enter into a debate with the hon. member, but I cannot accept the suggestion that there is anything compromising in the position of the Minister of Finance. The minister has been answering as expeditiously as possible all the questions that have been asked on this subject matter, and answered a very lengthy one today. I can only repeat the answer I gave a short time ago, and would again ask the hon. member to withdraw the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: I wish that this matter be transferred for debate at five o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 47 this motion is transferred to notices of motions (papers).

WHARF CONSTRUCTION, NORTH SYDNEY, N.S.

Motion No. 179—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

That an order of the house do issue for copies of the original and final specifications required in connection with the terminal development construction of a public wharf at North Sydney, Nova Scotia, the tenders for which closed September 30, 1964.

Mr. G. Roy McWilliam (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, this motion refers to copies of the original and final specifications. I am advised that there is only one set of specifications, and on this understanding this motion is acceptable.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservation expressed by the parliamentary secretary is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH WEATHER ENGINEERING CORPORATION

Motion No. 180—**Mr. Laprise:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all correspondence and telegrams exchanged since 1954, between the Weather Engineering Corporation of Canada and the Department of Transport or any agency of the department.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has informed us that he is willing to limit his motion to the tabling of the correspondence between the Weather Engineering Corporation and the department on the sole subject of rainmaking. Subject to that reservation, there is no objection to the motion.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservation expressed by the parliamentary secretary to the minister, is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS TO PENDING LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in view of the amount of controversy there is in connection with the sections of the labour code to which strong objection has been taken by the trucking industry, and the report today that the government does not intend to take any action to remove the differences between the industry and the department, would the minister for the sake of the record give the house some general idea of what he has in mind? He has told me on two occasions that he thought he had a plan whereby the criticisms which have been offered would be met and the dangers to

the industry would be avoided. My correspondence in this regard is very lengthy, and telegrams are being received, and the minister must be experiencing the same situation. Surely he would be willing, in order to let the industry know something of what he has in mind, to summarize his ideas in this connection.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, if it is agreeable to the Leader of the Opposition I would be glad to take this question as notice and at the first opportunity meet his wishes.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Could the minister look into this and give us an answer tomorrow? At the moment we are dealing with interim supply and we do not want to go into this field. We would very much appreciate a statement, because the industry is quite exercised over the situation.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): A supplementary question. When the minister is answering the Leader of the Opposition I wonder if he would advise the house whether he has referred this bill to and got an opinion from the Department of Justice as to what industries are affected, so that Canadian industries and working groups will know to whom this bill applies?

Mr. MacEachen: Unfortunately Mr. Speaker, I will not be in the house tomorrow, but perhaps I should indicate to the Leader of the Opposition today that I have under consideration a change to the transitional clause in part I covering hours of work.

At the present time it is possible within the terms of the bill for an industrial establishment to come forward and indicate that the operation of the hours of work provision will be detrimental either to the employees, the industry, the operation or the business. If that is demonstrated it is possible to grant an extension of 18 months for a period of adjustment. That possibility is included in the present terms of the bill and gives a considerable time latitude in adjusting to the requirements of the bill.

However, in addition to that I have under consideration a change under which, in certain circumstances and following appropriate inquiry, an extension of time would be granted beyond the present terms of the legislation. I think if this change is put into appropriate form it will meet the major objections of those operations which will find it difficult to implement the hours of work provisions at once, or even over a period of 18 months.

I believe that during the committee of the whole stage we can discuss this aspect and satisfy hon. members that appropriate steps are being taken.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Perhaps I may be allowed to ask one more question, Mr. Speaker. Has the trucking industry, or any other industry to which reference has been made, had this suggestion submitted to it so the committee might have the benefit, through the minister, of their views and advice regarding the pertinence and also the effectiveness of these amendments he has in mind?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I have had discussions with the various trucking interests and have indicated to them that this is what I have in mind. It seemed that a week or so ago when I met a large group of truckers this satisfied them. It may be that they have had further thoughts and that something of this kind, which I did not present in the detail I have given today, would satisfy them.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister whether there is any likelihood that he can give us a copy of the amendments so that we could study them prior to their presentation to the committee of the whole.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, this whole procedure is irregular, because under the rules I should not be permitted to answer questions in respect of a matter on the order paper. I did so, however, to accommodate the interest in this particular case. I do not think the irregularity should be extended further by presenting amendments at this stage before we commence our consideration.

INQUIRY AS TO WINTER WORKS PROGRAM IN NATIONAL PARKS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. In view of the announcement of the winter works program for Cape Breton national park, will the minister say when we can expect winter works programs for other national parks to be announced, and particularly Fundy national park where the work is desperately needed this winter?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): I think there

is a winter works program in mind for Fundy. We are endeavouring to accommodate the winter works program in that general area to a time which will permit us to accomplish it before what is regarded as the heavy snow period. We want to get started soon because there comes a time, in January I understand, when it is not possible to continue the work.

Mr. Bell: Do I take it from the minister's statement that they expect snow in Cape Breton before it comes to Fundy?

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): May I ask a supplementary question. Will the minister give consideration to the idea of expanding the winter works program as compared with what it was in previous years?

Mr. Laing: I believe the winter works program in Cape Breton national park is at least as high as if not higher than last year.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): May I ask a supplementary question of the minister. Will the minister take a look at the announcement made, in conjunction with the Minister of Labour, with regard to the way the work force is divided up, primarily to the great advantage of the Minister of Labour?

Mr. Laing: I will, and I have.

IMMIGRATION

DAISY MAUD HENRY—CONSIDERATION OF DEPORTATION ORDER

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 Citizenship and Immigration, but before doing so I should like to express our delight at seeing the Minister of Transport back in his seat.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: We are pleased that he has recovered from his indisposition, and we hope he will now be back to his old bouncy self again.

My question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is this. Has he as yet made a decision in respect of the case of Daisy Maud Henry? This case was referred to the minister about two weeks ago and I am inquiring regarding this lady who has asked him to reverse a decision of the appeal board regarding a deportation order which was issued against her.

[Mr. Laing.]

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I believe I gave a reply to that question on Monday last.

[*Text*]

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, as I recall the minister's explanation at that time, it was that he was going to look at the report when it was received. Has the minister decided to reverse the decision and cancel the deportation order?

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I made a statement on Monday on this subject.

LABOUR RELATIONS

MONTREAL—INQUIRY AS TO REPORT ON LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour.

Could the minister tell us when the second part of the report of Mr. Justice René Lippé concerning the dockers retirement fund will be published? According to my information, the judge is already in possession of this report; we would like to know when it will be made available to the public.

[*Text*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): I should like to take this question as notice and answer the hon. member later.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

SUGGESTED DANGER OF CURTAILMENT OF HOSPITAL AUTONOMY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In a speech this week delivered by her parliamentary secretary on her behalf she issued a warning to the hospitals saying that their autonomy could be curtailed. Can the minister specify how much curtailment could take place, by whom and at what level of government the curtailment procedure would be initiated?

Mr. Speaker: This question is obviously important and interesting, but perhaps it should be put on the order paper.

ROYAL COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS RESPECTING MEDICAL CARE PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Because of the introduction of a rather inferior medical plan in the province of Ontario, is the minister considering speeding up the introduction of the recommendations of the Hall commission, to provide a proper federal medical plan?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I suppose my hon. friend is referring to a headline in a Toronto morning newspaper which indicated that a report is being made to the provincial government. As yet there is no indication that they are going to bring in what my hon. friend has characterized as an inferior plan.

However, I would like to say that my department is working at top speed in order to have recommendations to make to the premiers of the provinces, but because it is a matter of such great cost and importance I do not think it would be possible to have an earlier target than that already selected and announced.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR AGENDA OF DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Some time ago the minister indicated that he would be making public the agenda for the dominion-provincial conference on Indian affairs. Inasmuch as this conference is just around the corner, I wonder if the minister could tell us what the agenda is.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question directed to me by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas), I believe, I said that the members of the house who would express the wish to be made aware of the topics to be discussed during that conference could secure a list from me.

As the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam had expressed his interest, I sent him a letter listing the questions to be discussed. I will be glad to send all hon. members of the house who so wish a list of the subjects to be discussed during that conference.

[*Text*]

[*Later:*]

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a question relating to the answer given just a moment ago by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration regarding the agenda for the dominion-provincial conference on Indian affairs. I understood the minister to say he undertook some time ago to send a copy of the conference agenda to members who expressed interest in it, but that is not what he said at the time he gave an answer to the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam on October 9. As recorded at page 8924 of *Hansard* for that date the minister said:

> Mr. Speaker, I shall be pleased to send to the hon. members a copy of the agenda which lists the problems to be discussed.

Some of us have been waiting for the transmission of that document, or for it to be made public, so we can communicate the information contained in it to people back home. It is unfortunate that the words used by the minister on October 9 did not truly or accurately reflect his intentions.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I noted that the plural was used in the reference to "the hon. members", while what I said then, in reply to the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas), was that I would be pleased to send "to the hon. member" a copy of the agenda. That is what I did.

However, I shall gladly send a similar copy of the agenda to all hon. members anxious to get one.

[*Text*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

COLUMBIA RIVER—ABSENCE OF NATIONAL FLAGS AT SIGNING OF TREATY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Athabasca): I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, following up a question put to him yesterday by the hon. member for Regina City. Can he now tell the house whether a deliberate decision was made by the officials of his department that the Canadian red ensign and the stars and stripes would not be used as a backdrop for the

ceremonial signing of the Columbia river treaty, which took place in the railway committee room?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I made some inquiries, and I can find no confirmation for the alleged statement.

PUBLIC WORKS

OTTAWA—LEASE OF SPACE BY DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. Pascoe (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre): I wish to address a question to the Minister of Industry. On March 4, in answer to my question, the minister's parliamentary secretary stated that the Department of Industry had leased the entire 11 storey Macdonald building on Slater street in Ottawa, with the exception of the ground floor, at a rental of $384,000 a year, with 119 private offices, 59 shared offices and 29 general offices. Can the minister confirm the report that, because of additional personnel, the department is now taking over space in another building?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Perhaps I should—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Unless we can clean this matter up very quickly, it is a typical question for the order paper.

Mr. Drury: I think I can. There are a couple of points. First, the Minister of Industry has no parliamentary secretary. Second, the Department of Industry does not lease space in Ottawa; this is the responsibility of the Department of Public Works. Third, the Department of Industry is not expanding its premises or personnel.

HOUSING

OTTAWA—USE OF FORMER GIRLS' RESIDENCE BY RETIRED CIVIL SERVANTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. McBain (Elgin): My question concerns possibly two departments, the Department of Public Works and the Postmaster General. In view of the absence of the Minister of Public Works perhaps the Postmaster General can consult with his colleagues. Has the Postmaster General, in his capacity as minister responsible for housing, received requests from organizations or individuals suggesting that Laurentian terrace on Sussex street, the former girls' residence, be maintained as a residence for retired civil servants who only have small pensions as income?

[Mr. Bigg.]

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member put this question on the order paper?

Mr. McBain: Mr. Speaker, with all deference, I believe this building is slated for demolition soon and I should like to receive a reply.

Mr. Speaker: Unless demolition is starting this afternoon, I do not see the urgency.

VANCOUVER—POSSIBLE EVICTIONS FROM VETERANS HOUSING PROJECT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Arnold Webster (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General. Has any progress been made in resolving the differences between C.M.H.C. and the group of veterans in the Vancouver Fraserview project who are refusing to pay the increased rentals demanded by the government?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, this is rather a difficult question to answer on orders of the day. I can say, however, that the deadline contained in the notices to the tenants does not expire until midnight Saturday night, and according to the last report that I got 50 of the tenants have not yet paid the increased rent. If they do not pay it, unless hardship can be established proceedings will be taken in an orderly way to enforce the eviction notices.

I believe not more than two cases of hardship were brought to the attention of C.M.H.C. and both these have been dealt with to the satisfaction of the persons concerned. I might add that one person, the lady whose name was mentioned during debate or in the course of a question period in this chamber, and who was referred to in the newspapers, said she had never authorized the use of her name, that she always had received good treatment and was quite happy.

Until midnight Saturday night I can make no other answer than that we are proceeding along the lines we have indicated more than once during the last few weeks would be followed.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

INQUIRY AS TO BOARD OF REVIEW ON "HATE" LITERATURE DISTRIBUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): I should like to ask the Postmaster General a question relating to the distribution of hate literature. Is the minister in a position to announce the composition of the board of review to which

he referred last Friday? Can he give the names of the members, the place of hearing and the date of hearing?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the hon. member for Wellington South is not here. He has put two questions on the subject, and I assured him I would be glad to give information to the house early this week.

I am pleased to announce, Mr. Speaker, that a board of review has been established. The chairman will be Mr. Justice Dalton Wells of the court of appeal of Ontario. The two other members will be Mr. Roderigue Bédard, Q.C., associate deputy minister of justice and Mr. G. Douglas McIntyre of the Department of National Revenue. The board will sit on November 23 and other days if necessary. The exact place of hearing has not been determined. It may be in this building or it may be in the justice building. This will be settled by the board of review itself.

There was another point mentioned by the hon. member for Wellington South. He asked if the meetings of the board of review would be in camera or would be open to the public. I would point out to the hon. member for Spadina and other members that while the responsibility for appointing the members of the board of review lies with the Postmaster General, the act goes on to provide that the board of review shall have the powers of a commission under part I of the Inquiries Act, so I presume it will be for the board of review to determine whether the hearings will be open to the public or held in camera.

OTTAWA—REFUSAL TO CASH OLD AGE PENSION CHEQUES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Postmaster General of which I have sent him notice. Is the minister aware that in Ottawa postal substation No. 47 a postal clerk informs customers that old age pension cheques will be cashed only if the money is to be spent in the store housing that post office; and will he look into this situation?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for having given me notice of the question. I would draw the attention of the hon. member and the house to the fact that post offices, whether they are postal stations or otherwise, are not banking institutions; they are not set up to cash cheques. However, there is a provision in the manual on financial procedure that government of Canada and provincial government cheques, as well as cheques of crown corporations, may be accepted in payment of postal values and services, providing the patron presenting the cheque is properly identified. There is a further provision that this can only be done on the postmaster's own responsibility, with certain conditions attached.

I might say I had a field officer look into this matter after I received notice of the question this morning, and he informs me that about three weeks ago a person presented a cheque at the post office wicket in question with the request that it be cashed; that there were not sufficient funds in the postal till to cash it, and there was no obligation to cash it. However, the person was told that if he or she wished to cash the cheque it could be presented to the store in which the post office occupies a section, and if the proprietor of the store wished to cash it, it could be cashed there.

STAMP TO COMMEMORATE BIRTH OF SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I have a question similar to but more urgent than the one directed to the Postmaster General by my colleague from Grey-Bruce. Is he considering issuing a commemorative stamp to honour the sesquicentennial of the birth of Sir John A. Macdonald, which is now only about 10 weeks away?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): I will have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

TRANSPORT

ONTARIO—SHIPPING SPACE FOR BEAN GROWERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. E. Cardiff (Huron): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport and welcome him back to the house. For some time now I have been endeavouring to get space for a shipment of beans out of Canada. Before the minister left he directed the request to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. This morning I received a letter from Cook Brothers to the effect that no space has been made available as yet.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will try to give these beans a push.

AGRICULTURE

QUEBEC—INQUIRY AS TO MEETING WITH MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, in the Minister of Agriculture's absence I should like to ask the Minister of Forestry a question which, I am sure, he will be interested in answering since he is aware of the demands made by the Quebec farmers at their fortieth annual convention. Moreover, this question springs from the reply given by the minister to the right hon. Leader of the Opposition last Friday.

Can the minister tell us whether he met the representatives of the Catholic farmers' union with a view to setting a date for a meeting between the Minister of Agriculture and the representatives of the province of Quebec and those of the farmers' union? If so, what is that date?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Not yet, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

CONTRIBUTIONS BY BUYERS ON BEHALF OF FISHERMEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that the regulations regarding unemployment insurance for fishermen specify that a fisherman may have a contribution paid on his behalf by the buyer only in respect of a catch which is delivered to that buyer in a face to face transaction, and as this regulation is working undue hardship on the fishermen of Nova Scotia, especially in the Chester area, where delivery of fresh fish must be made by common carrier, will the minister take action to amend these regulations so that in the absence of a real employer-employee relationship the landings of the fishermen may be considered eligible for unemployment insurance stamps?

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the minister has heard the question, but perhaps the hon. member would put it on the order paper.

[Mr. Cardiff.]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REPORTED COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF FRENCH NETWORK

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Secretary of State whether he was in touch with the head of the C.B.C. to ascertain the situation that was referred to by Hon. Bona Arsenault—I don't know what hon. gentlemen are laughing at. Perhaps my pronunciation is not the best, but I do remember that in the British House of Commons on one occasion Sir Winston Churchill called Sir Stafford Cripps Sir Stifford Crapps. Has the Secretary of State been in touch with the president of the C.B.C. in this regard, and have any investigations been made by the government of Quebec to produce supporting evidence on the presence of communists in the C.B.C. in Quebec?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the question as raised by the right hon. gentleman the other day has been referred to the C.B.C. I am quite sure that if we could have a definition of the phrase "left wing tendencies" it would certainly make things much easier for the C.B.C. to give an answer.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I asked about communists. Is the minister in a position where he does not know what a communist is, and needs a definition?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question.

Does the Secretary of State intend to invite Hon. Bona Arsenault to come before the committee on privileges and elections, or another committee, to define what he means by someone who has communist or socialist tendencies?

Mr. Lamontagne: No, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN COASTGUARD

APPOINTMENT OF ADMINISTRATOR FOR TRAINING COLLEGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Was it necessary for the department to reach into the ranks of the retired to find an

administrator for the proposed coastguard college at Point Edward?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): The hon. gentleman, as is not unusual, has his facts wrong. No appointment has been made to this position, because the college has not yet been established. What I did was to approve a suggestion that in the planning phase we should take advantage of the undoubted abilities of Captain Brand, who has great experience and who was the main initiator of the idea which is going to give this college to Point Edward.

Mr. MacInnis: I may say now to the Minister of Transport that I am not, as he tries to make out, usually wrong regarding these matters. A written announcement has appeared saying that Captain Brand has been appointed, temporarily at least, and my question was intended to find out from the department whether it was necessary, having in mind all the men in the services, particularly in the navy, who are being "cut", for the Department of Transport to go into the field of retired personnel. I am not questionning the captain's qualifications.

Mr. Speaker: I think the question has been stated. I do not know whether there is any further answer.

Mr. MacInnis: On a question of privilege—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. MacInnis: Order has been called.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is raising a question of privilege and I should like to hear what he has to say.

Mr. MacInnis: I have stated before, Mr. Speaker, that since it is your duty to call order in this house I do not intend to pay any attention to yells from the other side. All I want to say on my question of privilege is this. I am permitted to ask a question here, and if the minister so wishes he can answer it. If he does not wish to answer, that is something I must accept. But I also want an opportunity to answer what was not an answer to my question but a statement by the minister in reference to the question I brought up. He never gave any answer. He got up and made his usual political attack about what is going on. He made a statement rather than an answer to the question—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member will have an opportunity after ten o'clock to debate the matter by giving notice.

Mr. MacInnis: I intend to do so.

Mr. Pickersgill: I think perhaps I ought to apologize to the hon. member. If I said anything offensive to him I did not intend to do so. But I had thought that the hon. gentleman, like the other members from Cape Breton, was so pleased that this coastguard college was being established at Point Edward that he would have been very glad we took the most competent man immediately available to get on with the job as quickly as possible. It may not have been necessary, but in this particular case it seemed to me that it was advisable. I thank the hon. gentleman for showing his affection and esteem for me on my first day back in the house.

Mr. MacInnis: A further supplementary question. Will the minister not agree that the idea of a coastguard school in Cape Breton originated not, as he said, with an idea of Captain Brand but with a co-ordinator appointed by the Stanfield government who raised this question with the previous government as, I suggest, will be found in the hon. gentleman's files?

Mr. Pickersgill: I do not think this is the time to go into ancient history, but I know that when I became minister Captain Brand was very keen to get on with this thing. He kept at me until action was taken and, I may say, we have got on with it.

Mr. Grafftey: I had a supplementary question I should like to put to the Secretary of State—

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day. We are already three minutes over our time. The time was up at 3.25.

SUPPLY

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

INTERIM SUPPLY

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $740,710,974.77, being the aggregate of

(a) two twelfths of the total of all of the items to be voted in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965, as reduced, except finance item 15, mines and technical surveys item 25, national research council item 10, and transport items 15 and 25 for which the proportion is one twelfth and atomic energy item 5, external affairs item 20, forestry item 25 and legislation item 20 for which no proportion is being released, $651,829,576.84;

(b) an additional two twelfths of the amount of public works item 70 (schedule A), of the said main estimates, $666,666.67;

(c) an additional one twelfth of the amount of fisheries items 5 and 10, legislation item 5, mines and technical surveys item 70, post office item 1 and public works item 40 (schedule B), of the said main estimates, $20,263,800.00;

(d) two twelfths of all of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (A), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, except national defence item 56a, and loans, investments and advances items L12a, L17a and L37a for which no proportion is being released, $20,612,522.50;

(e) an additional two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103a (schedule C), of the said supplementary estimates (A), $872,966.67;

(f) nine twelfths of the total of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (B), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, $46,215,108.75;

(g) two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103b (schedule D), of the said supplementary estimates (B), $250,333.34;
be granted to Her Majesty on account of the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965.

Mr. Bigg: At ten o'clock last night I was discussing the need for more effective C.B.C. coverage in northern Alberta, and I was complaining that so often in these matters the government in power—and I am not referring specifically to any one government—is inclined to ignore the sitting member despite the fact that he often has considerable knowledge of local affairs and local needs. I am appealing to the minister who is in charge of the spending of the money to agree to at least consult the local member in these cases including, of course, myself.

I understand plans are on the drawing board to erect a television booster station in or near the village of Smith. These booster stations are expensive. I am interested in the taxpayers' money as well as in the provision of proper coverage for my constituents, and suggest that if the station were erected in or near the town of Athabasca television coverage would be extended to perhaps 20,000 people. If the station were built in or near the town of Smith it would only duplicate the booster station already erected at Grande Prairie, and would in no way improve reception in the area.

At the same time I should like to suggest that a similar station be erected in or near the Bonnyville-Cold Lake area, particularly in view of the fact that there are some 5,000 airmen and their families stationed in this area on duty away from home. If we budgeted properly for the C.B.C. and spent a few million dollars on providing reception in these outlying areas we would be getting better results for our money than we will by building television palaces in cities such as Toronto and Montreal. I do not think that is a fair distribution of the taxpayers' money.

[Mr. Speaker.]

I think the corporation has done well in many of its programs, but I should like to add my voice to those who say the leaders of the C.B.C., the directors, should take another look at the programming to see whether we cannot reduce unnecessary sensationalism and give the family viewer a chance to send his children off to a show if some of the programs are considered by the parents a little too adult for juvenile consumption.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the question of simultaneous translation, which is closely connected with matters of broadcasting and culture. I think the time is now ripe to have simultaneous translation of our debates in this House of Commons extended to the press and public galleries. If it is necessary for us here in the House of Commons to have simultaneous translation—and I am all for it—I think this service should be extended so that people who come here, and particularly those visting us from the province of Quebec, can hear the greater number of speeches that are still made in English translated into French and relayed to the galleries. In this way their visit to Ottawa would be fully instructive and they would go back home to the great province of Quebec knowing that we are in fact one big, happy country and we are trying here day by day to understand their problems and needs in exactly the same way as they understand ours.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could make this appeal in French. Personally I am doing my best to learn this language, and I would recommend this course to every member of the house. It is an enriching experience to try to become proficient in any language. I hope that within a year or two, if I keep working the way I have been, I will be able to make this sort of appeal without the necessity of translation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bigg: I repeat, because I think it is important, that I believe it is time we translated these speeches for the press and public galleries, so that we do in fact have complete equality in this house as far as our two official languages are concerned.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Chairman, my remarks in this debate will be directed to the question of the C.B.C., and I hope to take just a little

different viewpoint from what has been taken by previous speakers. I would like at this time to comment on some of the things said by members who have taken the opportunity in this debate to speak on the C.B.C. and to express my opinion that they have contributed a great deal in making this a real, parliamentary debate. I pay tribute to speakers from both sides of the house who have dealt with both sides of the question. I think this is as it should be when we indulge in real, parliamentary debate. I believe a great deal of very useful information has been brought out in the debate and is on the public record in regard to this most important topic.

This afternoon I would like to speak in direct support of a parliamentary committee being set up to look into the question of broadcasting. I do so because I had the privilege of sitting on a previous broadcasting committee in which we had the opportunity to hear from officials of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I believe this served a most useful purpose, because many of the questions that were in our minds and which we thought were very vital indeed were answered to our satisfaction by the representatives of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. This was not always the case, but it was true in a good many instances. We had an opportunity to meet with and question the various officials who face this tremendous responsibility of satisfying the people of Canada as far as broadcasting is concerned. I believe this is all to the good.

Some accusations of a very serious nature have been put forward in the various speeches delivered in this chamber. These accusations have concerned the activities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I would think, sir, that the members of this crown corporation would themselves welcome an opportunity of having a forum in which to present their side of the story; that they would welcome an opportunity of answering these various questions. They have a great responsibility in providing programming for Canada because this is a very complicated subject. Certainly the men who handle this tremendous sum of money do not make these decisions or undertake these huge expenditures without real consideration and a definite policy in view.

I fail to understand why the government, in its wisdom, would refuse to consider setting up such a forum in which the corporation could make known to members of parliament its views, purposes and contemplations with regard to future expenditures. Naturally, when we speak of $100 million and are considering such large amounts of money, every member of parliament is concerned. This is a great deal of money. I believe that the way in which questions have been answered, where no definite information is given, causes members of parliament to wonder whether something is indeed not as it should be. As far as I can determine, Mr. Chairman, out of the debates and the general opinion across this country, there is a growing opinion that parliament has absolutely no control over this crown corporation; there is a growing opinion across this country that they have a blank cheque as far as the government is concerned. In other words, no matter how much money they want, all they have to do is put in a requisition and it is given to them. There is a growing opinion across this country that this corporation is an entity unto itself; they make all their own decisions, they go their own merry way, they do not have any regard for anyone as far as their responsibilities are concerned, and the people of Canada will pick up the cheque.

This is what is bothering the people of Canada; this is what bothers people in my riding. We are in just a little different position than people in some of the ridings of hon. members who have taken part in this debate. This is because of our geographical location. Many members have said, "If you do not like the programs, turn them off". This is exactly what happens in my area. Because of our close proximity to the United States we have seven or eight alternate channels, some of them being United States stations, and this gives us a variety of programs. What happens is that people turn off the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation program and turn to American radio and television. This is why we who live in the area are so vitally concerned that the C.B.C. programming be of the very finest calibre, in order that our children and the people in the area get the Canadian news, the Canadian facts and Canadiana; so we are not constantly subjected to American views and the American way of life. This is a problem as far as we are concerned.

It is true that there is much discussion about the quality of the programming and some of the programs that have been termed off-colour. Certainly there must be some degree of dissatisfaction or we would not have received these complaints. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that for this reason a committee on broadcasting should be set up, so that the men responsible for the programming of the

C.B.C. could come here and give their side of the picture. Perhaps there are very definite reasons for the programs which have been aired by the C.B.C.; but until their side of the picture is given, hon. members have a right to information as to the C.B.C.'s policy in this regard. Hon. members on the government side of the house have in one or two instances tried to explain why the policy of the C.B.C. should not be subject to examination; they have said that the C.B.C. should have an absolutely free hand. If the C.B.C. were to undertake the censoring of their own programs, which I am sure they do, then perhaps we would not have any of this dissatisfaction. But we want to know to what degree they do censor their own programs.

I think that most of the dissatisfaction to which I have referred arises out of the times we are living in now. We live in an era we find hard to understand; an era of irresponsibility to a degree among our young people; an era where justice and laws are challenged; an era where adults are not sure that their teachings to their children are going to be understood or obeyed. This is an era of the greatest unease which perhaps this world has ever seen. I am sure that much of the criticism of some of the programming of the C.B.C. in its television and radio transmissions, as well as matter appearing in magazines, periodicals and other lines of communication, arises out of this fear. We feel that these channels of communication and the teachings of adults today are not checking this trend in our youth who seem, in the opinion of the people to whom I have talked, always trying to keep just one step ahead regardless of which direction they are going. I think this is what is alarming our people today.

Is this state of affairs going to lead us to a greater breakdown in morals? Is it going to lead to a greater breakdown in our sense of responsibility? Are we paying taxes to this huge corporation which is running along without control in order to lead our young people in this direction? That is the fear which is expressed.

Hence, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely feel that if a broadcasting committee could be set up it would have an opportunity, not of censoring but of questioning the men with the responsibility for programming. They could be asked what they feel is right, what they feel the nation needs and how programs should be presented in the future. In this way I think there could be more of a sense of confidence in this huge medium.

The people are alarmed at what they feel is this sense of irresponsibility. They are alarmed at statements to the effect that there is a communist infiltration in the C.B.C. In this day and age when something is unexplainable and not understood by the people they think communist forces are at work. We want to know as members of parliament what is the C.B.C.'s answer to this charge and how they are monitoring their entire set-up to guard against being the tool of such a movement in Canada.

Another matter bothering the people of the country is this. Last year the C.B.C. spent $85 million. This year their budget is $100 million. This means only one thing to the people: an enormous sum of money. People cannot picture it mentally. They have never seen such a sum piled up or counted. They have no idea what is $1 million, let alone $100 million; they have no idea how high it would be or how wide or deep. To them it is just a tremendous sum of money, and they want to know what is being done with that money. Is this crown corporation building a huge bureau, a huge edifice, to be used like an empire? The people see on reading various financial statements that a few years ago the C.B.C. operated with $20 million. Now they require $100 million. When people walk down the street and see the beautiful big building just completed here in Ottawa for the C.B.C. they want to know whether it was necessary that it be built. They want to know whether we have to spend millions of dollars here in Ottawa when people elsewhere in the country have no radio or television coverage; and I think they should have the answer to this question. Certainly these huge edifices in Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal would not have been built unless they were needed; but the C.B.C. should have the opportunity of explaining why they were necessary and what is their program for the future.

When we had the broadcasting corporation before the committee previously we began to learn what a tremendous entity it was and what a complex and technical nature it comprised. I have heard it suggested in this house that the broadcasting committee should be divided into subcommittees, each one to deal with a particular facet of our broadcasting picture. I think that is very advisable because it has a complicated structure. I have heard it argued that we are not technicians and cannot supervise programming. It is true we know nothing of the technical aspects of broadcasting or television, and we do not

want to. But as representatives of Canadian citizens we do want to know what is going on, where we are going in the future and what is planned for this huge edifice.

We have heard rumours that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is a gifted favour club; that there are certain reporters and newspapermen connected with the C.B.C. as well as certain television specialists and cameramen who are sent around the world on special news projects. The Olympic games was a prime example. No one who watched the broadcasts and heard the commentary at the Olympic games can voice any criticism; it was an excellent type of program. But I have heard it said in my riding that there were more C.B.C. personnel in Japan than there were Canadian athletes. The people want to know how much such a thing costs, and how much it costs to put on a program.

These are some of the main questions we are asked as members of parliament. This is why I think it is so necessary that we be given an opportunity to pass these questions along to the C.B.C. management. The minister responsible is questioned in the house day after day but gives us the stock answer that he will pass on these questions to the C.B.C., and that is the end of them. We have heard it said with regard to a certain program—I am not going into the details of it—that of 100 telephone calls received 70 expressed indignation at the program and 30 expressed approval. We want to know what happens when the public says it does not like a certain program. Is the program changed? Do the C.B.C. take into consideration the views of the people in future programming or are these views ignored entirely? Unfortunately no matter what the people say their views are entirely ignored by the C.B.C. We should like an opportunity to question some of these officials of the C.B.C. who are directly responsible and find out what are the channels. If a program is not liked or brings on tremendous public indignation, what is the approach to the C.B.C.? Whom must we contact, and what is done about the complaints?

These are some of the questions the C.B.C. could answer if there were a forum. Unless they are given this opportunity the people at large will be more suspicious than ever; and we members of parliament are going to be more suspicious too. When the estimates of the C.B.C. are before us we are going to be asked to grant this considerable sum of money. As was pointed out by other hon. members, we do not want to give an open cheque to this crown corporation when we do not know what is going to be done with the money. That would not be fair. When the estimates of other departments of government are before the house we can question the very last dollar and get the answers we wish —or at least we have the opportunity to ask questions. This has never been so in respect of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

By those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I have earnestly attempted to put on the record the views of the people of my riding. As I have pointed out before, our views are perhaps a little different because we have this variety of choice. However, I should like to repeat that the one regret we do have arises from the fact that people are prone to take advantage of United States television and radio rather than of our own C.B.C. That is why we are so concerned that there be nothing done at all, or allowed to be done, to downgrade the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and its programs. That is why I make an earnest plea once again that this government seriously consider placing this entire matter in the hands of a broadcasting committee. Certainly this matter does not have a partisan flavour, but is something from which there can be no political gain. Surely this is something of concern to all the people of Canada because, after all, the taxpayer is footing the bills.

Mr. Chairman, all governments have followed the practice of placing matters, about which they require further study, in the hands of standing committees. By doing so I think this government would have the finest opportunity possible of solving two problems which now exist. It would provide answers to the questions people are asking generally in Canada about the C.B.C., and at the same time give the staff of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, who I am sure are attempting earnestly to provide the very finest entertainment possible, an opportunity to present their side of the story.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Chairman, I would have preferred taking advantage of another occasion to draw to the attention of the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé), who is not present in this house at this moment, the application of his famous ARDA program in the province of Quebec, and especially in my district of Roberval. The minister will certainly defend his position and say that the projects must be submitted by the provinces, so the officials of his department may examine them.

Nonetheless, all those famous joint programs have a dramatic character: We never

know who is really responsible for them, and I am inclined to believe that they were created in order to confuse the situation indefinitely, so that, i findividuals or groups of citizens endeavour to accuse the government, the latter may answer that it is not responsible for such a situation, and the provinces will claim that they alone are not responsible for such projects.

Thus, when the time comes to pay, or when numerous and bothersome delays must be explained, the responsibility is shifted from the federal government to the provinces, and from the provinces to the federal government.

The same situation exists in the ARDA program as well as in any other joint program. I will but mention a second one—the famous winter works program.

I wish to protest energetically against this practice of delaying payments. In fact, I do not know what is what, although I live in Ottawa and continuously attend the sittings of this house. Is it the federal government's fault? Is the government of the province of Quebec sleeping amidst its glory?

However, there is one sure fact: hundreds of farmers, labourers, heads of families, are still waiting for the money they earned last winter; they have not yet received one cent.

Mothers and children suffer for lack of the bare essentials, and this, because the two governments do not agree on how to solve their problems. Programs are suggested, studied and planned. In the meantime, children are starving.

Mr. Chairman, what I have just mentioned exists in two parishes of my county, namely Notre Dame de Lorette and St. Elizabeth.

One government is blamed or the other, when the two are not blamed at the same time. But no solution is ever found, nor does money ever come in. To punish the citizens of these two communities located in a designated area, they are told they will not have any work during the 1964-65 winter season. This then, Mr. Chairman, is how the two Liberal governments, in Quebec and Ottawa, solve the problem of winter unemployment in the electoral district of Roberval.

I particularly wish to point out this situation to the minister, since November 1 is drawing near and conditions are still at the same point as ten months ago in those two parishes. I am told that Ottawa is responsible for this, and I am pretty sure the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacEachen) is quite

[Mr. Gauthier.]

unaware of the situation. Therefore, we expect from the minister a clear and outright statement, so that the truly responsible one might be taken to task once and for all.

Second, I should like to revert to the matter I dealt with at the outset of my remarks, that is, the ARDA program.

I point out to the Minister of Forestry that the Quebec government has probably lost sight of the real purpose of this joint program.

The act actually provides that its main purpose is agricultural rehabilitation and rural development. In his speech of September 17 last, the minister specified this object quite well, when he stated at the beginning:

> As Minister of Forestry, I am responsible for three distinct programs: the program on forest research, the assistance program for the transportation of feed grain and the ARDA program.

He goes on to say:

> In order to include all those programs under a single department, a motion is now on the order paper of the House of Commons to change the name of the department to that of department of forestry and rural development.

On page 4 of that speech, the minister said:

> In my opinion, one of the most important aspects of the ARDA program is rural development.

The minister makes a clear distinction between the three main points his department is interested in, that is forestry, transportation of feed grain and ARDA. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, after having established those three points, I will show the minister that in my region the ARDA program is not applied as he wanted it to be.

I go over the various press releases from the Minister of Forestry which I have received and very carefully kept.

We find that, in all the other provinces, an effort has been made to make use of the ARDA program, in some cases through a study, in other cases by developing several pastures, and in still other cases by undertaking drainage projects.

This is evidenced in the releases of May 29, 1964 when the minister announced a study to be made during a trip.

> Early next week, two forest rangers of the federal Department of Forestry in Ottawa will leave Fort Nelson in a jet craft 28 feet long on a 1,200 mile trip on the Mackenzie river system.

The minister was announcing certain studies concerning rural redevelopment under the ARDA program.

And there was another project in Saskatchewan, a program of studies of the natural,

social and economic resources of the Torch river area, followed by two famous proposed studies which fitted very well in the ARDA program. Then came some wonderful projects in certain provinces, having to do with the establishment of new pastures.

Again through a press release, the minister announced a new pasture in Alberta for a sum of $315,900, another in Saskatchewan covering over 35,000 acres, another community pasture of 19,200 acres, another one in Alberta at a cost of $600,000, still another in Ontario at a cost of $140,000.

Mr. Chairman, all this goes to show that, in the other provinces, the work of the federal and provincial governments was really aimed at implementing the ARDA program.

The same thing applies to drainage in the other provinces. If you refer to the minister's press release, you will see that he announced a drainage project, in Manitoba, at a cost of $476,000.

Mr. Chairman, after this over-all review of those releases, let us see what has been done in Quebec.

The minister will probably reply that the government has transformed crown lands into blueberry fields. Since, as I say, that was done on crown land and not on farm land, as required under the ARDA program, it constitutes forest transformation rather than farm rehabilitation. It is not redevelopment of old bare farm land either.

It is not that I am against such clearing operations, that we may be sorry for in a few years, but I feel both governments took the bear by the tail. In my opinion, they have been concerning themselves with forest development instead of farm development.

If proper use had been made of ARDA, they would have started by rehabilitating existing farms which have always been marginal for lack of necessary governmental help.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, assistance should first have been provided to all farmers who own blueberry fields since, up until now, that is the only problem which has been tackled under ARDA in our district. Then, aid should have been given to those who have set up co-operatives for the rational growing of blueberries. After those two initial stages, it would have been time to set up the syndicates which have now been created for the production of those berries on a commercial scale.

Those syndicates are surely not farm organizations. In my district we call them patronage syndicates. Those are the organizations the minister has seen fit to subsidize.

What has been the result to date? Political protégés have succeeded in making from $2,000 to $3,000 in the space of a few days. What will be the outcome of all that? Surely not employment for the 8,700 families mentioned in the minister's press release of August 3, 1964, which reads as follows:

> The federal Minister of Forestry, Mr. Maurice Sauvé, and the Quebec minister of agriculture and colonization, Mr. Alcide Courcy, announced jointly today... that an amount of $140,000 will be spent for the implementation of an ARDA project whose purpose is to find which areas are suitable for the growing of blueberries. The federal government will pay half the cost of the project.
>
> To this day, nine blueberry fields have been set up in Quebec under ARDA. The new project is to determine whether it would be advisable to develop additional fields of that kind to provide increased income and employment for over 8,700 families in the Abitibi and Lake St. John areas.

In my opinion, those figures were established, not by the minister, but by government officials, who have been rather generous, considering that the expenditure of $135,000 for the setting up of a similar blueberry farm, not too far from my town, has provided employment for only 42 heads of families approximately, the rest of the money, that is $102,000, going to small political protégés to pay for their machinery and for other political advantages in connection with those works.

It is for that reason I say that even if the minister were to set up 20 blueberry fields of that kind, it is not with such works that he will create jobs for 8,700 family heads.

I want to repeat that if millions had been used—true, a few millions were invested in those projects—but if first things had come first, that is, first of all try to improve what already exists—and what already exists is the family blueberry farm—I think it would have been a worthy achievement in my region and then, I think work would have been done within the framework of ARDA, because it would have been a direct assistance to the farmer.

After that stage, grants could have been made to the many blueberry co-operatives that farmers have set up as a result of painstaking efforts in our region. Today, when they would be ready to produce, those same farmers are being frustrated in their rights and cannot get any money from the two governments so as to improve existing blueberry farms.

But what happened? Millions were voted to set up syndicates, what are called blueberry syndicates, to break new ground in

the bush and try to grow blueberries—imagine the tremendous mistake—while land only waiting to be improved is neglected. Thousands of acres of growing trees are destroyed, cut down and burnt to try an experiment, while just close by, the same experiment has been carried out for the last 30 years.

That is where I believe the minister committed a serious error. I cannot accuse him directly, because I think that the government of the province of Quebec is also responsible to a certain extent, but when something wrong is done in a province, the one paying a share, that is the provincial government, to the extent of 50 per cent, should be alert and ascertain that the subsidies granted by the federal government to pay the farmers be used for the purposes for which they were intended in the estimates —that is, for the Canadian farmers, as provided for in ARDA.

Those are the two questions I intended to raise. If subsidies are still granted to those famous syndicates, and if the very basis of the most profitable industry in our region is allowed to deteriorate, in my opinion, we are heading toward catastrophe. We might wake up too late, if ever, because we will then realize that we have committed the greatest error of our lives.

I said, a while ago, that we are not directly helping the farmers through those syndicates because—and the minister probably does not know it—50 per cent of their members are not farmers. City people—plumbers, electricians, lawyers, notaries—compose the membership of the blueberry syndicates. The farmers who are members of those syndicates, who intend to operate blueberry fields are not at all encouraged when they realize that four or five political protégés direct those organizations in order to have the number of members required to be granted an operating permit and benefit from the subsidies. I am sure that most—I do not say all—of those who direct those organizations are more interested in taking advantage of the subsidies than in promoting the agricultural economy of our district.

I wish to draw the minister's attention to these points, because I know he will take them into serious consideration. I ask him to conduct an investigation because, after all, we pay 50 per cent of those grants. I would ask him to order an investigation in our districts. He would be amazed at the amount of patronage—not federal but provincial—being dispensed in that field. He would be amazed at the sums of money appropriated for that purpose, which are not used to help our farmers, and even less to provide for agricultural rehabilitation and development as contemplated by ARDA.

That is why I stated at the beginning that the ARDA plan had never been used in our district. It is the forests that are being improved, instead of farm lands which could become profitable in our area, if only both governments would provide assistance.

[*Text*]

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Mr. Chairman, I wish to deal with the whole field of cultural affairs connected with the C.B.C. During the last few days criticisms have been voiced on both sides of the chamber about C.B.C. programming. I do not intend to go into the question of programming, although I do not agree with a lot of the things the C.B.C. has done, but this debate has focused attention on some of the problems besetting our national broadcasting policy.

I would like to comment on the remarks of the hon. member for York East on the question of whether we still need the C.B.C. as it is presently constituted. Having been a member of parliament for six years, and having experience of our broadcasting committees, I do not think setting up another committee is sufficient for our purposes. While we might vent our own personal steam on what the C.B.C. is doing, we would come away from such a committee with the same results as previously. The C.B.C. would carry on, each year, in accordance with Parkinson's law, increasing its appropriations which, like Topsy, continually grow. This year it is asking for another $15 million for capital expenditures.

It is time we took a serious look at cultural affairs in Canadian broadcasting. It is time we took a serious look at the $100 million annually spent on the C.B.C., at the $6 million the national film board is using, and at the $380,000 that is necessary for the B.B.G. Mr. Fowler in his commission report on broadcasting in 1957 made some interesting comments on this problem. At that time we were discussing whether we should have a public system of broadcasting and the conclusion was reached that because of economics and geography we required a national broadcasting system subsidized from the public purse. But right at the beginning of his report Mr. Fowler said:

No politician in his sane mind could want to encounter the difficulties and criticisms and head-

aches of supervising a public broadcasting system if he could possibly avoid it.

This is what we have been hearing during the last three days. I think it is time we took a hard look at the difficulties we encounter in the supervision of this public broadcasting system. The C.B.C. was set up, as we know, in 1932 under the Bennett government and approved without dissension. But things have changed a great deal since those days. They have changed even since Mr. Fowler's report was made. We have entered the jet age, a new age of electronics. In 1957, at the time of this report, it was suggested we could not have a private television network because we could not afford one. What happened a few short years later, when franchises were made available for additional television stations in some of our major cities? There was really keen competition to get these stations. I think we should remember, too, that the Canadian broadcasting system was not set up by government alone. Even in the earlier days of radio and television they depended on private operators in certain cities to link in with their network to provide coverage across Canada. This surely should be the role of government—to supervise the broadcasting industry, to make regulations to ensure that the content of our television is Canadian, at least to a major extent. It should have some responsibility for seeing that communication is established with remote areas of Canada. These are responsibilities which rest on government in the broadcasting field.

In the years before 1957 we did not have a board of broadcast governors. We now have a board set up by parliament to regulate broadcasting in Canada. It does not matter what government is in power; it does not matter whether you have a committee set up to investigate the C.B.C. or not, there will be all kinds of complaints every time the C.B.C. shows a film which a block of the population does not like. It is not the function of government to push culture down somebody's throat. Culture is not generated that way; it has to be developed from the bottom, up. You do not suppress perversion by exploiting it; you do not suppress minority and hate literature by exploiting that. The C.B.C. has taken it unto itself to become a little government all its own. There can be no control by parliament, as the hon. member for Calgary North so ably pointed out yesterday. Parliament has no control over this monolithic giant which has grown up, like Topsy.

It is a very good question, whether or not parliament should have control over the programming of our broadcast system, as long as it meets certain standards. It is very easy to say to a government in power that it has twisted the arm of a government corporation to suppress a film or to show a film. Are we to go back to the example of dictator-like countries, where they all have a national broadcasting system which is primarily a propaganda instrument to keep governments in power?

The time has come when we should have a reorganization of our broadcasting facilities in Canada. We should take advantage of the board of broadcast governors and allow them to regulate broadcasting. If some television network steps out of line, this is the board which should be stepping on it. If we did that we could immediately save ourselves, not the entire $100 million, but a substantial part of it. I say this because I think the C.B.C. should continue in force, first to administer its overseas network, to provide a radio and television coverage in a mechanical way—I mean by this, technical facilities—and, second, to provide communication with the remote areas of Canada. We could immediately save ourselves at least $80 million a year. We could put up for sale the C.B.C. stations which are now operating in our major centres. We could add to the capital account of the federal government many millions of dollars through selling these tools used to do a job which should be done by private enterprise in any case. Put up the one in Edmonton; it would be sold very readily. Put up the one in Ottawa. Put up the stations in Toronto and Montreal.

In 1957, Mr. Fowler said:

> We are satisfied that the volume of advertising revenue available in Canada is not in itself sufficient to pay for a Canadian broadcasting system.

This has been shown to be wrong. There is enough revenue to pay for another network and there is enough revenue in Canada to pay for competing networks. The situation is there in a nutshell. Allow the C.B.C. to continue to provide films through the national film board. If they want to take it over, that is all right with me because I do not think we need these different divisions in government. All that it does is add new buildings and more people doing paperwork. The national film board is responsible for advising the governor in council on film activities and is authorized to produce and distribute films in the national interest, in particular, films designed to interpret Canada to Canadians and to other nations. Surely we have a vehicle here in the national film board to interpret Canada to Canadians. This is one of the

responsibilities of the C.B.C., and surely we could go one step further, because the national film board is now spending $670,900 for films produced specifically for television.

We have all these things which are duplicating each other. I expect the national film board is growing each year, too, because we have to interpret Canadians to Canadians. In other words, we have to interpret ourselves to ourselves. Of course, once you get a good job under the government working for the national film board you are not going to sit down and wonder how you can cut down your appropriation; you are going to sit down and wonder how you can build a little empire for yourself. We have seen the C.B.C. grow. They have a lot of things they would still like to do. They would like to put up buildings in Montreal and Toronto and I am sure these will be magnificent edifices. I am also sure that if private enterprise was offered this network they would find very quickly that they did not need these magnificent edifices at all—that it could do at a quarter of the cost what the C.B.C. has been doing, and that the amount of commercial revenue the C.B.C. is now taking in would very nearly cover the starting cost for a new network.

This is basic economics and a basic reassessment is needed of where we are going in this broadcast field. We have to sit down and take a look at it, and do so right now. Are we going to continue this policy which was established in the 'thirties, this policy which said we needed a public broadcasting system in Canada? I agree that in the 'thirties we did, and maybe even up until 10 years ago we did. Maybe up to five years ago we did. But the time has come when the government of Canada is subsidizing General Motors or anybody else to advertise its products on a national television network. This in essence is what we are doing.

It is very fine to talk, to say what you like about drama and everything else. Some hon. members were saying yesterday that we were not fit judges of what should be on television, anyway. I agree. We should not even be bothered with it. We set up the board of broadcast governors to control broadcasting; we do not want to be concerned. Indeed we are very foolish if we are concerned because, as the hon. member for Calgary North said, there is really no control whatsoever. The ordinary person in Canada believes parliament does have control. Constituents say to us: "Why do you allow the C.B.C. to do this?" We tell them we do not have any control over the corporation, and they wonder what we are doing. But we have no control over the C.B.C. and we will have no control whether we have an inquiry now or at any time in the future. We will have a continuing, spiralling increase in costs, because they want to go into colour television. Imagine what is going to happen when they go into colour television: they will probably then have to rebuild all the facilities they now have, because they will not be just right to suit a government corporation.

Mr. Woolliams: What about the Pearson film?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): The Pearson film, of course, is a very good example and one of the prime reasons why it is time to cut off the C.B.C. from programming entirely. The C.B.C. should then be relegated to dealing with the technical side of things, to ensure that the people in the more remote areas of Canada have communication in both television and radio. We have this now, in a sense, in asking the C.P.R. and the C.N.R. to build our microwave networks; we are asking private industry to build these networks. All I am suggesting is that we should go one step further. Let us be sensible and businesslike; let us take this emotional nonsense about programming out of the House of Commons and give it to the board set up to regulate broadcasting. Let us forget about this spiralling, empire building organization the C.B.C. has become. I am sure there are other government departments that could move into the building on Bronson avenue here in Ottawa; there are other government departments that could take over the empty buildings of the C.B.C. I am sure that anybody worth his salt who is now with the C.B.C. can get a job in the private broadcasting industry. If he cannot, he had better look to his laurels and pull up his socks.

Can we as a nation and as a country afford this corporation? I say, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot afford to continue with this $100 million a year plaything that does not do anything except annoy the majority of the people of Canada. I know there are many organizations and people in Canada who say the C.B.C. is great. In our farm communities, in our own community at home, we enjoy the C.B.C. farm programs. We think they have done a service along this line. But there is absolutely no reason why the national film board could not take over this portion of the functions of the corporation and provide these films to private networks. After all, the

only reason government got into broadcasting in the first place, other than for the purposes of supervision, was because it was not economical to have a privately owned network across Canada.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Certainly.

Mr. Moreau: I wonder whether the policy of selling the C.B.C. to private interests is a policy that his party is advocating.

Mr. Starr: He did not say that at all.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): What I said had nothing to do with the policy of this party. I am giving my views with regard to a subject with which I have been very deeply concerned for a number of years.

Mr. Woolliams: As a taxpayer.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): As a taxpayer, as my hon. friend says, and also as someone who has been involved with the medical care of patients. I believe that television is a force the potency of which has not even been reckoned with as yet. I believe it should certainly be regulated and supervised, but I see no reason whatever why government should continue to operate studios and produce programs, etc., other than in the national interest; and, as I say, we have such an organ in the national film board, which is already set up specifically to produce films which interpret Canada to Canadians. As I said previously, they are now spending money to produce these films for television. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we have the national film board doing it on the one hand, and we have the C.B.C. doing it on the other. The only difference is that the national film board has not yet found out how to get enough money and they are operating on a very minor level at the moment. I am not suggesting they should be given a larger budget; all I am suggesting is that we should not leave all these things to the C.B.C. I am not saying we are going to sell the C.B.C. I say, let us sell their properties and their franchises in the major areas.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member not agree that this is virtually disbanding the C.B.C.?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Not at all. The C.B.C. was set up, as I have already said, because it was not economically feasible to have a private network in Canada. Government has no business in soap operas; that is not the role of government, in my opinion.

Mr. Woolliams: It may be for the Grits, though.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): It may be. But we have to take a really close look at this matter. If we let it go any longer we are going to be lost to this creeping bureaucracy and they will have so much power that we will not be able to do anything about it. We must start looking at the situation now and see that we have a change from the basic policy that has been propagated by one royal commission or inquiry after another. This basic policy is that we must have a public broadcasting system.

We must have supervision of broadcasting in Canada. I agree that there are types of films which are educational and which, using the words of the Canada Year Book, interpret Canada to Canadians. We need this kind of film still; but they could be made available through private broadcasting. We could do more in regard to providing communication to some of our more remote areas. As the hon. member for Athabasca suggested, when we cease to build these edifices in Toronto and Montreal perhaps we will be able to take modern communications into the hinterlands. The cost of television has of course changed very considerably from 1957 to the present time, and will change more as time goes on. As these methods of communication become more common and we have more scientific developments, we will of course have more efficiency and more economy in setting up a television network.

We have all seen what has happened in this industry. The first network was set up with coaxial cable, and so on; then along came microwave and this brought down the cost of network operations. Further developments will probably bring down the cost of network operations to an even greater degree in the future. We now have jet transport, which means it is only a matter of three or four hours to travel from east to west. All these things have changed the entire concept of this industry, even the 1957 concept of the Fowler royal commission. In their report they say that the overwhelming weight of evidence submitted to them compelled them to report that Canadians wished to have a Canadian broadcasting system. The report does not say "a public broadcasting system". We of course want to keep broadcasting as much Canadian as we possibly can; we want to develop the arts with Canadian personnel. All I am sug-

gesting is that private industry can probably do it better than government. Then the Fowler report says that Canadians are willing, within reason, to pay for it. I wonder if we are still within reason in paying for it. I do not think that at the present time the majority of Canadians who are aware of the situation would favour a public broadcasting system. When one considers the history of this corporation, what has happened in the past, why we had it in the first place, and how it has developed throughout the years, he realizes that the time has now come for us to seriously consider its basic policy. This has been the policy of every government. The former government had the same policy toward the corporation, and the government before that had this policy, which is based on the assumption that Canadians want it and need it, and that it was an economic necessity to have a public broadcasting network in Canada.

I am suggesting that the necessity is no longer there from an economic point of view; that the majority of Canadian people who understand the situation no longer feel that we need to have a public broadcasting system; that we could save ourselves a great deal of emotional agony; that we could probably improve the broadcasting fare for Canadians if we were to suggest to the C.B.C. that they should reorganize their entire operation so they would be responsible solely for the technical side of broadcasting. This would include, for example, the remote areas, film boards, educational television advancement and international programs. If that were done I think we would get down to basics and save this country millions of dollars. For example, $100 million right off the bat would be saved and there would be a continuing $100 million a year.

Mr. Moreau: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member but I fail to understand his point. He seems to be advocating essentially that we turn over the broadcasting field to private industry; at least that is what I understood. In view of the general support he is getting from the members on his side of the house, such as the hon. member for Bow River and the hon. member for Ontario, may I ask whether this is an official party position?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): No, it is not. The hon. member should appreciate that over here we are allowed to express our views from our own experiences.

[Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson).]

Mr. Woolliams: I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member is putting words in my mouth. I have not made a speech on the C.B.C. If the hon. member for York-Scarborough, one of the trained seals of the Liberal party, wants to make a speech let him make one.

Mr. Noble: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few observations on C.B.C. television activities. It is my belief that the Canadian people are grateful to the C.B.C. for the excellent service they provide across the nation. Personally I admire the board of directors of the C.B.C. for the contribution they have made and continue to make. On their shoulders rests a great responsibility. Decisions made by them can and do have a tremendous influence on many people.

Some people resent the fact that the corporation is a power unto itself and that censorship from any outside source is frowned upon by that body. Many people feel that its work should be open to inquiry, subject to public scrutiny and answerable to public opinion. On the other hand, its progress could be impeded and its services damaged with too much supervision and too many inquiries.

It is understood by everyone that the C.B.C. should be non-partisan and free from political interference. Occasions have arisen when such suspicions were perhaps justified. Such circumstances should not be tolerated and regulations to assure this should be strictly adhered to; but I do think the Canadian people should have an effective liaison through which they might voice their disapproval of extremes that should be protested against and corrected without delay.

Several days ago I objected to certain C.B.C. television programs by way of questions in this house to the Secretary of State. No other course was available to me by which my constituents would know that I had made this appeal. Nevertheless the reply I received brought people everywhere to the full realization of how helpless are the government and the people of the nation to protest effectively a very undesirable program, a feature of our own crown corporation.

My disapproval was directed at the play "Feast of Lupercal" on the program "Festival" of October 7, and again at the same program one week later when two related plays were presented, "Mrs. Dally has a Lover" and "Today is Independence Day". Each play appeared to be an effort to outdo the previous one in vulgar language and in portrayals of

seduction and illicit love. My hon. colleague from Grey-Bruce went into some detail on these yesterday so I will not repeat his remarks. Thousands of television viewers across the country were alarmed and disappointed to think that the C.B.C. with its great influence would give time to such revolting plays, which not only displayed bad taste but could be instrumental in promoting immorality in our young people.

This sordidness has gone beyond the limit and should be discontinued at once; because we cannot continue to sow such vulgarity without reaping the demoralizing reward. There is plenty of good material that could be used which would be an inspiration to Canadian family life. There is an abundance of clean, informative, constructive and entertaining program material available to the C.B.C. which would assist parents in getting their children on good moral foundations and by which they, the C.B.C., could make a really creditable contribution to our way of life. The C.B.C. can be a nation builder.

Our young people are the strength of this country and we must demand quality in all ingredients that go into their physical, moral, spiritual and intellectual make-up. The C.B.C. can contribute much to the last three of these. The Canadian people deserve value for the $86 million C.B.C. operation.

Mr. Peters: I had not intended to speak about the C.B.C. but, having listened to some of the comments which have been made, there is another side to the picture. At one time I asked the producer of a show which I considered to be way out why this kind of program was broadcast, and I think his answer is one which all hon. members should consider. He explained to me that because the C.B.C. was such a large organization and served large numbers of people in widely scattered areas of Canada, both the intelligentsia and others, there were programs which should be shown on a limited basis—probably 15 minutes a week—which were in the high class drama category, the sort of thing probably I would not understand. I agree it would be unfortunate if the only music the C.B.C. played was that of Don Messer, even though I happen to like it. If that were the case it might promote a nation of maritimers, which might not be in the interests of the development of this nation. However, I personally would give it a very high rating. My friends who consider themselves of the intelligentsia say that this is very low-brow entertainment. I think it is true that many of the programs shown on the C.B.C. must reflect the interests of all the people in Canada. If we look at some of the programs which have been referred to and to which objection has been taken these are the types of programs which may meet the cravings of some of the more highly educated people in our society who feel that this sort of drama is necessary and is a good thing.

I believe the C.B.C. has done an excellent job. Those members who feel otherwise should question the farming organizations who appear before our committees. Surprisingly enough one category to whom the C.B.C. has brought television and radio coverage is our rural population. They have used this as their total means of communication in order to keep in touch with many other parts of the world. In some instances there is no daily newspaper these people can buy. Many do not have even a weekly newspaper, but depend on the C.B.C. radio and television service to bring them the events of the world, whether they be in the form of drama, other entertainment or news broadcasts. As I say, I think the C.B.C. has done a very good job in this regard although there are many other areas in Canada which still require coverage.

Some will say that the C.B.C. does provide a type of service to a very large percentage of the Canadian population. That is not true when we consider total coverage as far as television and radio are concerned. I think those people who believe in an extension of this type of thing should be sympathetic toward that part of our population which depends entirely on the C.B.C. or government sponsored services for their entire communications media.

The C.B.C. is a very large organization. A communications system in this country must of necessity be a large system. In Canada the C.B.C. operates both radio and television stations, and for the most part private service is provided in the form of networks to large communities, and through affiliates to the smaller communities. There is competition in this field in many sections of our country.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other communications medium which I think should be kept separate from the two I mentioned, and I refer to radio Canada. Radio Canada is providing broadcasting services to one segment of our population which has not been supplied this service by private enterprise.

In comparing various services provided by these three systems we must consider the field of news, entertainment, culture and

philosophy. When considering the news aspect, I think we must agree that the C.B.C. is providing adequate coverage. I am sure every member of parliament watches the C.B.C. news programs closely and will agree that that organization has done very well in covering local, national and international affairs. Some of the outstanding events that have taken place throughout the world have been brought to the attention of Canadian viewers as quickly as possible through the facilities of the C.B.C. The demand in Canada for coverage of international events as quickly as possible has increased, and the C.B.C. has met this demand.

In considering the field of entertainment one must keep in mind the difficulties which arise because of the likes and dislikes of viewers. Sometimes I think advertisements are more entertaining than the programs. The C.B.C. has done a good job in this field.

The great difficulty which any organization providing a communications service must face is in the field of culture and philosophy. One of the previous speakers suggested the C.B.C. should be sold. In the event such a thing took place we would only have private television and radio outlets throughout this nation. What kind of culture or philosophy would we then have on our programs in this non-competitive but private system? Certainly such programs as "Quest", "Festival" and "This Hour has Seven Days" would not be possible, because the private systems are dependant entirely upon sponsors. Can anyone visualize a sponsor agreeing to sponsor a program such as "Festival"? I do not hesitate to say that I do not like that particular program, and I think the people who take part in it are a bunch of nuts. That is my personal opinion. I have not been trained in the school of drama, or in the field of culture. Perhaps that is why I think the way I do; but I realize there are a great many nuts in this country who believe this is a very worth-while type of program.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, this type of cultural and philosophical program in a private communications system would have to be sponsored, and I cannot visualize a sponsor sponsoring that type of program, knowing that he would probably have a telephone call the following morning cancelling 40 or 50 contracts because of it. Just because I do not like that kind of program I do not see why it should not be presented. If I were the almighty in the field of communications I would know and be able to pick out what was good for people and what everyone would like, but obviously I am not. I have made no pretense in this regard, nor do I believe the C.B.C. has given any indication that it is the body which should decide what is good and what is bad. The C.B.C. has made a tremendously successful attempt to provide controversial subjects. Controversy is not bad for Canadian people, and I am quite proud of the program "This Hour has Seven Days".

Mr. Habel: You should not be.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member says I should be proud of it.

Mr. Habel: I said you should not be proud of it.

Mr. Peters: I think I should be proud of it because it is a highly controversial program. Perhaps it creates controversy in a sensational way, but it deals with actual problems which face the world today.

Mr. Habel: It is destroying the world.

Mr. Peters: The hon. member suggests this type of program is destroying the world. This type of program is providing information to the people, and I believe it is by hiding information that people are destroyed.

I should like to refer to one statement made during this program the other night. The speaker was a man with whom I violently disagree. In his statement he asked what would happen if a segment of a population from another country was dumped into one of our major cities. I would suspect that anyone who did not think about that question, in the light of the way we solve our own problems, must have turned the set off. Certainly it was a controversial suggestion which in my view warranted some consideration.

With the advent of an entirely private television and radio system in this country we would have a lack of controversy, as a result of which we would be even less colourful than we are. Sponsors of programs would demand that they be non-controversial, because they want to sell their products to every viewer watching the programs. Those members who say they believe in free enterprise and freedom of initiative must have their wires badly crossed when they suggest that we should have a monopolistic control over this medium so there will not be controversy. Those are the kind of people who suggest there should only be one government or one political party—the one they support.

I have no objection to controversial programs. While the C.B.C. has made mistakes we must remember that the C.B.C. is

pioneering in this field certainly in this country, if not on the North American continent. It is perfectly proper for hon. members to stand in the house and say they believe that programs which contain interviews and discussions about things such as women's bosoms should not appear during the hours of t.v. programming when children are likely to be watching t.v. I agree that perhaps such programs should be directed toward adult audiences at a time after children have gone to bed. Those who are responsible for putting on these programs should exercise some judgment as to whether they are family programs or whether they should be viewed later in the evening when the children have gone to bed.

One of the amusing things about selling the C.B.C. is that I do not hear anyone say we should sell all of the C.B.C. They say we should sell that part in the large cities where the C.B.C. makes money. Let us look at what has happened in the major cities in which we have allowed a second television station. Did we really get a new type of program? Did we really accomplish very much by this except having the opportunity—and I am 100 per cent in favour of having the opportunity to choose between two or three stations—of choosing between stations? Have we really accomplished anything in a cultural sense as was indicated we would when the applications were made to the B.B.G.? We may have. Again, I may not be in a position to judge; I may not be trained to judge. When we talk of selling the C.B.C. should we not really consider the whole of the C.B.C. operation, rather than consider only those parts of it which are financial plums?

The B.B.G. was established several years ago to provide some control over the operations of the news media in Canada. I feel they have failed to do the job we expected they were going to be able to do. It may be that the board of broadcast governors act should be returned to parliament for amendment. It is quite possible we did not give them enough authority to be able to do the things we thought they were going to do. We know that they have been almost ineffective in policing the broadcasting services in Canada. This may be a field that should be referred to a committee on broadcasting.

This raises another question, Mr. Chairman. Why have we not referred the B.B.G. and the C.B.C., if that is our desire, to a committee of this house? Is this government so ineffective they have not been able to decide for themselves what changes in policy they wish to make in this field, and for that reason have not been able to establish a committee? Is it because there are enough committees of this house and this is not an important matter? I feel the government has a responsibility to tell us why they have neglected to establish a committee on broadcasting. Then, the question of cable television could have been referred to this committee. I believe there are things that we could improve, and certainly there will always be things we could improve. The B.B.G. could give us the benefit of their experience in a broadcasting committee and make recommendations for the changes they wish made. This opportunity should be afforded. We should not be in a position of attacking them and saying they have not done a job unless they have an opportunity to appear and suggest the changes that should be made.

I should like to close by saying that I believe the C.B.C. has done a remarkable job. They have brought to Canadians over a widely scattered area television and radio programs that are a credit to the nation. It would be safe to say there is not anyone in this house who does not violently dislike some program on the C.B.C. I believe it is safe to say also that there are Canadians who have a particular program and they will go to a great deal of effort week after week to watch it closely. One of the members referred to the field of culture, and this applies to rural Canada. There are many farmers who will make an extreme effort to take advantage of the opportunity to watch certain programs because they are of value in their farming operations.

I think we should be very careful, Mr. Chairman, about blasting the C.B.C. because of a particular program. I am quite happy that those who are responsible in parliament for the C.B.C., not only in this government but in previous governments, have rejected the idea that members of parliament should be able to discontinue a program on the C.B.C. just because it is objectionable to them, personally. This matter should be decided by responsible people. If the C.B.C. is not doing the job, then we should collectively look at all the problems of the C.B.C. and make the changes that are necessary. Then, once we have made them, they should be enforced. If we start telling the C.B.C. what type of program to put on, what the content of the program should be and when it should be put

on, how much of the time of the C.B.C. should be allotted to culture, then I believe that medium will lose its effectiveness in Canada and will disappear as an influence on the Canadian way of life. I believe the majority of Canadians are proud of the C.B.C. and want it to continue. They should demand that members of parliament give the C.B.C. an over-all policy direction as to the extension of services into those areas that do not have service now, and continue to supervise in a general way the operations of the C.B.C., as has been our practice for a number of years.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Chairman, I should like to take a few minutes to express to those who are responsible for the administration of the C.B.C. some of the views of the middle class citizens who pay part of the expenses incurred by this corporation.

The C.B.C. costs the federal treasury close to $100 million a year. Though this amount is large—very large indeed—this is not the only aspect with which the public at large finds fault.

As regards this budget matter, I believe that parliament—that is the representatives of the Canadian people—should be able to scrutinize the expenditures of the C.B.C. Should these expenditures be justified, nobody would object to their examination or, for that matter, to taking the advice of those who, after all, pay the shot.

The other aspect upon which the people at large would like to make observations is even more important. I am referring here to the programming, the choice of commentators, the selection of the ideas that can be suggested to our people by means of radio, and especially television. I must say, right now, that far be it from me to ask the government to control the programming or the appointment of radio and television commentators.

What this government—or this parliament—can and must do is to require that the board of directors and top officers of the C.B.C. should have good moral standards, in addition to intellectual and physical qualifications, so that they in turn may demand the same qualifications from their senior employees.

In this regard, I wish to repeat that the government, or parliament, should require the directors of the C.B.C. to be of strong moral fibre, in addition to their intellectual and physical qualifications, so that they might be able to see by themselves what is defective and what might mislead the people.

[Mr. Peters.]

Mr. Chairman, we are aware of the influence of the corporation on public opinion.

Through the means at its disposal, the C.B.C. may form or deform public opinion. Through its programming and the commentators it selects, it may induce the majority of the population to be for or against someone or something.

If the officials of the C.B.C. possess the required moral qualities, it will not be necessary to tell them what to do. On the other hand, if voluntarily or through negligence, those persons in whom parliament rests its trust, do not assume their responsibilities, then parliament will have to interfere so the moral level of our population be not lowered through the influence exercised by broadcasting media.

In my opinion, the first duty of this crown corporation consists in giving news. The second should consist in raising the intellectual and moral level of our population, and the third, in offering varied programs for the healthy enjoyment of its listeners in their moments of leisure.

The function of a news service is to inform the people. What we expect from the C.B.C. is that it informs the Canadian people objectively on political, economic and social activities. You realize, Mr. Chairman, that if one day the C.B.C. wanted to give the people a false impression of a politician, it would be quite easy because day after day through its news service, it could spread the idea that this politician is a public enemy. On the other hand, if they wanted to build up another politician it would be quite easy for the C.B.C., with its large means of broadcasting, to gradually and slowly push up another politician.

Therefore, what we are asking is that in the political field—and this goes for parties as well as individuals—the C.B.C. through its broadcasting system should give objective facts. It should objectively inform the Canadian people on the opinions of political parties or on statements made by politicians.

I think that the C.B.C. should try to raise the intellectual and moral level of the people. Nowadays there is much talk about education, particularly in my own province. I welcome the efforts made by our school boards and our governments to give the people a higher intellectual level.

We know that the C.B.C. is providing popular education, but there again the accent should not be put only on intellectual education. There are three kinds of education: intellectual, physical and moral. Nowadays, advanced

intellectual education is provided, but moral education related to that intellectual education is too often overlooked.

If we consider only that we are living in a more realistic environment, that people are able to decide for themselves whether a program is good or bad, to distinguish between good and evil, and if the C.B.C. network puts on educational programs which may lead some people to feel that today everything is permitted, this will be disastrous.

On the other hand, if our population has a very high intellectual level but no moral education, I suggest we are still better off with a population whose intellectual level is lower but has a really solid moral education. Remember the days of our forefathers when people only went to school one or two years but were nevertheless receiving such a solid moral education that we could be sure they would make good citizens.

Mr. Chairman, people will say: but you cannot point to any C.B.C. program which is trying to put over an idea. For example, we heard recently some politicians, for instance the secretary of the province of Quebec, say that ideas expressed through certain publicity media are ideas always favouring the left. Am I right or am I exaggerating?

Of course, when a public organization wants to feed a new idea to the people, a new idea which is contrary to what they have learned and to their moral principles, it can proceed a little at a time. For instance, by instilling daily a drop of vinegar into the minds of the people, they may be convinced that they no longer have to respect authority which is only established to enslave the population.

Unfortunately, that is what we can too often observe in certain informative programs or in the views of certain commentators who speak to the general public through the C.B.C.

There are also, Mr. Chairman, certain things that we must point out. If the C.B.C. were endeavouring to break up the present family concept, they would only have to show on the television screens continuous disputes between couples, divorces or matrimonial triangles in ever family depicted in the programs shown. Thus they would succeed in having our people think that disputes and divorces are natural and that it is normal that one day a couple has to separate.

To make up for these programs which seem to imply that family life is over, we should have more programs and more commentators outlining what a united family is, what is established order in a family endowed with moral sense; then the people would notice that not only matrimonial triangles are successful but it is nice to see harmonious families where all work together, not only for their personal happiness but for that of the community as a whole.

It is the duty of the C.B.C. to fill the leisure of their audience in a sound way with varied programs, joining pleasure and profit.

I met one day a school teacher who told me: "Nowadays, with television, it is very difficult for us to teach our young people to respect their parents, to be honest, to live in keeping with the established order. When, from his earliest childhood to the time he is an adult, a youth sees on the television screens murders, thefts, friends at variance, he gets used to that and thinks those are normal things."

This teacher added: "Usually, a man has not the mishap to witness more than one serious automobile accident in his life. This man will probably not see more than one normal love, he will probably not witness more than a bank robbery with his own eyes. With television coming into our daily life, young people constantly see movies where murders are committed as a matter of fact, where someone robs a bank when in need of money and where attempts are made to break the law."

The C.B.C. should broadcast more and more educational and moral programs so as to compensate for those programs which seem to disrupt society.

In conclusion, also in connection with the C.B.C., I should like to mention something which happened on June 26, 1964.

I said earlier that the C.B.C. should follow a new policy in order to inform the public, both on the economic and the political level.

On June 26 last the farmers of the province of Quebec organized a march on the provincial parliament. On that occasion, 18,000 farmers asked the provincial government for a better fate, or new laws to raise their standard of living.

On the same day I left the house, after the question period, to listen to the C.B.C. news. At that time nothing at all was said about what was happening in the provincial capital. I went out to lunch and, before coming back to the house at two o'clock, I listened again to the C.B.C. news bulletin. Again nothing was said about this very important demonstration in the capital city of the province of Quebec.

I immediately telephoned the news director of the C.B.C. in Montreal to ask him if some-

thing was happening in the city of Quebec. By this, I did not mean separatists causing a disturbance. He replied: "Yes, there is a farmers' march." I inquired: "Why don't you mention it?" He said: "The fact was mentioned. We are going to mention it again, but it has already been mentioned."

Mr. Chairman, I immediately communicated with the C.B.C. to find out how many times between nine o'clock in the morning and two o'clock in the afternoon, at the time of this march, the C.B.C. had mentioned the march of the Quebec farmers on its news network; I was told that between nine and two o'clock it was mentioned three times in short news bulletins. In these short news bulletins the people were not informed why the farmers were marching on the provincial parliament. It was simply stated: Mr. Lesage will receive the farmers at such or such time, and Mr. Lesage had the farmers informed that unfortunately he will be absent and will not be able to receive those thousands of farmers who will be there.

I am saying this to show the contrast between June 26, 1964 and what happened some time before, when a march was organized by the peace marchers at La Macaza. There was a similar march a few months afterwards, and on that occasion the C.B.C. showed on the television screens the peace marchers getting ready for this La Macaza march. One could see small groups of five or six people on lawns in the city of Montreal preparing themselves to resist the policemen, in case they should tell them to get out of the way. I have seen that myself on the television screen. And then, the C.B.C. went to this area, so as to show the public a few hundred people who were protesting, and rightly so, for they had a right to protest; I am not criticizing the stand of the peace marchers who were protesting against nuclear arms. The viewers were shown a group of objectors, but I wonder why the C.B.C. did not give the population at large more details and information when the farmers marched on Quebec, at which time 18,000 persons were also protesting who had every right to protest?

Those then are the questions we ask ourselves. Of course, we will be told that news was given, that we were told what the farmers obtained. Yes, we were told: that the farmers obtained this and that from the provincial government and, in this news bulletin which I have before me, we were even told that the farmers obtained a 25 per cent decrease in school taxes, and an increase of 20 cents per 100 pounds of milk. But, the city-

dwellers who heard these news bulletins had to pay the next day or the following day, 1 or 2 cents more per quart of milk, for which they tended to blame the farmers.

Instead, the population, the consumers should have been told why the farmers of Quebec had marched on parliament to explain their situation and to assert their rights with regard to the important matter of land taxes. The population should have been acquainted with the reasons which led these men to march on the provincial parliament.

I would therefore ask that the C.B.C., through its news service and general educational program, attach more importance to the field of agriculture. Every Sunday, the French network of the C.B.C. has a half hour program entitled: "Les travaux et les jours". We need more of these programs to show city people how our agricultural structures and organizations helped the country, to show the urban population what tremendous wealth agriculture represents in Canada, where it has supplied work directly or indirectly to more than 35 per cent of the labour force.

That is all I wanted to say about the C.B.C. and, for a few seconds, I should like to deal with another subject. My remarks are meant for the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé).

Last week we attended the fortieth convention of the U.C.C. in Quebec city, where we met hundreds of farmers who asked for immediate action from the provincial and especially the federal government with respect to the dairy industry. Today I put a question to the Minister of Forestry and he told me that no date had yet been set for a meeting between the federal authorities and members of the Catholic farmers' union.

Last July I made a proposal to the federal government in which I asked for a guaranteed minimum price of $3.50 per cwt of industrial milk and for a subsidy, retroactive to May 1, of 35 cents per cwt of milk for the first 100,000 lbs. Some members or ministers found that suggestion ridiculous. Well, today, farmers are not content with a minimum price of $3.50, but they are requesting $4 per hundred pounds of milk and ask the provincial government to provide a further subsidy of 40 cents per hundred pounds.

What I now ask the Minister of Forestry, who is largely responsible for agriculture in eastern Canada, is to show great diligence and not in 15 days or in one or two months, but immediately, take the necessary steps to increase the standard of living of eastern

farmers and more particularly those in his province, that is the province of Quebec.

If we make these requests and reiterate them to the government, it is because farmers have asked us to make representations. You may be sure that if the Minister of Forestry is to announce in the house some concrete measures to increase the standard of living of farmers, we will not be surprised at all. On the contrary, we will applaud him, because for more than a year and a half now we have been hoping that the minister would make a statement as soon as possible, and the sooner the better.

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak about the human person, the priority of man, the individual and his institutions. Our society recognizes only the institutions—

An hon. Member: This is a free country.

Mr. Latulippe: —to the prejudice of the individual. Should we recognize both, or give priority to each individual? Should we allow each individual to have access to science, progress, institutions, vital economy, intellectual, moral and social development? When we speak about the good of the people, social welfare, common good; we speak about groups of people; we speak in the abstract, and this leads us to forget that in reality, in practice, all groups are made of individuals, human beings, living persons, made up of flesh, blood and spirit.

When one says that the common weal must have priority over individual interests, one also forgets that the common good is the sum of the individual, personal private good.

When a group of persons is visualized as a unit it is only under the form of an abstraction.

Thus a nation, a country, Canada are only abstract terms or an idea which actually represents all human beings living in a determined area of the world, or a part of the world specifically outlined by the process of the human mind.

What can a beast know about Canada? It is part of a herd. A forest is made up of individual trees. God created the earth, the world and mankind. Men divide the earth into continents, countries, provinces, cities, parishes and territories.

God created man as a human being, but men are the ones who establish families, groups, societies, companies, communities, churches, corporations, associations, and when a legal entity is given to those groups, it is still through a process of the human mind.

In reality, those groups are composed of living and concrete units of human beings.

The family group is itself a group of distinct individuals, of living persons. The family as such only exists as a concept of the human mind. The family is always only a group of individuals of human beings.

In everyday language when we say that public good comes before private welfare, it does not mean that in search of private welfare, the individual well-being of the other people living in the same group, should be taken into account because the public good, per se, has no real existence, it is made up of the welfare of individuals.

This distinction in the language is so essential that confusion in the meaning of the words private good and common or public good, or perhaps social well-being, is responsible for all the social mistakes which complicate the general operation of our modern economy.

Such great importance has been given to this evolution of the social pattern, the company pattern, that today nearly all legislation is intended to promote the progress of the group to the prejudice of the human being, of the individual.

Companies are prosperous, make huge profits and accumulate lots of money while individuals are getting poorer, more deprived, lost and ignorant. The latter have to put up with inadequate housing, while the former are installed in vast manufactures or 500-feet high structures or 50 storey skyscrapers.

During the daytime the individual works in the best of sunlit skyscrapers, 10 or 50 storeys above the ground, but at night he must go back to small, inadequate and overcrowded lodgings or even to a damp basement.

Children are crowded into narrow and unsanitary slums, thus preparing a new generation of people who will have to be given hospital care at the government's expense or rather at the expense of their fellow citizens.

The state itself is but a group of living human beings. Will we ever understand that?

When a country like Canada enacts laws, erects monetary, economic and political systems, why do we allow institutions to pay a lesser amount of income tax on profits, why do we allow banks, for instance, to accumulate over and above the declared and permissible reserves as depreciation or for other reasons, secret reserves which are not taxable?

If large corporations must accumulate such a large amount of reserves, profits and capital, why do our monetary, economic and political systems ignore that human beings and families also need the same proportion of reserves, profits and capital?

Why did we neglect the human being in this race toward wealth, in this thirst for progress, in this desire for profits?

Over a period of two years, between September 1962 and September 1964, the 754 big companies listed on the Montreal stock exchange have seen their capitalization increase from $44 billion to $72 billion, a $28 billion capital profit in two years, 24 months, a 62 per cent capital appreciation for the few people who can afford to invest money in stocks while so many citizens of this same Canada go hungry and are living in poverty. Why?

Why so much poverty in the midst of so much abundance?

When I hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) say that Canada is a prosperous country, that it enjoys unparallelled prosperity—well yes, it is prosperity for those who handle the finance of the country. They are the ones who go up the ladder, but the others go down. Only because the common weal has precedence on the personal weal, only because one has forgotten that the common weal is the sum of personal welfare and that one has succeeded, by all kinds of economic sophisms, to cause people who are not as learned as our university trained economists to believe that things must be so because the Lord said that there will always be poor people and rich people among us.

Poor people—perhaps? But we do not have to put up with the idea of poverty-stricken people, of destitute persons.

Poverty compared to wealth means to own little instead of owning much, while indigence has nothing and lacks the bare necessities of life.

In any event, in the ordinary life, our monetary, economic and political systems are only instruments of administration, of production and of distribution of material, intellectual and spiritual goods and services among human beings, considered either as groups, families or single people, as living units, or as family or social groups.

All groups are made up of unities. All chains are made up of links. All our monetary, economic and political systems are able to operate and to provide decent means of living to all human beings in Canada merely through a new organization of the leadership.

Hence the strength of our institutions depends upon the strength of the unities, of the people making up our institutions, governments, banks, manufactures, communities, universities, churches, provinces, municipalities, school boards, colleges, corporations, co-operatives, associations with material, intellectual or spiritual aims.

All institutions are the product of the human mind, are conceived by the human intellect in the same way as the constitution of a country.

Do animals have constitutions, governments, companies, co-operatives, unions, except in La Fontaine's fables? And there again, they are imitating men.

When I speak of the evolution of our way of thinking towards our monetary, economic and political organizations, I do not want to take anything away from anybody. I do not want to change anything in our principles of operation. I do not want to creat anything new. I am only trying to consolidate the past, I rely on the present, and I look ahead to the future, to the future of every group constituting our country, Canada, and I want to give more to everybody, without taking anything away from anybody. I want to give something more to everybody, to each and everyone, child, teen-agers or adults, forgetting no one.

When I speak of evolution of our way of governing our country and our institutions, I am not blaming anybody. I am not trying to displace anybody. I only want to improve customs established on old and outmoded basis which were once useful but which our own progress made obsolete; I only want to improve the way of thinking which served the progress of humanity but which are threatening to destroy that very progress, if we adhere to the status quo.

The present progress is not the final stage of the evolution. Having brought a tremendous boon to humanity through its scientists and university men, this progress must now reach to the social classes less favoured by nature or by society.

I am not attacking any particular classes, not even directors of banks and of important concerns, professors and university graduates, but my words of warning are meant for them, because it is their responsibility to adapt their systems to a more humanitarian progress to give greater consideration to the human being as well as to the needs of each

unity constituting the nation and the higher institutions.

The head must remain the head but one must not neglect the fingers.

The head must remain the head, and no longer neglect the arms.

The head must remain the head, and no longer neglect the limbs.

The head must govern the whole, and no longer neglect the units.

The head must govern the whole, and no longer neglect the various parts.

That is what everybody admits in principle, in abstracto, in the conception of ideas; but most of all, that is what facts must express in concrete action, in present monetary, economic and political terms by present governments, by present ministers, by the present Minister of Finance, who controls and holds all monetary, economic and political machinery as regards money circulation, that means of exchange, that social instrument which is used for all transactions between men in the material, intellectual and spiritual fields nowadays.

All this renovation of leadership toward the progress of the unit, of the human person, of the individual as a component part of the whole can and must be carried out within the regular frameworks of our present monetary, economic and political machinery, within the framework of free enterprises, of private property, under the powerful and able leadership of a truly democratic government, that is devoutly dedicated to the service of the people while protecting the interests and capital of large private enterprises.

A careful study of the program I am introducing today under the title "Personal Vital Right", will be sufficient to convince the most apprehensive masters and the most fervent devotees of our present tradition.

All the rights of man must be expressed in dollar signs.

That is the central point of all consolidation of acquired wealth.

The "Personal Vital Right" is a simple technique, a very simple formula of administration which requires no new legislation, no new institution, no new mechanism; it can be worked out within the normal monetary, economical and political mechanisms used at present.

I do not profess to have invented anything new.

I do not profess to have discovered anything miraculous.

I do not profess to have dethroned the present scientists.

I do not profess to have superseded the present politicians.

I do not profess to have overthrown the present financiers.

I simply want to impart to you the results of my research and my findings while I watch you all.

The conclusion is quite simple. Do keep acting the same way, each one of you in his own place, in the same institutions, having in mind solely the new mentality, and striving, with your enlightened intellect, toward unity, the human being and his needs, at the same time aiming in your institutions at the capital gain.

All this may be done without changing anything almost without anybody noticing it. Everything takes place in the mind of the administration. If you belong to such administration, you alone are concerned, and nobody else. Other people will benefit from the result and congratulate you when the time comes. But the administration has to prepare the implementation of the program, of the technique, of the formula, which consists only in aiming at unity in order to reach the whole, in aiming at the human being to reach the whole, in aiming at the progress of each individual to attain prosperity for the country, the nation, your institutions.

If you hunt geese, you have to kill the birds one by one in order to get the flock. To milk a herd of cows, you have to milk them one by one. To build 1,000 Buick cars, even through mass production, you have to build them one by one. Every figure is a series of units, even in economy. A million is made up of dollars.

Even if the intelligentsia and the millionnaires are used to abstract calculations in real life we have to abide by the unit. The spirit is willing, but the flesh is slow.

Even the most learned, the most famous doctor—

The Chairman: Order. I regret I have to interrupt the hon. member, but it is six o'clock.

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Chairman, may I call it six o'clock?

[*Text*]

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the acting house leader whether there is any change in the government's plans for tomorrow, to carry on with interim supply?

Mr. MacNaught: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will carry on with interim supply. I hope that will be completed reasonably early in the day so that we may go on with our consideration of the main estimates, departments of citizenship and immigration, forestry, national revenue and industry.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to ask the acting house leader a question? Would the government not consider calling at an early date, tomorrow, Friday or Monday, the resolution preceding the Canada pension plan? As the government knows, that debate is limited by our new rules to one day and we would lose no time in getting the bill before us by following this course.

Mr. MacNaught: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, I may say that his suggestion will be given every consideration, but I must point out to the house, as I have done before, that at the moment nothing is of more urgency than interim supply.

Mr. Knowles: Does the minister not realize that the way this debate is going it would not delay the passing of interim supply if we took one day out for this important measure?

Mr. MacNaught: I think there is every probability that the debate will conclude tomorrow.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, October 29, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. MACINNIS—PRESS RELEASE RESPECTING FLAG COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I rise on a question of privilege. Earlier, Mr. Speaker, I spoke to you about two questions of privilege I wished to raise, and it was agreed that because of the short sitting hours on Wednesday one of them should be brought forward at ten o'clock.

However, the question I wish to raise at this time affects all members of the house, the integrity of each and every member in relation to the tasks they assume when serving this house. It is based on a press release, prior to the report of the flag committee, which was issued in the name of one of the hon. members of that committee. I feel this constitutes an obvious violation of the duty which this committee took upon itself when meeting in camera, to withhold any and all information which might develop in the course of those meetings.

This press release is a deliberate violation of that undertaking. It is a disgraceful performance, reflecting on every member of this house who undertakes to do a job which is assigned to him by the house. This release to the press is, without doubt, one which was prepared well in advance, and I cannot understand how any such detailed report could have been prepared without the prior knowledge and consent of at least one or two of the hon. member's colleagues. The whole procedure following developments within the flag committee has taken on, with this release, the aspect of deliberate plants throughout these hearings, plants that are put before the Canadian people as the choice of the flag committee, which nevertheless in my opinion, now confirmed by this report, were a deliberate move—I do not think necessarily the workings of one man—on the part of the government to imply to the people of Canada that this was being brought about by efforts on the part of the flag committee. The report that the A.Y. Jackson flag had been accepted as the national flag, and other similar reports, followed by this particular report, certainly convince me that everything that has been done within that committee has been done deliberately by the government, and this release would support that contention.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege—

Mr. Horner (Acadia): How much did he get paid for the article?

Mr. Pearson: —the remark by the hon. member that everything that was done in that committee by the Liberal members was done under the instructions of the government, or under any pressure from the government, is 100 per cent, completely false.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: How much was he paid?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let us get on with the business before the house.

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. Reference was made a moment ago by the hon. gentleman opposite to a story released in the paper today, which indeed I did write. I prepared it in the committee this morning. I can assure the house that it was not prepared with any help from any other member, or indeed with the knowledge of any other member; and I did so knowing or expecting that the papers would be released later this day, after the report had been filed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deachman: If I have caused any embarrassment to the Chair I do indeed humbly apologize.

Mr. Bell: You embarrassed the government.

Mr. Lambert: It is still a lousy trick.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I also rise on a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman has stated that this article was prepared this morning. It is interesting to note that it has been copyrighted, so that certainly there has been fast action since the committee met this morning.

Flag Committee Report

This article, sir, to which reference was made by the hon. member for Cape Breton South, is one that cannot be excused in any way. It is a violation of the responsibility of members of parliament. That committee met throughout in a spirit that is not in keeping with this hon. member's statement here, which is one more serious than I would like to describe at this moment; in fact it constitutes a complete dereliction on his part and is a matter of serious importance to this house.

Some hon. Members: Shameful.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We have been wondering where all these leaks came from. No doubt this will have been cleared up now by the production of this article in advance of the house being apprized of the recommendations made by the committee. Indeed, it is a contravention, I believe, of the arrangement made in the committee, if I understand it correctly, namely that nothing was to be revealed of the course taken in the committee. In other words this is an ex parte statement made by an hon. gentleman designed to exculpate himself and apparently others associated with him in a course of action which is inexcusable in the extreme.

Mr. Speaker: I have not seen the article and the Chair is taken by surpise, but I will look into the matter.

CANADIAN FLAG

PRESENTATION OF SIXTH AND SEVENTH AND FINAL REPORTS

Mr. H. M. Batten (Humber-St. George's): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the sixth report, as well as the seventh and final report, of the special committee on a Canadian flag, in English and in French.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the report be read?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: I am advised that it is not generally the practice to read the report of a committee at this time but with the unanimous consent of the house it could be read. Does the house give unanimous consent to the reading of the committee's report?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Pearson: Both reports.

[*The Clerk Assistant proceeded to read the sixth report, as follows:*]

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

The special committee on a Canadian flag has the honour to present the following as its sixth report.

1. Pursuant to its order of reference of September 10, 1964, your committee has before it, for consideration and report, the flag question.

2. On September 15, 1964, the House of Commons designated 15 members of the committee: Mrs. Konantz, Messrs. Batten, Cadieux (Terrebonne), Deachman, Dubé, Flemming (Victoria-Carleton), Langlois, Lessard (Lake St. John), Macaluso, Matheson, Monteith, Pugh, Rapp, Ricard and Scott.

3. A subcommittee on agenda and procedure was appointed. The members were Messrs. Batten, Deachman, Monteith, Ricard and Scott.

4. Your committee held 45 sittings in camera and heard 12 witnesses in the fields of history, heraldry, protocol, art and design. The members of the committee express their gratitude to these witnesses for their efforts in providing detailed information and also to the nearly 2,000 Canadians who submitted flag designs and suggestions.

5. Your committee considered the following motions:

(a) For a national plebiscite—motion defeated by a vote of nine to five (9 to 5);

(b) The adoption of only one national flag—motion carried fourteen to zero (14 to 0);

(c) That the Canadian red ensign be the national flag for Canada—motion defeated ten to four (10 to 4).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why did you bring in two flags, then?

[*The Clerk Assistant continuing:*]

6. The designs received by the committee, together with those previously submitted, were grouped into three categories, namely:

Class A—those containing three maple leaves;

Class B—those containing one maple leaf;

Class C—those containing the union jack and/or the fleur de lys.

Elimination by an agreed procedure left only one design in each category. A vote for the retention of each finalist was then taken with the following results:

A—The three maple leaf design was retained by a vote of eight to six (8 to 6);

B—The single maple leaf design was retained by a vote of thirteen to one (13 to 1);

C—The design containing the union jack and/or the fleur de lys was rejected by a vote of nine to five (9 to 5).

A vote was then taken to determine the committee's preference between the design containing three maple leaves and the design containing one maple leaf. The single maple leaf design was retained by a vote of fourteen to zero (14 to 0).

As previously agreed, a vote was taken to determine whether or not the final selection was acceptable as a national flag for Canada. The result of this vote was in favour, ten to four (10 to 4).

7. Your committee, therefore, recommends that the flag to be designated as the national flag of Canada be a red flag of the proportions two by length and one by width, containing in its centre a white square, the width of the flag, bearing a single red maple, or, in heraldic terms, described as gules on a Canadian pale argent a maple leaf of the first.

8. The committee received and discussed a motion that it submit to the House of Commons two reports as follows:

Report No. 6, being the report herein, dealing with the national flag and final report No. 7 dealing with a flag to symbolize Canadian membership in the commonwealth of nations and Canada's allegiance to the crown. This motion was carried by a vote of nine to five (9 to 5).

It was moved and seconded that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag be now adopted. The motion was carried by a vote of ten to four (10 to 4).

Respectfully submitted,
H. M. Batten,
Chairman.

[*The Clerk Assistant proceeded to read the seventh and final report as follows:*]

The special committee on a Canadian flag has the honour to present the following as its seventh and final report.

Following its decision on the recommendation regarding a national flag for Canada, your committee then considered the question of a flag to symbolize Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations and her allegiance to the crown.

It was moved "That the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to provide that the Canadian red ensign may continue to be flown as a symbol of Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations and of her allegiance to the crown". An amendment was moved to substitute the words "royal union flag, generally known as the union jack" for the words "Canadian red ensign".

The amendment carried by a vote of seven yeas, two nays and five abstentions. The motion as amended then carried by a vote of eight yeas, one nay and five abstentions.

Your committee, therefore, recommends that the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to provide that the royal union flag, generally known as the union jack, may continue to be flown as a symbol of Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations and of her allegiance to the crown.

It was moved and seconded that the seventh and final report of the special committee on a Canadian flag be now adopted. The motion was carried by a vote of eight yeas, one nay and five abstentions.

Respectfully submitted,
H. M. Batten,
Chairman.

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Léon Balcer (Three Rivers): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the leader of the house or the chairman of the flag committee when it is intended to move concurrence in the report that has just been presented to the house?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as leader of the government perhaps I could answer that question. It will be recalled, I think, that on September 10, when I reported to the house in regard to the discussions held by the party leaders on the procedure to be followed in setting up the flag committee, I said at that time that once the flag committee had reported to the house I would invite the party leaders to meet me again and we would discuss the procedure to be followed in the light of the report. I have already invited the party leaders to meet me tomorrow morning. However, it is not convenient for one party leader to be here tomorrow, so I hope we will have the meeting on Monday morning.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED IN DEALING WITH AMENDMENT METHOD

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question will not have to do with the flag committee or anything of that kind. We have had a full revelation from the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra; therefore no questions are necessary.

I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question in regard to the repatriation of the constitution. When the address is placed before the house to embody the proposed amendment, will the British North America Act in its present form be brought before the house and dealt with section by section, or how does the government intend to bring about the right of the parliament of Canada to deal with the amendment of its own constitution?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be making a statement on this matter, or if I am not in my place the Minister of Justice will be making a statement very shortly on the procedure to be followed in this matter.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is related to the question just asked by the Leader of the Opposition, and it is likewise to the Prime Minister. Is there any difference between the proposed constitutional amendment agreed to by all the provinces with respect to the delegation of powers to the provinces and the proposal of the Conservative administration in 1960, which is generally called the Fulton formula?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, in so far as the delegation of federal powers to the provinces is concerned there is no difference.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. A question of law cannot be answered in the house, and I want to say at the same time that what the right hon. gentleman has said is not correct. It is quite different, because section 91 (1), involving matters of federal jurisdiction, is now going to come in part under the provincial legislatures, and this was not so in the formula we put forward.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman has disputed my right to answer this question, and has also disputed the accuracy of the answer. In case he has some doubt about accepting my word may I quote what the premier of Manitoba said the other day on this matter. I refer to the Winnipeg *Tribune* of October 24, where Mr. Roblin is reported in quotes as saying:

"The delegation provisions of the draft are exactly the same as under the Fulton formula. That is why those who say it was a put-up job are completely wrong."

Including my right hon. friend.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I say at once that is not a question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I also say at once that the words uttered by the Prime Minister are false. The fact is that the premier of Manitoba made no reference whatever to me in the course of his remarks. That is false, and the Prime Minister knows it.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I would not like to do any injustice to my right hon. friend. When I quoted the remarks of the premier of Manitoba, the quotation as taken from the Winnipeg *Tribune* ended with the words:

That is why those who say it was a put-up job are completely wrong.

That was the end of the quotation. When I said "including my right hon. friend" that was my observation.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And, Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister could have got way with that falsity he would have done so.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Pickersgill: Temper, temper.

Mr. Monteith: Who is getting red in the face?

[Mr. Pearson.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Minister of Transport must not get annoyed. Doctor's orders.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I say I had expected an interesting afternoon, but not quite as exciting as this.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

NON-PARTICIPATION BY INDIANS IN DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration I would like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister, relating to the dominion-provincial conference taking place today on Indian affairs. Has the right hon. gentleman knowledge of any objections by native Indian organizations and people to the fact that this meeting is being held without their presence? Further, I ask whether he does not think this is justification for opening the meeting to native Indian people so that at least, in accordance with their rights, they may attend as observers?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think the normal procedure in meetings of this kind is being followed, but I shall be glad to look into my right hon. —my hon.—friend's question and see if anything can be done.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the right hon. gentleman for my promotion.

COMBINES

BRITISH COLUMBIA—REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING AUTOMOBILE PARTS AND ACCESSORIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to ask the Minister of Justice. Has the minister received an appeal from the automotive retailers association of B.C. urging immediate action to correct abuses in the distribution of gasoline, tires, batteries and accessories and, if so, is he considering taking action on this urgent appeal?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I have received some representations in this respect, and I am pleased to state that the matter is receiving active consideration. I expect to be in a position in the near future to make known the policy of the government with respect to the recom-

mendations of the restrictive trade practices commission in its tire, batteries and accessories report.

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): As a supplementary question, does the minister realize this question was first asked of Hon. Lionel Chevrier in May, 1963, and a report has been promised ever since that time?

Mr. Favreau: I realize this, Mr. Speaker, but I hope the hon. gentleman will also realize that I recently said I would be placing certain recommendations before my colleagues, and I am pleased to add that they are presently before the cabinet.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR FROM NOVA SCOTIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Since he seems to be in a rather good mood today may I ask him whether he is in a position to announce today the appointment to the C.N.R. board of directors of a representative from the province of Nova Scotia? By way of explanation to the minister may I say I pose this question again as the result of strong representations from prominent members of the Liberal party in that province.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, although I am not quite sure whether this is an altogether appropriate question under the rules, I may say—

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): It was allowed the other day.

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes, it was allowed the other day; I noticed that in *Hansard.*

Mr. MacEwan: When you were away.

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes, when I was away.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): On a point of order, the Speaker is in his seat, not over there.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I was answering the hon. gentleman. I was going on to say I had some doubt in my mind whether this was the kind of question envisaged in the rules given to Your Honour by the house some time ago, but I would like to have the privilege of answering it anyway, and to say that it is the intention of the government to appoint a director to Trans-Canada Air Lines, or Air Canada, from the province of Nova Scotia. I think the hon. gentleman will appreciate why, on the balance of advantages, it was thought at this particular time that this would be a more appropriate appointment for that province.

TRANSFER OF HOTEL MANAGEMENT TO PRIVATE INTERESTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport and ask whether consideration is being given to the transfer of the management of the Fort Garry hotel in Winnipeg, or any other C.N.R. hotel? If so, will Canadian companies be given a chance to put in competitive bids?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): By "management" does the hon. gentleman mean ownership?

Mr. Chatterton: Management.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is a matter for the management of the railway. I would not know anything about that.

Mr. Chatterton: Then would the minister inquire from C.N.R. and advise the house?

Mr. Pickersgill: I would be glad to make some inquiries, Mr. Speaker.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—INQUIRY AS TO REPORT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Justice what progress is being made with respect to the study relating to juvenile deliquency, and whether he is in a position to report.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is a question requiring an answer far too large to be given at this time. Would the hon. member put it on the order paper?

Mr. Howard: May I rephrase it and ask the minister whether the committee has completed its study.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the committee has made a first report and is considering issuing a final report before the end of the year.

Inquiries of the Ministry

PENSIONS

CANADA PLAN—REQUEST FOR EARLY CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Can he tell us whether the government has given consideration to the suggestion I made at adjournment time last night that very early—today, tomorrow or Monday—we take up the resolution stage of the Canada pension plan? As the right hon. gentleman knows, that could be debated in one day under the new rules and it would not delay the passing of interim supply. Has consideration been given to this suggestion?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, but it is considered important to get interim supply passed before we proceed to any other business, however important it may be.

Mr. Knowles: As a supplementary question, has the government considered that if we take a day out of the present interim supply debate for this it will not change the final date at which interim supply is agreed to?

Mr. Pearson: By the same token, the postponement for a few days of the resolution to which my hon. friend refers will not postpone the application of the bill to which it applies.

Mr. Knowles: That has been the story for the last 18 months.

Mr. Churchill: Then why do you support them?

[*Later:*]

Mr. Knowles: Because the answer to my question about the scheduling of the debate on the Canada pension plan was unsatisfactory, I should like to give notice that I will raise the matter in the overtime period.

AGRICULTURE

QUEBEC—INQUIRY AS TO APPLICATION OF ARDA PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the minister responsible for the application of ARDA in eastern Canada?

Can the Minister of Forestry tell us in which areas of the province of Quebec the ARDA program, or the minister's program, is applied at the present time?

[Mr. Favreau.]

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is a question for the order paper.

INDUSTRY

LOCATION OF PROPOSED SECOND HEAVY WATER PLANT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lawrence E. Kindt (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Since invitations to bid on the second heavy water plant have gone out to six companies, is it the intention of the government to name the site, as was done for the first plant in Cape Breton, or will the company making the lowest bid choose the location where it can operate at the least cost?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, that is not a matter within my administrative responsibility.

Mr. Speaker: It is also a question for the order paper.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A supplementary question to the question directed by the hon. member for Macleod to the Minister of Transport. When he was asked a question with respect to the location of the heavy water plant, the Minister of Transport said this matter did not come within his jurisdiction. Why, then, did the Minister of Transport claim responsibility for placing the first heavy water plant in Cape Breton?

Mr. Pickersgill: I am glad to have the credit for it.

Mr. MacInnis: A further question to the Minister of Transport. Did I understand the minister to reply from his seat in respect to my last question to the effect that he was glad to take credit for the heavy water plant in Cape Breton?

Mr. Pickersgill: No; I was very glad that the government of Nova Scotia gave credit to certain of the members on this side of the house for seeing that that was done.

Mr. MacInnis: A further supplementary. Would the Minister of Transport care to read the second column on page 7430 of *Hansard* where the Minister of Industry, the minister responsible in this case, had this to say:

I would point out that the choice of location—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is not a question. It is a statement.

Mr. MacInnis: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Is this question of privilege an attempt to make a statement or is it really a question of privilege? The Chair is trying to help the hon. member, but there is a limit.

Mr. MacInnis: My question of privilege is intended to establish once and for all responsibility for the location of this plant, and to deny the claim made by the Minister of Transport by the words of the minister responsible, the Minister of Industry. In order to clear up this matter it will be necessary for me to quote the responsible minister, the Minister of Industry.

Mr. Speaker: Do I understand that the hon. member wishes to attribute the success of this venture to one minister rather than to another?

Mr. MacInnis: I think it is my privilege to know what the Chair has ruled, but I failed to hear the ruling because of the noise from the other side of the house. If Your Honour would repeat your question I would attempt to answer it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member can read it in *Hansard*. I still do not know what the question of privilege is.

Mr. MacInnis: It involves myself. It is a personal question. I wish to clarify the statement of the Minister of Transport in regard to the question I asked, in reply to which the Minister of Transport made a complete denial of what was said by his own colleague, the Minister of Industry. There is a conflict here between two ministers, and I think it is the duty of the Chair and of the two ministers concerned to clear it up to the satisfaction of the house and to my personal satisfaction. The Minister of Transport wishes to maintain credit for the establishment of this plant—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is making a complaint, surely, not raising a question of privilege. If he wants a detailed answer, let him put his question on the order paper. I am sure he would then get a detailed answer.

Mr. MacInnis: I am not looking for a detailed answer. I am looking for a truthful one.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REPORTED COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF FRENCH NETWORK

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice.

Since his recent statement, has Mr. Arsenault, a member of the Quebec provincial government, given to the R.C.M.P. the names of those he claims are communists in the C.B.C., or has he presented evidence of communist activity in the C.B.C.? Or, to use the English expression—

[*Text*]

I would simply like to ask, have the mounted police asked Mr. Arsenault to put up or shut up in this regard?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): I will take this as a suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

Did the R.C.M.P. ask Mr. Arsenault to supply them with a list of the supposed communists or with evidence of communist activities within the C.B.C.?

Mr. Balcer: The Liberal federation?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I am evidently not in a position to answer that question. All I can say is that, to my great satisfaction, whenever an investigation must be made in the public interest of Canada, it is always conducted in an efficient manner. However, I may add that if it is in the interest of the house to know the answer to that question, I can inquire.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Not according to Mr. Arsenault.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Inasmuch as the answer given by the Minister of Justice is rather vague and that charges were proffered by a member of the Quebec government, I believe that the minister should at least tell us if the R.C.M.P. is conducting an investigation, following the statement made by Mr. Arsenault to the effect that the C.B.C. would be harbouring communists. Is the R.C.M.P. conducting an investigation in this matter?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I just said that I was not in a position to reply to that question. I answered in a general way, and I will naturally find out if an investigation is required.

[*Text*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

EXTENSION OF INCREASED AID DURING INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION YEAR

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Chapdelaine (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Could the minister tell the house whether the government is considering the establishment of a special foreign aid program to mark the international co-operation year?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the hon. member's question, but I shall read it in *Hansard* tomorrow and give a reply later.

Mr. Chapdelaine: Mr. Speaker, I might repeat my question now if it would help the minister.

I asked him if Canada was considering the establishment of a special program to assist foreign countries, since the United Nations declared 1965 the international co-operation year?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member no doubt knows that a voluntary committee is being set up for that great event and I take this opportunity to remind the hon. member that a few months ago, the federal government considerably increased its foreign aid program.

[*Text*]

UNITED NATIONS

POSTPONEMENT OF MEETING OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether a decision has been taken by the United Nations to defer the meeting of the general assembly from November 10 to a later date. If the decision has not been taken, perhaps the minister could tell the house what progress the secretary general is making in this respect in his attempts to convince the other nations.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The next meeting of the general assembly has been postponed to December 1.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Lamoureux in the Chair.

INTERIM SUPPLY

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $740,710,974.77, being the aggregate of

(a) two twelfths of the total of all of the items to be voted in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965, as reduced, except finance item 15, mines and technical surveys item 25, national research council item 10, and transport items 15 and 25 for which the proportion is one twelfth and atomic energy item 5, external affairs item 20, forestry item 25 and legislation item 20 for which no proportion is being released, $651,829,576.84;

(b) an additional two twelfths of the amount of public works item 70 (schedule A), of the said main estimates, $666,666.67;

(c) an additional one twelfth of the amount of fisheries items 5 and 10, legislation item 5, mines and technical surveys item 70, post office item 1 and public works item 40 (schedule B), of the said main estimates, $20,263,800.00;

(d) two twelfths of all of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (A), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, except national defence item 56a, and loans, investments and advances items L12a, L17a and L37a for which no proportion is being released, $20,612,522.50;

(e) an additional two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103a (schedule C), of the said supplementary estimates (A), $872,966.67;

(f) nine twelfths of the total of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (B), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, $46,215,108.75;

(g) two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103b (schedule D), of the said supplementary estimates (B), $250,333.34;

be granted to Her Majesty on account of the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Chairman, last night when the house adjourned I was saying that society is only made up of individuals, human beings, human persons whose actions are either taken personally, or as a family or a company, or all sorts of associations.

By saving the institutions we are not saving the individuals. But by saving each and every individual we are saving the institutions, especially those which are useful to the human persons.

If each individual in a country were prosperous, the nation would surely be prosperous. It would not be so, if it were the other way around. Institutions cannot prosper while

leaving the majority of individuals in poverty and insecurity.

Heads of families and single persons get equal pay for equal work.

Mothers get no salary for their work as a mother within the family.

Children and students cost a lot of money, and yet they get no personal salary in our present economic structure.

Taxes on company benefits and capital are not as heavy as in the case of private individuals.

If, to figure out economic values, the needs of the human person were taken into account, without overlooking normal capital return for our institutions, everything would become clear and easy in the making up of the national budget of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon), because a national budget is made up of revenues, expenditures and surpluses, just like the budget of any company, any institution, any family, any individual human person.

And why not start with the easiest step in this new orientation of federal, national, provincial, municipal, family and personal administration.

You can see that we always have to come back to the human person. Therefore, let us settle once and for all the budget of the human person, which is the basic unit of the country's economy.

Mr. Chairman, that administration formula should apply everywhere. It is simple and recognized by everybody.

Revenues, expenditures and profits: that is why our 19,300,000 citizens should be assured of their personal subsistance right, guaranteeing each Canadian citizen a minimum subsistence revenue of $1 per day for each child under 16 years of age, $2 per day for each student of 16 years of age and over, $3 per day for each adult dependant, without revenue.

I would ask, Mr. Chairman, that I be permitted to table a more detailed statement—so that I would not have to read it into the record, which would be rather long—which is made up only of explanatory figures.

However, further studies should be made to complete this work, this draft of an administration program based on the needs of a human being while taking into account capital returns of institutions.

I am prepared to briefly expound my argument to the ministers of this government before the Canada pension plan bill is submitted to the House of Commons.

I am very keen on it, because a personal vital right program would, in itself, be sufficient to fulfil the whole unemployment insurance program and that of personal pensions of all Canadian citizens, whatever their age or condition.

I respectfully submit it to you and I ask you to study it in the light of the true interest you show toward the solution of the monetary, economic and political difficulties which affect every person, every citizen of this country.

The economic justice of this nation ranks first among any justice, because it affects the *primo vivere* of every individual within the regular framework of his daily life, of his daily earnings.

Prime Minister of Canada, Minister of Justice, minister of national, social, family and personal finance, it is up to you to act.

Priority of the individual over the institution: Wealthy, powerful and learned citizens of Canada, do you admit that this country is composed of units—19,300,000 human beings?

Wealthy, powerful and learned citizens of Canada, what use is being made of all our talents, our wealth, our authority?

Wealthy, powerful and learned citizens of Canada, are we thinking only about ourselves, our institutions, or about the 19,300,000 persons who are Canada?

A country does not exist; only individuals have life. A government does not exist. A political party does not exist. A ministry does not exist. Only human beings exist and are responsible or are not responsible.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is the one responsible before the 19,300,000 Canadian citizens.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) is responsible for the administration of justice. Economic justice is the most important of any justice, because it affects the *primo vivere* of the 19,300,000 citizens of this country within the practical frameworks of life, of daily earnings.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) is responsible for the finances of the 19,300,000 citizens of this country, in the 4,700,000 families of one or more human beings, who have a body and a mind, who have physical, intellectual and spiritual needs which are all paid for in money and which are produced by 7,000,000 working adults who are the only ones to draw revenues through their work and their capital.

The Minister of Industry is responsible.

The Minister of Agriculture is responsible.

The minister of commerce is responsible.

The Minister of Labour is responsible.

The ministry, the government and the political party do not exist. Only human beings have life, intelligence and responsibility.

Let us cease burying our responsibility behind abstract barriers, behind creations of our mind, behind institutions whose responsibility is limited, atrophied, anonymous.

Every individual is responsible for his position and if he does not feel able to play his part, he should give it up to someone else.

Let us stop hiding behind party politics. Every minister should pursue only one policy: the people's policy.

And the people include 7,000,000 children under 16; 1,000,000 students over 16; 1,300,000 dependent adults in all age groups; 3,000,000 mothers without any income; 12,300,000 Canadian citizens without income; 7,000,000 adult producers with an income; 19,300,000 citizens with needs.

Every citizen has a personal vital right, a natural and divine right, attached to his person from his birth to his death, independent even from his ability to work, to earn a living, before God and man.

All groups, all companies or organizations of every type are merely human institutions, legal bodies, private or public, made up of living persons.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Latulippe: Ministers and members of parliament, whether Liberal, Conservative, socialist, Social Crediters, nationalist, separatists—

The Chairman: Order. As much as I regret it, I must inform the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Chairman, I have here a table which would prove my point. However, since it is fairly long, I would ask that it be printed in *Hansard*, if possible, without my reading it.

The Chairman: Order. No, that is not allowed, unless the table is part of the hon. member's speech.

Mr. Latulippe: It is part of my speech, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: I am sorry, but our standing orders do not allow such procedure.

[*Text*]

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, in rising today to speak on supply I would point out that we have listened to various speeches in reference to the C.B.C., but I wish to direct my attention to something that arose this afternoon and which I believe affects the whole house. I trust you will bear with me, Mr. Chairman, because I have only had the last ten minutes in which to prepare these remarks.

I have said that this matter affects the whole house, and as the official opposition one of our major duties is to control the spending of money. When there is a privilege which affects the whole house, then it goes to the very root of the function the opposition are expected to perform in this house.

This afternoon we saw a matter which has been brushed aside by the Prime Minister. This afternoon the Prime Minister rose and said that something was false but then made no further explanation, and no other members on the government side said anything in this regard. I should like to refer to what took place on September 10, 1964. On that day the special committee was set up to consider the question of a Canadian flag. The composition of that committee comprised members of the Liberal party, the Conservative party, the New Democratic party, the Social Credit party and the Ralliement Creditistes. Although I was not a member of the committee and consequently have limited knowledge of the facts, as I understand it—and I challenge anyone to deny it at this time—when the committee first met it agreed that it would sit in camera and that if any of its considerations were to be disclosed such disclosure should be made by the chairman.

There now appears to have been a serious breach in this respect, Mr. Chairman. If such a breach occurred in a court of law which was sitting in camera the person guilty of the breach would be in contempt of court and brought before the bar of justice. I suggest that this particular member of the house is in contempt of parliament this afternoon. It is interesting to note that in the Ottawa *Citizen*—

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Tardif): Order. I think the hon. gentleman will realize that he has to relate his remarks, not to an individual member but to the problem under study.

Mr. Woolliams: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not quite follow what you mean but I have always had a lot of respect for the Chair and am trying to stay within the rules. I do not think I am out of order in this regard. I am now coming to grips with the problem. As I pointed out at the outset of my remarks, the function of an official opposition is to check into the expenditures of government depart-

ments. One of the expenditures will provide for this committee and other matters in connection with the flag. If I might continue with my remarks, I was referring to an article which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* of today's date.

Mr. Fane: The editor is the Prime Minister's nephew.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes; as one hon. member says, the editor of the paper is the nephew of the Prime Minister. It is rather peculiar, Mr. Chairman, but on several other occasions the Ottawa *Citizen* has been able to publish reports concerning various matters and problems which are about to be reported to parliament prior to their actual report in the house.

Miss LaMarsh: Well at least it speaks the truth.

Mr. Woolliams: Now we have the minister of health speaking and we are always interested in what she has to say.

Miss LaMarsh: That is more than we can say of you.

An hon. Member: Remember the truth squad.

Mr. Woolliams: We all know she knows about the truth because she was the one who invented the truth squad during the last election; but the Prime Minister had to dissolve that truth squad because he was losing more votes than she could manufacture. However, I do not intend to be put off the rails by the minister of health. I was saying that it is peculiar that this newspaper is often able to report upon government business which should be disclosed in the house prior to its actual disclosure in the house. This disclosure is far more serious because the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra had given his solemn oath to that committee that he would disclose no facts found by the committee.

The Chairman: Order. I feel that at this stage I might be expected to make a comment as to whether or not the remarks of the hon. member for Bow River are relevant. I realize of course that discussion on interim supply is rather general in nature and is not, according to our practice, very easily restricted. But on the other hand, in the course of this particular debate the Chair has tried to bring to the attention of individual members the fact that speeches and remarks have to stay within the ambit of the administration of the government. That is to say, they must refer to government business. I have been following the hon. member's remarks to this point and they seem to me to relate to the conduct of an individual member of the house. I have strong reservations about whether at this particular stage of the debate these remarks can be considered relevant and proper to be discussed in committee of supply on the consideration of interim supply. The hon. member for Bow River might wish to keep that in mind.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; I appreciate the point you have raised. However, with great respect to the Chair, I would say that this is a serious matter of government business relating to how the government conducts its business. I submit there are past precedents for this. The terms of reference of a debate like this are that hon. members can talk on matters which are relevant to government business; and I am saying this is a matter of government business and I should like to proceed.

As I was saying, this hon. member had given his solemn promise, if not oath, to that particular committee that nothing would be—

The Chairman: Order. It is the feeling of the Chair that the subject matter of the hon. member's remarks deals specifically with the conduct of an individual member, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. It seems to me that this cannot be considered government business any more than the conduct of any other individual member could be considered to be within the ambit of the administration of government. I would strongly urge the hon. member to pass on to other considerations perhaps.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, in addition to referring to government business, there has been an infringement of the rights and privileges of parliament. Only the other day on interim supply we were discussing a problem which affected the Canadian National Railways. During the last two or three days we were discussing a problem concerning the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. On both occasions we were talking about the authority of parliament with respect to crown corporations.

We are now dealing with the authority of parliament with regard to the actions of a member on the government side which infringe on the rights and privileges of parliament itself. So far as we can judge the government has given its approval of this type of action on the part of one of its members. Surely this is a problem which should be discussed at this particular time;

this is the most suitable period to raise the matter because on interim supply, as on all supply debates, grievances may be raised. This is a legitimate grievance regarding the action of an hon. member who was a member of the flag committee. I think the hon. member for Bow River is within his rights in raising this topic.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre refers to the fact that the privileges of this house have been infringed. This is possible. The Chair cannot, of course, dispute that in any way but machinery is provided to deal with that kind of situation through a substantive motion. Certainly in my view, however, this matter should not be discussed on interim supply because it concerns the personal conduct of an hon. member. In this regard perhaps it might be appropriate to refer the hon. member to citation 128 (1) of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which reads as follows:

A personal attack—

I realize this is not a personal attack in the sense of personalities, but it is personal in the sense that it is directed at one individual member.

—by one member upon another, is an offence against the house, in the person of one of its members, which, on account of the respect due from every member to the character and dignity of the house, as well as the importance of preserving regularity in the debates, calls for the prompt interference of the Speaker, in order that any irregularity, into which a member may have been betrayed in the warmth of debate, may be rectified—

And so on. That is the view of the Chair.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, may I speak before you make a ruling?

The Chairman: Yes, I would be pleased to hear the views of the hon. member on this subject before I make a ruling.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that you have read a specific rule, but with the greatest respect I suggest that it is not applicable.

I am not going into detail this afternoon, but what I am attempting to discuss is this. We have a new kind of government: We now have government through newspapers. We are observing news leaks and government through those news leaks rather than by parliament. I suggest that the whole process of government is in question.

I am not making any personal attack at this moment on the member for Vancouver Quadra, but he happens to be one of the actors who has acted on behalf of and for

[Mr. Churchill.]

the government. He is the man who allowed the news to leak out so that we could have government by newspapers rather than government by parliament.

Mr. Chairman, the rights and privileges of parliament are at stake, and the expenditure of money is at stake. Surely those matters are related to the matter under discussion this afternoon. This situation was only brought to our attention a few minutes before we came into the house this afternoon. I had some idea of the kind of motion I would move if I intended to make a personal attack, and that is something I may do tomorrow when we have more time; but today we are discussing the privileges of parliament itself.

The news item in question is nothing more than a new kind of process of Liberal government. It is government by the Prime Minister's nephew through the Ottawa *Citizen*. I submit that we have the right to debate this serious matter this afternoon. I can understand the attitude taken by the government in opposition to my suggestion. They adopt that attitude because they are frightened and do not want these facts disclosed to the Canadian people. The government wants to keep the opposition silent in this regard. We do not intend to be silent about this question. Of course I must respect your ruling, but if you rule against me, and I say this with respect, we may appeal your ruling. We have the right this afternoon to discuss this situation. It should be aired because it goes to the very foundation of this institution.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, I should like to make some observations in relation to the question now troubling you, and the point of order which has been raised in connection with a discussion of this matter.

It seems to me that there is no doubt whatsoever that we are in this committee to discuss the matter of interim supply for the next two months. We are being asked to supply funds to pay all the expenses of parliament and expenses related to committees of parliament. One parliamentary committee is now under discussion. The expenses of that committee will have to be paid by this parliament, and I say to you that if any member on any side of this house chooses to raise a point related to the matter now before this committee he has a perfect right to do so. If that discussion reflects upon the actions of a member of that committee, that is unfortunate, but it is not the point at issue. The point is that we are being

asked to vote money to pay the expenses incurred by the flag committee, and we have as much right to discuss those expenses and the actions of that committee as we have to discuss the expenditure of any other moneys.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, in relation to the question now before us, I believe on more than one occasion during the debate on interim supply members of the cabinet, and particularly the President of the Privy Council, have risen to indicate that the time for opposition members, or members on the government side, to air any grievances they have regarding the conduct of the affairs of this nation is during the debate on interim supply. That being the case, I cannot understand how one could possibly suggest that the hon. member for Bow River has been out of order this afternoon.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, at first glance the thought you expressed seems to carry considerable support. However, one knows what happens with some frequency in the law courts during the course of an argument. A lawyer may find the judge in disagreement with his position, but as he continues to argue his case changes take place in the thinking of the judge. I am sure Your Honour is well aware of that fact, because of your experience. I was very much impressed, as I expect you were, by the argument advanced by one whose experience in parliamentary life has been lengthy. One of the ways by which rules are discussed is by assistance given in interpreting those rules. The hon. member for Victoria-Carleton, former premier of his province, raised a point which I submit is one that deserves Your Honour's fullest consideration.

A committee of parliament is set up for a specific purpose. The committee now under discussion was set up for a specific purpose. It went off to the country and apparently sought strength by looking out at the hills. All these things cost money. Professional witnesses in heraldry and the like were called, and their expenses must be paid. That being so, those expenses are the proper subject of scrutiny by parliament. That is exactly what the hon. member for Bow River was endeavouring to do. He was attempting to ascertain whether those expenditures were in keeping with parliament procedure, and I ask Your Honour to give the fullest possible consideration to this matter so that no one will be able to suggest that parliament does not have the right to examine expenditures, however small they are as compared with larger ones.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I should like to offer a few brief words on this point of order. I think there must be general agreement with the concluding portion of what the Leader of the Opposition has said. I assume that the expenses of the flag committee are covered in the legislative items, or somewhere in an item a portion of which we are now voting. Therefore if one were merely arguing that we have the right to discuss what that committee did, that argument would be difficult to deny.

However, as I understand the situation, Your Honour is not concerned with the fact that an hon. member is discussing what the flag committee did, but rather with the fact that he is discussing something which took place entirely outside the flag committee, indeed outside the house, namely the publication of an article in a newspaper. I did not understand that Your Honour was trying to cut off a discussion about the flag or the flag committee. However, if an offence against the House of Commons has been committed by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra—

Mr. Churchill: Why do you say "if"? Do you not think he has committed an offence?

Mr. Knowles: I certainly think he was stupid. I also found it quite annoying to watch television last night and hear a member of this house state, before a report had been made to the house, that there were certain things in it he would not accept. I suppose the Leader of the Opposition has the right to be arrogant on television and the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra has the right to be stupid—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: —but we also have the right to expect the rules of the house to be observed.

Mr. Woolliams: Do you think there were others involved besides the hon. member?

Mr. Knowles: I doubt it. I do not know, but I think it is the kind of stupid thing that a person does all on his own. But, Mr. Chairman, surely if an offence has been committed against the house, that is for the house to deal with. It is not an offence against the committee of supply. Therefore I submit Your Honour is right in asking the hon. member for Bow River not to bring into the committee of supply the question of what an individual has done which may be an offence against the house.

I agree with the Leader of the Opposition and with the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton that we are discussing the expenditure of money and I believe it is the case that some of that money is for the expenditures of the flag committee. All right, we can discuss what went on in the flag committee; but to discuss in committee of supply what an individual has done outside the house is a different story. While I do not presume to define what Your Honour is trying to rule on, it has been my understanding that it is that narrow aspect of the matter on which you have been trying to make a ruling.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to Beauchesne, fourth edition, citation 119, paragraph 2:

> In parliament every corner of the country is represented and no rule should silence elected representatives when they think they have a message to deliver. Freedom of speech is a sacred principle and if there is a place where it should be fully respected that place is the parliament of the nation, and it is the Speaker's responsibility to see that this principle is not infringed upon.

Paragraph 3 reads as follows:

> Relevancy is not easy to define. A wrong comprehension of it may have a serious effect on the freedom of speech. Members are often deprived of their right to speak on the pretext that their remarks are irrelevant when as a matter of fact they refer to matters perhaps remote but yet related, even indirectly, to the question under debate. In borderline cases the members should be given the benefit of the doubt. A great deal of latitude must be allowed in the House of Commons which is a forum where every phase of public affairs can be discussed and every member has the right to be heard, even if in doing so he sometimes disregards the rigidity of procedure.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Frenette: Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you for giving hon. members the opportunity to express their opinion on the rules of relevancy you would have the committee follow.

Obviously, I am not an authority on parliamentary procedure, but in view of the reputation enjoyed by the parliament of Canada among the public, I feel it is imperative for us to proceed in an orderly fashion and for the Chair to be recognized as the proper authority concerning our proceedings.

In my opinion, it is unthinkable that every time you seek to restrict an hon. member to the matter under consideration, the member in question should rise to argue with you and then keep on with his remarks as if nothing had happened.

I am of the opinion that the authority of the Chair must be respected by all members, and we now have a golden opportunity to prove, not only our maturity, but also our intention to work in the interest of the Canadian people.

I agree wholeheartedly with your decision.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to speak on the same subject—

The Chairman: Does the hon. member wish to speak to the point of order?

Mr. Rondeau: No, Mr. Chairman.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: The point raised has been well discussed and well aired, and perhaps the result of the discussion would seem to indicate that the Chair was on the right track from the start. However, at this point I should not like to make a general ruling, and the ruling that the Chair was attempting to make or was suggesting to the hon. member was that his remarks should not be directed to the conduct of an hon. member individually. I am sure he will want to abide by this ruling of the Chair.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I think I can come within the terms of your ruling in this way. I want to ask this question. Was the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra—I am not talking about him personally—a front for the government?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Woolliams: Government members say no. We would like to hear them on that point. Were government members getting leaks from the committee during the course of the committee's sittings?

Mr. Deachman: On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, today I indicated very clearly to Mr. Speaker in the house that I had not been in contact with anyone in connection with this matter, and the story which I prepared I prepared myself and I released it to the press for publication after the house had opened.

Mr. Churchill: Nonsense.

Mr. Deachman: It was given to the press only after the committee had concluded its hearings.

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order. I would suggest that we might allow the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra to state his question of privilege very briefly, and I will allow the hon. member for Bow River to state his point of order briefly.

Mr. Deachman: I am accused by the hon. member of being a front for other people, of having been in connivance and collusion with other people in connection with the story. I want to repeat again what I said to Mr. Speaker in the house today, that I wrote the story myself, that I did so without getting in touch with any other members of the committee at any time and at no time did I have anything to do with anyone connected with the committee, with parliament or with the Prime Minister's office in connection with the story.

An hon. Member: How much did you get paid for it?

The Chairman: Order. In my opinion there is no question of privilege, but a denial of a statement by the hon. member for Bow River. To my mind both the denial and the statement are out of order because they involve a discussion of the private conduct of an hon. member which should not be a subject of discussion in committee of supply at this stage.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I never made any charge against the hon. member. I asked a question of the government and that is what makes my remarks relevant and within the terms of your ruling. I will proceed to ask the question again. Was the hon. member a front? Was he in communication with cabinet ministers while the committee was sitting? Was the hon. member getting his inspiration from the government in this regard?

Some hon. Members: Order.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member said he is not making a charge, and I cannot deny that, but he is certainly making an insinuation. The Chair tries to stay out of the debate if at all possible, but certainly the hon. member would seem to be going against the spirit of the ruling of the Chair by using those words.

Mr. Woolliams: Maybe the answer to the whole question I have raised can be found by looking closely at the article itself, which deals with what was discussed in the flag committee. At the beginning of the article it says:

The Commons flag committee has completed its six-weeks task and this afternoon submitted its findings to the house.

One of its Liberal members, Grant Deachman, reveals in this frank report how the committee worked and arrived at its final decision.

Without any reservations whatsoever we know the hon. member disclosed the facts of the committee, the evidence of the committee, the report of the committee before the chairman of that committee could disclose those facts by a report filed in the House of Commons.

There were leaks throughout the time this flag committee was operating. Where did they come from? Did they come from the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, or from other members that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra talked to—and I am talking about Liberal members? We have just to take a look at what he said is the inside story. He said he wrote this a little time after the committee had made out its report. It is a strange thing. He may be speedy on a typewriter, or he may be a speedy writer, but he whirled out practically everything the committee had done a few minutes after the committee made its decision—

The Chairman: I suggest the hon. member is discussing the very matters which the Chair has ruled are not relevant in the discussion on interim supply.

Mr. Woolliams: I take it you are ruling the facts I have been setting out in this debate are out of order, and I would like to appeal your ruling.

The Chairman: I am sure the hon. member realizes the position of the Chair. The Chair has suggested to the hon. member that he cannot discuss the personal conduct of another hon. member, and I am sure the hon. member for Bow River recognizes this ruling. Any comments that he makes which seem to infringe against that rule cannot be allowed to pass without the hon. member being called to order.

Mr. Woolliams: Sir, with the greatest respect to you, I have been in this house since 1958 and I have never asked to appeal any chairman's or Speaker's ruling, but this afternoon I ask to appeal your ruling in this regard so that I can continue my remarks.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman—

Division

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Bow River appeals from the Chair's ruling. The hon. member for Villeneuve may have the floor after report has been made.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker resumed the chair and put the question as follows:

In committee of supply when a vote to provide for interim supply was being considered the Chair ruled that a discussion on the actions of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra in connection with the flag committee was not in order. Whereupon the hon. member for Bow River appealed to the house from the ruling of the Chair.

The house divided on the question: Shall the ruling of the chairman be confirmed?

And the ruling was confirmed on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Armstrong
Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce)
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Bélanger
Benidickson
Berger
Boulanger
Boutin
Byrne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cameron (High Park)
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Cantin
Caouette
Cardin
Caron
Carter
Cashin
Choquette
Chrétien
Côté (Longueuil)
Cowan
Deschatelets
Dionne
Drouin
Drury
Dubé
Ethier
Eudes
Forest
Forgie
Foy
Francis
Frenette
Gauthier
Gelber
Gendron
Godin
Gordon
Greene
Grégoire
Groos
Guay
Habel
Hahn
Haidasz
Harley
Honey
Howard
Jewett, Miss
Kelly
Knowles
Konantz, Mrs.
Lachance
Laing
LaMarsh, Miss
Lamontagne
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Laverdière
Leblanc
Leboe
Leduc
Legault
Lessard (Lake St. John)
Lessard (St. Henry)
Loiselle
Macaluso
Macdonald
Mackasey
MacNaught
McIlraith
McMillan
Martin (Essex East)
Martin (Timmins)
Mather
Matheson
Matte
Moreau
Morison
Mullally
Munro
Nixon
O'Keefe
Olson
Orlikow
Otto
Pearson
Pennell
Perron
Peters
Pickersgill
Pilon
Plourde
Prittie
Prud'homme
Rinfret
Rochon
Rock
Rondeau
Rouleau
Roxburgh
Ryan
Sauvé
Scott
Sharp
Tardif
Teillet
Thompson
Tremblay
Wahn
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Webster
Winch—118.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Balcer
Baldwin
Bell
Cardiff
Chatterton
Churchill
Crouse
Diefenbaker
Doucett
Enns
Fane
Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)
Forbes
Girouard
Grafftey
Gundlock
Harkness
Horner (Acadia)
Horner (Jasper-Edson)
Jorgenson
Kennedy
Kindt
Loney
MacEwan
MacInnis
MacLean (Queens)
Macquarrie
MacRae
McBain
McCutcheon
Madill
Millar
Monteith
Moore
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nasserden
Nesbitt
Nowlan
Nugent
Paul
Pigeon
Rapp
Rhéaume
Ricard
Skoreyko
Slogan
Smallwood
Starr
Stefanson
Stenson
Thomas
Valade
Vincent
Willoughby
Winkler
Woolliams—59.

Mr. Brown: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted to confirm the chairman's ruling.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Cyr: Mr. Speaker, I was paired; otherwise I would have voted in favour of your ruling.

[*Text*]

Mr. McLean (Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted to confirm the chairman's ruling.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, in view of—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I was calling on the pairs. I have to announce the result of the vote, and I declare the ruling confirmed.

And the house having resumed in committee:

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I had a question of privilege while you were in the chair.

Mr. Monteith: So they are breaking all the rules again.

The Chairman: Order. My understanding of the rules is that the chairman was in the Chair as the Speaker only for the purpose of the appeal from the ruling of the chairman. There was nothing before the house so that the Chairman must resume the chair in committee of supply.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman—and you are the chairman now—I would say this. I had a question of privilege to raise while you were in the chair, and under the rules a question of privilege must be made at the soonest possible moment. This has been denied by your walking away from the Chair.

The Chairman: I would suggest to the hon. member, and I respect his experience, that the way to do this would be to ask that the committee rise, and when the Speaker is in the Chair at that moment raise his question of privilege. But certainly there is nothing for the Chair to do at this point except to resume committee of supply.

Mr. Churchill: The committee had risen and reported progress, Mr. Chairman, and the Speaker was in the chair.

The Chairman: I should like to bring to the attention of the hon. member that the committee had not risen and reported progress.

Mr. Churchill: Then how could the Speaker be in the chair if the committee of the whole house was still in session? That is impossible.

The Chairman: I do not pretend this comes from me but I am advised by the table that this is governed by standing order 59 (4) and is the standing practice. In any event, the chairman never reports progress when going into the chair on an appeal to the house. The hon. member for Bow River has the floor now.

Mr. Woolliams: Then I will raise this question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, while you are in the chair as chairman. In view of the question of privilege which was raised this afternoon while the Speaker was in the chair, I would move this motion. In view of the breach of privilege of this house by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra by disclosing certain facts in the report of the flag committee to a newspaper before the same report was filed in the house, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre:

> That the action of the hon. member be referred to the standing committee on privileges and elections to take such action in reference to the said member as may be necessary.

The Chairman: Perhaps the hon. member realizes the situation, since he was rather anxious that the chairman of the committee remain in the chair. The ruling of the Chair must be that the time to raise this question of privilege would be with the Speaker in the chair, and the way to do this would be to move that the committee adjourn. If that motion were carried the Speaker would be in the chair and the question of privilege could then be raised. The hon. member knows that under standing order 59 (2) the committee is bound by its terms of reference, and the terms of reference of the committee certainly do not include a question of privilege such as this. Therefore I would have to rule that the question of privilege cannot be entertained at this time.

Mr. Woolliams: Then may I say this. I as a member, and I am sure this party as a whole, would not want to delay this committee on a matter of procedure, so I will make this motion at the first opportunity when the Speaker is in the chair.

The Chairman: The Chair appreciates the co-operation of the hon. member.

Mr. Woolliams: Now, Mr. Chairman, if I understand your ruling I cannot discuss at this time the actions of the individual himself regarding his disclosure to the press of certain facts with reference to the flag committee. I should now like to change the tone of the discussion for a few moments. When the flag committee sat, it sat in camera. What took place at the meetings of that committee should be known only to those members and not disclosed outside that committee by an individual member, whom I will not name at this time. What has taken place is extremely improper and may jeopardize all future committees. It was agreed by that committee that not only would it sit in camera but that any report to be made of its proceedings would be made by the chairman of the committee rather than by individual members. The failure of a member to live and abide by that committee's procedures and rules is a violation of the rules of the committee. If we allow that improper procedure to go unnoticed, then individual members or groups of members of future committees will be able to make statements

to newspapers before the committee has made its report to the House of Commons, and therefore any approach—

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member must realize that the decision he now is faced with is no longer a simple ruling of the chairman but a decision of the House of Commons. I ask the hon. member to respect that decision.

Mr. Woolliams: In view of the fact you are now suggesting that I cannot discuss any aspect of this matter I will abide by your ruling and resume my place.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: I shall be very brief, Mr. Chairman, because I would not want the passage of interim supply to be delayed indefinitely. There are three clear and simple points I wish to bring to the attention of the government.

Here is the first one. The government should undertake to eliminate slums in our cities through a well-defined program and, with the co-operation of the provinces, to renovate the blighted areas in our cities, following agreements with town planning councils, so that once the program is fully carried out, everything would look wonderful.

Blighted and unhealthy areas such as those exist in Quebec and Montreal. But those homes should also be given all the comfort required: enough room, good lighting, easy maintenance, sufficient space in which to put the car and also for the children to play.

Rents should be truly reasonable and within the means of small wage earners because until now the government has never considered such a program. Instead, it has used poultices to meet the needs and has built so-called low rental units but you should see what they call low rents.

Such a housing project called Les patios has been carried out in my riding under that federal legislation; they have the crust to ask $85 a month and over for rent. The units are badly built so that they are exceedingly warm in summer and very cold in winter.

A special credit provided by the Bank of Canada at very low interest rates—equivalent to service costs—should be made available for the rehabilitation of the blighted areas in our cities. That would get the provinces and municipalities interested in the restoration of such areas.

We could, in this fashion, relieve the distress and poverty which exist even in this 20th century. We would, at the same time, be helping the aged with small incomes and those workers who fail to adapt themselves to present day conditions either because they are too young to retire or too old to be classified as readaptable in the labour market.

By rebuilding certain parts of our cities, we would develop the labour market and, by so doing, reduce unemployment, all the while using our materials which abound in this great Canada of ours.

The second point I should like to bring to the attention of this committee is the urgent matter of railway crossings in the old Quebec capital. It is a continuous hazard for car drivers and for all the people of that city and I think that in that regard, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) would only have to refer to the remarks of my hon. colleague from Quebec East (Mr. Beaulé) to ascertain how easy it would be to carry out such a change.

I take this opportunity to read into the record a request which came to me from the Quebec and district labour council. A copy was sent to the Minister of Transport, the mayor of Quebec city, the Speaker of the Senate, hon. members for Quebec South (Mr. Cantin), Quebec East, Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Marcoux), myself and also to the presidents of the C.N.R. and the C.P.R.

Sir,

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of a resolution passed by our council at its last regular meeting.

The object of the said resolution is to protest against the many grade crossings existing in the old capital city. We believe that such a situation is indeed an unnecessary shortcoming and that it represents a continuous hazard for the car drivers and the whole people of Quebec city.

The whole matter is submitted to your attention and in advance, we thank you for all you could do to remedy such a deplorable situation.

Yours very truly,

The Quebec and District Labour Council
by Thérèse Belleau
corresponding secretary

The third point I wish to raise in this house, concerns the Minister of Transport and has to do with the Quebec piloting office.

For many years those workers have been called upon to work overtime for which they are paid one month and a half later. But this year many employees are complaining that they have not yet received their salaries for overtime done in June and which should have been paid on August 15, overtime done in July which should have been paid on September 15 and overtime done in August which should have been paid on October 15.

I would like to ask the Minister of Transport to give us the reasons for and cause of

this delay in paying overtime. Does it mean that the department has no money available to pay its employees? This is apparently not the case, since the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) told us on many occasions that the country was in a very healthy financial situation.

[*Text*]

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speakers from all sides of this house who have taken part in the debate on interim supply, and particularly to those who have dealt with the operations and policies of the C.B.C. At the present time we are being asked to vote $740 million to carry forward the government's program for the next two months. That is a large sum of money. At the end of the period for which we are being asked to vote this money, the government will have operated through interim supply for a period of nine months. There is an indication now that it does not believe the session will conclude before the end of this year. That is a clear indication of bungling inefficiency. This session has now become the longest on record. The government should not be proud of that fact, because its achievements are few.

Mr. Byrne: Tory filibustering.

Mr. Stefanson: That is an example of the usual contribution of the hon. member for Kootenay East. All he ever does is make the odd interruption from his seat.

Mr. Byrne: Not always.

Mr. Stefanson: There has been criticism from members on all sides of the house about some of the programs produced and sponsored by the C.B.C. To listen to the hon. member for Halifax who spoke the other night one would think that anybody who criticizes or raises any complaint against the C.B.C. is committing a sin. It appears to me that members like him have attempted to set up the C.B.C. as some sort of sacred cow against which no one must breathe a word of criticism at any time.

Mr. Nesbitt: A goldplated sacred cow.

Mr. Stefanson: During the past few weeks several members have questioned certain actions by the C.B.C. involving certain programs and also the allotment of free time to various political parties. I feel these are valid complaints and in my opinion they are not an attempt to interfere with the C.B.C. During the past few weeks members of parliament, and no doubt the management of the C.B.C., have received complaints about the caliber of certain programs, especially the effect they may have on morality. Those in charge of programming always point out that you cannot please everyone, that what some people object to other people approve. This is quite true. However, I would hope that the management of the C.B.C. would take heed of these complaints.

Several members have expressed the view that there is a need for controversial programming. This may be true. However, I would think that a program such as the C.B.C. presented last Sunday night when they interviewed the American nazi, Mr. Rockwell, is the type of program they should refrain from producing. I do not believe that the people of Canada favour spending the taxpayer's money on such programs. Several members have discussed programs and have offered some criticism while others have discussed the administration and financing of the C.B.C.

Parliament is being asked to grant a sum of money in the neighbourhood of $88 million to enable the corporation to carry on for the current year. The amount required from parliament for the corporation to carry on becomes increasingly larger each year. This is something which should be scrutinized and checked by parliament. It is true that the officials of the corporation appeared before the public accounts committee in July of this year. In that regard I would point out that on June 18 a motion was moved and passed in the committee in these terms:

> That the public accounts committee call officials of the C.B.C. before the committee in order to examine into the accounts of the corporation including the extent to which the recommendations of the Auditor General and the Glassco commission have been implemented.

At that time the chairman of the committee added these words:

> We should add to that the fact that we are engaged in dealing with the Auditor General's report on the public accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1962, and March 31, 1963. This gives us a framework for our inquiry which is, in this particular instance, not a broadcasting inquiry but an inquiry into the financial and organizational aspects of the C.B.C. within the framework of these terms of reference.

From this one can see that the terms of reference were quite limited. They allowed for discussion of the 1962-63 annual report of the corporation, but this report deals only with finished business. It would have been much more beneficial and much more interesting if we could have dealt with current busi-

ness. Many members have suggested that the government should appoint a special committee to look into all aspects of the operations of the C.B.C. I support these suggestions and urge the government to appoint such a committee at an early date.

It has been pointed out that the C.B.C. was originally established by the government headed by the late Right Hon. R. B. Bennett. The C.B.C. is at present under severe criticism and there are some signs that there may have been government interference. Examples of this are found in the incident when the Minister of Transport seemed to force his way into appearing on television last summer and also in the handling of the so-called "Mr. Pearson" film. These things have left doubts in the minds of Canadians about the independence of the C.B.C. and are further reasons why a special committee on broadcasting should be set up. The hon. member for Cartier also raised the question of the legality of producing a certain program, and this too should be clarified.

I believe that the record of the C.B.C. over the years is good. However, I wish to point out that in my opinion the C.B.C., with its radio and television networks, is the most powerful instrument in Canada and if it is misused it can be used to make or break individuals. I trust that the management of the corporation will at all times be free from political interference and will live up to the aims and objectives originally laid down.

The hon. member for Churchill spoke about the need for an extension of service. He referred to the need for the extension of both radio and television services to cover the northland. I also wish to say a few words about the need for extension of service. I represent a riding which is in the centre of Manitoba and right in the heart of Canada. Many people in the area I represent either have no television reception or receive it on a hit or miss basis.

Over the years I have received many petitions and letters requesting improved television service for the people of the interlake area. I have pleaded with C.B.C. officials to take action to provide this service. I believe that one of the aims and objectives of the C.B.C. is to make radio and television service available to all Canadians. I must confess I am disappointed that a greater effort has not been made in this regard. The hon. member for Churchill pointed out that in 1961, after the committee on broadcasting had met, we were led to believe that within three years 98 per cent of the population of Canada would have these services available. However, on reading the annual report of the C.B.C. for 1964-65 it would now appear that it may take 10 years to provide these services. This is not fair to the people concerned. The hon. member for Churchill made out a strong case for the people he represents and pointed out that at least 50 per cent of these people have no television service whatsoever while the other 50 per cent only have canned television.

Since I became a member of the house in 1958 I have made representations to the various ministers to whom the C.B.C. has reported and to officials of the C.B.C. about the situation with regard to television reception in the interlake area. I want to review very briefly the history of the C.B.C. television station in Winnipeg. CBWT, Winnipeg, began operations in May, 1954, on channel 4 with an antenna height of 192 feet. A height limitation was imposed because of the proximity of the tower, which was right on Portage avenue, to the Winnipeg airport. At the time channel 4 was assigned to Winnipeg by the Department of Transport it was the best channel available with maximum fringe area coverage.

The Chairman: Order. It being five o'clock, in order to permit the house to consider private members' business it is my duty to leave the chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: 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 notices of motions (papers), private bills, public bills.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES BY PROVINCES

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe) moved:

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of the report prepared by officials of the Department of Finance concerning federal expenditures in each of the provinces of Canada.

He said:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, at this time, we are discussing, or rather asking for the tabling of papers by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon). Unfortunately I notice that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) is not in his seat nor is his parliamentary secretary.

Yet, we are dealing with the tabling of papers concerning them and I am surprised that neither of them is here, especially as

I have evidence which will show how very important it is that these papers should be produced.

As you will remember, on Friday, August 7 last, I mentioned in this house figures on the amount of taxes of all kinds the province of Quebec would be paying and what it would be getting in return, compared with the other provinces. Those figures seem to have stirred the interest of all members, since they were referred to afterwards by a large number of members and ministers and became the subject of more than one debate. So meaningful were the figures I quoted that the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) even though fit to put forward his views and, as can be seen on page 6532 of *Hansard,* in the left column, he said:

I know that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) will in due time set the record straight and that the experts of his department will give us exact figures in keeping with the facts, which will definitely prove that the province of Quebec has, and will always have, everything to gain by remaining within confederation.

These figures were to be given us by the Minister of Finance.

The words I referred to were from the hon. member for Lotbinière.

We asked for that report and we are still waiting for it.

Further on, same page, same column, with regard to the figures I had quoted on the amounts collected in taxes, or taxes paid by Quebec to Ottawa, and on what Ottawa could give in return to Quebec from those taxes, the hon. member for Lotbinière, because so many hon. members had been shocked by those figures, saw fit to add these words:

I say that those figures are wrong—

And if the hon. member for Lotbinière stated that those figures were wrong, it was because he found them shocking, as indeed they were.

He went on:

I say that those figures are wrong, and that in due time, the Minister of Finance will reveal the true situation, as regards the taxes collected by the federal government in the province of Quebec and the redistribution of those taxes in that province.

Well, the Minister of Finance did not provide us with those documents. He announced in his speech of August 7, 1964—he thought it fit to speak about it himself—that experts of his department were making an inquiry, compiling reports and would provide the house with those papers.

Three weeks ago, a paper stated those figures would not be published because that could lead to a sort of revolt among the people of Quebec, as the figures were so prejudicial to the province of Quebec. They were not made known to us and that is why we move today this motion for papers.

We ask the Minister of Finance to bring in the report of his experts, and to bring in those documents on the amount of taxes collected in each province and the amount given back by Ottawa to each province. The Minister of Finance has this information but he refuses to give it to us.

Now, all the figures we can quote can only bear out what we have been saying from time to time to the effect that in this confederation at the present time some provinces are neglected in comparison with others.

Just recently we discussed the Department of Trade and Commerce estimates. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) had published his estimates in which I found something really amazing.

The Department of Trade and Commerce is one of the most important departments and, on a total budget of $83,037,540 for the year 1964-65 as can be seen at the bottom of page 436 of the bluebook for the year ending March 31, 1965:

Special: Payment of carrying costs of temporary wheat reserves and payments in connection with the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act; total, $46,700,000.

Out of total estimates of $83,037,000, the Department of Trade and Commerce spends $46,700,000, that is nearly 55 per cent, in the three western provinces only.

I have no objection to their receiving $46 million to assist western wheat producers, but when an equal share is not given to farmers or producers of other goods in the province of Quebec, when the Department of Trade and Commerce does not assist the other provinces, but only these three small provinces, while the other provinces pay just as much in taxes, then I have an objection.

If the Minister of Finance will not quote figures, while we quote some, then he has no right to state, as he did on August 7 last, that our figures are wrong and that we quote erroneous figures.

I can see that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is in his seat. It is a fact that out of $83 million spent by his department, $46 million are earmarked for the wheat item for the three prairie provinces.

Why not appropriate a further amount for agriculture in eastern Canada, in the maritime provinces, in the province of Quebec, in the province of Ontario?

I already quoted figures on November 12, 1963. On August 7 we were dealing with the figures provided by Mr. K. W. Taylor, and yet the Minister of Finance said that these figures were erroneous. Today I am quoting figures included in the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

On November 12, 1963, as reported on page 4636 of *Hansard,* in the left-hand column, I started referring to all the reports of the various departments, agencies, and crown corporations. With supporting figures, I showed what Quebec was getting per capita in comparison with the other provinces. For the Department of Forestry, I mentioned for instance the annual report of this department for 1962. We were then in 1963, and I pointed out that out of a total amount of $11 million paid by the federal government with respect to forest surveys and reforestation the province of Quebec received nothing.

In the field of forest fire protection, Quebec received $1,200,000 out of a total of $8,123,000, or less than 18 per cent of the total amount of the grants.

I was also mentioning Quebec's share of the loans granted by the Farm Credit Corporation and I was saying that, at that time, Saskatchewan was getting over 16 times the number of loans granted in the province of Quebec, and Alberta nine times more than Quebec.

On that same date I mentioned the expenditures of the Post Office Department and by the Department of National Health and Welfare in the field of hospital insurance.

I also dealt with the report entitled "Technical and Vocational Education in Canada", and I pointed out that Quebec had received at that time only $25 million compared to Ontario's $200 million.

I was quoting a series of reports. In fact, they practically covered four pages of *Hansard,* with figures showing that in every field Quebec was not getting its share, except in the field of unemployment insurance, and that is because there is more unemployment in that province at the present time.

After quoting all those figures or reports from various departments or crown corporations, we were told that we would be supplied with the real figures.

On August 7, 1964, we again asked for some explanation about the inadequate distribution of federal expenditures throughout the country or in every province. We quoted once again figures provided by a federal civil servant. At that time many Liberal members rose to say that our figures were incorrect; some even said that the Minister of Finance would supply the correct statistics.

We are now asking the Minister of Finance to supply them, since he stated that for the past several months his departmental experts were preparing a report containing all those figures. This report is now ready. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Finance said himself that he had a copy in his office.

When the question of this report was brought up, the Minister of Finance being absent from the house, another minister declared that the report was ready but that it had not been submitted to the cabinet. This was three weeks ago, and we would like to see that report, for we are entitled to those figures inasmuch as they will indicate clearly what this confederation represents to each province, what the Ottawa administration is, in short, just how favours are distributed, if the expression may be used, between the federal government and the various provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I see the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay) objects to the use of the word favour. But when the minister or the officials of a department allot 55 per cent of a budget to the storage or payment of grain in three provinces, leaving only 45 per cent to the other seven provinces, of which two are the most heavily populated in Canada, I say favours are granted to certain provinces as compared with the others.

I repeat that we are not opposed to these three provinces receiving $46 million, as long as the other provinces also receive a reasonable share, a portion of what they are entitled to.

Mr. Speaker, if these figures were given to the people, if the Department of Finance disclosed the true situation in that field, that is if it published what each province pays in income tax, sales tax, succession duties, indirect taxes, etc., and how much the federal government has spent in each province, then the federal government would perhaps make a self-examination and say: Perhaps there has been poor administration and maybe the provinces complaining about confederation have a right to do so.

When those figures are published, it will be possible to detect past mistakes and then attempts could be made to rectify them and to improve the allocation of taxes and funds

paid by Canadian taxpayers. Then the people might have a different reaction about confederation.

Mr. Speaker, those figures exist. We think that they should be provided, and this is the reason why we have introduced the motion under consideration.

The Department of Finance should not be ashamed to publish those figures. If they are to the advantage of Quebec or another province, then the necessary steps could be taken to improve the situation or to set the facts straight as soon as these facts are known. But as long as we do not receive these figures from the Department of Finance, we shall continue to declare that the ones which we quoted on November 12, 1963, as is evidenced by *Hansard* of that date, as well as those we read into *Hansard* on August 7 last, and as long as the Minister of Finance will not bring forth the report of his experts, we shall keep maintaining that the figures we quoted are accurate and must be accepted as such.

The figures we submitted establish beyond any doubt that the province of Quebec is paying in taxes over $600 million more than it is receiving, while other provinces draw up to $300 million more than what they are paying in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, some members doubted our figures were correct. The Minister of Finance was so astonished by those figures that he has seen fit to have an inquiry made and a report prepared by the experts of his department. That report is now completed and we ask that it be tabled. We are making that request with no ill intent, but because we feel that, when those figures are known, the Minister of Finance will feel even more compelled to correct the situation, which could only benefit the whole country.

[*Text*]

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): In rising to reply to the hon. member for Lapointe may I respectfully suggest that the hon. member dealt with the issue set forth in the motion in a somewhat distant and indifferent manner. I would suggest also that it would be profitable to look at the exchange which took place between myself and the hon. member for Lapointe when he moved his motion yesterday as reported at page 9515 of *Hansard*. The hon. member moved:

> That an order of the house do issue for a copy of the report prepared by officials of the Department of Finance concerning federal expenditures in each of the provinces of Canada.

To this, I replied as follows:

> I should say that there is no such report as suggested in the motion. At the same time I should add that work has been done by the officials and is continuing to provide information for the minister with which to answer the large number of questions which have been asked on this subject matter. In view of the circumstances I would respectfully invite the hon. member to withdraw the motion.

Then the hon. member for Lapointe replied, in turn:

> Mr. Speaker, the report we would like to have tabled is the one which the Minister of Finance promised October 7 last when he denied certain figures mentioned in the motion. We believe the Minister of Finance could at least table what he promised us on October 7 last.

My answer to that was as follows:

> I am not aware of the precise answer given by the minister but I respectfully suggest that the hon. member put his question upon the order paper and I undertake to see that it is given attention.

This offer was rejected by the hon. member for Lapointe, who went on to say that these were not privileged documents and that the Minister of Finance had undertaken to communicate this material to the house at an appropriate time. The hon. member added:

> If those documents are too incriminating for the government, let him say so.

I replied with respect to that observation:

> I do not want to enter into a debate with the hon. member but I cannot accept the suggestion that there is anything compromising in the position of the Minister of Finance.

It seems to me that this motion arises out of a misunderstanding, an honest misunderstanding, on the part of the hon. member of what the Minister of Finance said during the debate on August 7 last. The Minister of Finance did not undertake to table any official report. What he did say to the house was that he was preparing answers to the many questions which had been raised on the subject of federal-provincial fiscal arrangements. In the course of a debate in which the hon. member for Lapointe played a conspicuous part, my minister said this would mean a great deal of work for the department but they were persisting in their efforts and would table the information.

In the interest of precision may I put on record the exact words used by the Minister of Finance during the debate on August 7? I now refer to page 6552 of *Hansard* for that date. My hon. friend said:

> There is one other point on which I would ask the house to bear with me if I reply to it in detail. It is in connection with the figures which were read into the record last night by the hon. member—

Then, later, in the course of the same debate, the minister made these remarks, as reported at page 6554. Again I quote:

> The Department of Finance has made a detailed study of the expenditures and finds it can allocate approximately 40 per cent of gross federal expenditures to provinces by residence of recipient. This includes social security payments made directly to individuals, and various payments made to provincial governments and provincial institutions. Another 16 per cent of our expenditures can be roughly allocated by provinces on the basis of the location of the works on which they are spent or the service which they are spent or the service which they are used to provide. When these are eliminated this leaves about 44 per cent of the gross expenditures for items which cannot be said to be paid for the benefit of people in any particular province, and these can only be distributed arbitrarily, for example, on the basis of population.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the very nub of the point raised by the hon. member for Lapointe. I quote again from the remarks of the Minister of Finance as reported on page 6554 of *Hansard* for August 7:

> Time has only permitted the department to make a detailed study of this nature for the year 1961-62. We shall provide the details of these figures in answer to the questions to which I have referred.

I have read and reread the statement of the Minister of Finance during the debate on August 7, and nowhere can I find an undertaking by the Minister of Finance that he would put a parliamentary report before this house on matters relating to federal-provincial fiscal arrangements.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member agree to my putting on the record another statement from the same speech of the Minister of Finance which he has not quoted and which it is important should be quoted for the record? Would the hon. member accept another quotation—just five lines—from the same speech of the minister on the same day. He said:

[*Translation*]

> The Department of Finance endeavoured to allocate fairly as much as it could of the federal revenues, by provinces, for the year 1961-62. This endeavour has been taking place over the last several months. I may say the departmental officials have been struggling with this problem for quite some time.

It is in that speech that the Minister of Finance said that for several months the officials of his department have been making an analysis and a distribution of federal receipts and expenditures amongst the provinces.

It is the report of that work carried out by the experts of the Department of Finance to which the minister referred in his speech that we would like to have tabled in the house today.

[*Text*]

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Speaker, may I say that the quotation read by the hon. member does not disturb one bit the position I have taken on this matter; and again I point out that no reference is made by the minister to the fact that he would table any parliamentary report or reports such as this.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I never suggested that the Minister of Finance would table such a report. I said that such a report does exist, since the Minister of Finance himself referred to it in his speech of August 7.

I think the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance should not distort my remarks. I never suggested that the Minister of Finance had undertaken to table that report, but that he had said that such a report did exist and that it would be tabled. That is a different thing.

[*Text*]

Mr. Pennell: I beg to differ with the hon. member for Lapointe and would refer to the precise words he used on October 28, yesterday, when he said, as reported at page 9515 of *Hansard*:

> Mr. Speaker, the report we would like to have tabled is the one which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) promised October 7—

That is a direct allegation in the house that the Minister of Finance had promised such a report. As I said, I have read and reread the statement the Minister of Finance made on that occasion, and nowhere did he undertake or promise to the house that he would table a parliamentary report on this subject. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that the position of the government has at all times been consistent on this matter. I might say that the hon. member for Lapointe was neither the first nor the foremost member of this house to raise this question because the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) brought this matter to the attention of the house a few days ago. At that time the question was dealt with by the Acting Minister of Finance, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp). This occurred on October 9 and the passage is to be found at

page 8918 of *Hansard*. At that time the Acting Minister of Finance, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, informed the house that a study was being undertaken by the department in order to answer a large number of questions that had been placed on the order paper. In the course of his remarks he stated:

> Mr. Speaker, the question is extremely complicated, and perhaps it would assist the house if I mentioned, for example, that one has to distribute sales tax collected at factories throughout all parts of the country. It would not be fair to say that all the sales tax collected at the factory in province A was paid by the consumers in province A; nor, for the same reason, would customs duties collected, for example, in the port of Montreal be properly attributed as revenues attributable to the province of Quebec, because those customs duties of course are paid by all Canadian consumers of those goods which pass through the port of Montreal. This is the nature of the problem; it is extremely complicated. The Minister of Finance has not seen any figures that have taken into account this redistribution of revenues collected at particular points.

At that time the Acting Minister of Finance indicated that every effort was being made to answer these questions on the order paper. I invite the attention of the hon. member for Lapointe to the fact that only yesterday we tabled an answer to question No. 1,755; a very extensive answer to a very pressing question, which answer covered a large part of the information being sought by the hon. member for Lapointe.

I want to assure the hon. member that I am not indifferent or inconsiderate to his desire to obtain information on this very important and interesting subject to all Canadians. Yesterday I invited the hon. member to put his question on the order paper and said we would make every endeavour to deal with it expeditiously. Apparently the hon. member for Lapointe is not interested in asking specific questions and prefers to rely on figures, as he said today, that he has given in *Hansard* and which have been demonstrated to be inadequate, and therefore misleading. As a responsible member of the house I can only assume that the hon. member for Lapointe accepts responsibility for relying on those inadequate figures. But, Mr. Speaker, I would go back—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance claims that on several occasions he had asked me to put questions on the order paper in that connection. I must point out that the first time he mentioned that to me was yesterday, and he did so at a time when notices of motions for production of papers were already in the hands of the order paper editors and accepted for consideration today.

He should not say that he suggested several times that I put questions on the order paper.

I might add that replies to questions put on the order paper are always very vague. I know, because I asked some before.

The answers are very vague and inexplicit. We get only what the minister is willing to let us have. So, today, I am not asking for the same thing. I am asking for a report that actually exists, because the Minister of Finance himself stated, last August 7, that his department was attempting a distribution of revenue and expenditures by provinces and had been at it for the last several months—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not think there is a real point of order. The hon. member disagrees with the parliamentary secretary who has the floor at the present time. It might be a good idea to let him finish, after which the hon. member for Lapointe, if he feels he has been incorrectly quoted, would have the right, according to our standing orders, to take part in the debate once again, or later on, to clear things up.

[*Text*]

Mr. Pennell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think, in justice to the hon. member for Lapointe, I should correct myself in saying that on several occasions I had asked him to place his question on the order paper. The hon. member is quite right; I did that on one occasion only, yesterday. I stand corrected on that point, Mr. Speaker, and would so indicate to the hon. member. To come back again to this question of the report, I think we are here dealing with a difference in words and perhaps it is an honest misunderstanding between the hon. member for Lapointe and myself and other members of the department.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would allow one question perhaps we could settle this matter. Does such a report exist now?

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Speaker, I can answer that question best by saying that as questions have arisen and have been placed on the order paper, the officials of the department have compiled information passed along on memoranda, which was necessary to deal with the large number of questions, the whole school of questions, of a particularly extensive nature; and naturally, more and more information is building up as we keep answering these questions.

For instance, let me put before the house one of the questions asked, question 1,755. It reads as follows:

1. What payments did the federal government make to the province of Quebec during each of the fiscal years 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64 and 1964-65 (estimated) under the following headings, in detail (a) unconditional grants (b) conditional grants (c) payments to individuals (i) unemployment insurance benefits (ii) family allowances (iii) old age security (iv) others?
2. What is the total amount of all payments made in each of the fiscal years mentioned above?
3. What is the per capita share paid by the government with respect to each of the above items compared with the per capita share paid to the other nine provinces?

The department has spent literally hundreds of hours on just this one question. And we do not take exception to it. As the house is aware, there is a rule in Beauchesne which says that ministers need not answer questions where an unreasonable amount of time is involved and unnecessary expense placed upon the public. I suggest that the Minister of Finance could properly have taken shelter behind that rule, had it been his desire to avoid answering this type of question, as is suggested by the hon. member for Lapointe. However, the answer to that question was given last Monday and is now available to the hon. member for Lapointe. As I say, I appreciate his interest in the matter and take no exception to the question, but the department has spent hundreds of hours—months—trying to answer all the questions of which that is but one example.

May I bring to the attention of the house question 1,615 which has also been answered:

1. What was the federal contribution to the province of Prince Edward Island for each of the following fiscal years, 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64 and 1964-65 (estimated) under the following: (a) unconditional grants—itemized (b) conditional grants—itemized (c) payments to individuals (i) unemployment payments (ii) family allowances (iii) old age security (iv) all others?
2. What is the total amount of all payments for each fiscal year mentioned above?
3. What is the per capita contribution in each category and how does this compare with the per capita contribution to the other nine provinces?

I might also mention that there was one question on the order paper which asked the government to go back 20 years and to disclose all the payments paid to the provinces and all the revenues collected province by province. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, the problem faced by the Department of Finance. It would be physically impossible for the department to answer all these questions with the staff it has; and the cost to the Canadian taxpayer would be staggering. As I say, Mr. Speaker, we are endeavouring to answer these

[Mr. Pennell.]

questions and have already made a great deal of information available to all hon. members, including the hon. member for Lapointe.

I have made reference to the fact that material has been collected within the department. This material was gathered together to assist the minister in answering questions on the order paper. It is, I suggest, a well established rule that interdepartmental communications by officials to ministers are confidential. This is a very good and sensible rule, Mr. Speaker, and a rule which has been observed in this house for many years.

In that connection—and I do not wish to weaken my argument by repetition—may I refer to one or two precedents. On January 23, 1959—I am sure this is a precedent which will appeal to the hon. member for Lapointe—the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin), now the Secretary of State for External Affairs, asked for a report of General Graham on civil defence. On that occasion the government took the position that the report was privileged because it was prepared by a member of the public service for the consideration of the government. I would ask the hon. member for Lapointe to note this particularly: Upon this explanation being given to the house the motion was not pursued. I have come across at least two occasions in *Hansard,* in which the hon. member for Lapointe has expressed great admiration for the hon. member for Essex East and his conduct in the house. I again invite him to follow in the footsteps of the hon. member for whom he has professed such great admiration and not to pursue this motion further, in view of the explanation already given the house.

Let me quote one more precedent, Mr. Speaker. On March 12, 1956, as reported at page 2016 of *Hansard* for that year, the premier of Quebec, Mr. Lesage, then minister of northern affairs, was asked to produce a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the government and the superintendent of Banff national park and the constituents of Banff. On that occasion I suggest that the minister correctly stated the well established rule which once more was accepted by the house without debate, that:

Such exchanges are, I believe, of a privileged character as between officials and the government. I therefore could not acquiesce in that part of the motion.

The minister at that time did table the correspondence whch passed between himself and the citizens but he did not table the information which passed between him and his officials. The house without a vote, ac-

cepted what is a well established precedent both in Westminster and in this house.

So, Mr. Speaker, I end by once more appealing to the good nature of the hon. member for Lapointe. I say to him with unfeigned sincerity that I appreciate his interest and his desire to obtain information on this important subject, and if he places his question on the order paper I shall endeavour to give it immediate attention and have it answered, bearing in mind the great amount of work involved. But I again ask him to withdraw his motion.

Hon. J. Watson MacNaught (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I could make an appeal to the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) to withdraw his motion. I think it is obvious from the remarks of the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Pennell) that no such report exists. The hon. member for Lapointe has pursued his argument very well and has put his case before the house. I think now that the best interests of parliament would be served if he would withdraw his motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed, in reply, to answer the Solicitor General (Mr. MacNaught), on November 12, 1963, I mentioned figures in this house. At that time—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I wonder whether the procedure followed by the house at present is in order. The Solicitor General asked a question, but on the other hand the hon. member for Lapointe has already contributed to the debate and, according to standing orders, the hon. member cannot speak a second time, except under special circumstances provided for in standing order 37. Nevertheless, if he has the unanimous consent of the house, it may be possible to allow him to answer the suggestion made by the Solicitor General.

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question asked by the Solicitor General, on November 12, 1963, certain official reports were compiled by various departments and crown corporations. I had given those figures to the house, and they were most instructive. But my figures were said to be incorrect. At that time we were told that we would be given the true figures. On August 7, I again quoted official figures provided by officers of the Department of Finance. Again I was told that my figures were not correct. Even the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) said that my figures were inaccurate. In due course, the Minister of Finance himself, as reported on page 6554 of *Hansard*, stated that his officials were in the process of allocating expenditures by provinces.

All I want to find out is this. Can we know what work has been done by officials of the Department of Finance, not with respect to question No. 1,755 mentioned a moment ago by the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Pennell), but rather concerning the amount of taxes and duties of all kinds collected by the federal government in each province and the amount spent in each province? Could we get detailed information in that respect? That is what we want to know. We are not concerned with replies to other questions which do not deal with the same point.

Is that report ready or is it being prepared? If it is ready, we would like to see it. Otherwise, if it is still being prepared, we would like to know when it will be tabled, since the Minister of Finance has told us that his officials have been working on it for some months now.

[*Text*]

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to reply, I can only repeat what I said earlier, that the department is collecting a great deal of information to answer all these questions. The hon. member refers to reports. Perhaps he prefers to call them reports. We have been gathering all this material, and memoranda pass back and forth among the officials of the department. This information eventually finds its way into the hands of the minister who answers the questions.

As I pointed out to the hon. member, if we followed his request we would be violating a long established and sensible rule of this house, that correspondence between officials and the minister ought not to be made public. I do not think I need explain why that rule has been followed for such a lengthy period of time. This rule has been accepted by the house and I think it applies to the situation today.

I wish again to emphasize that at no time did the minister undertake to table a parliamentary report, in that sense of the word.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that it is not customary —to use the same expression as the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance —for the government to make available to the house and to the general public the correspondence exchanged between a minister and government officials.

However, such a statement is a pure and simple admission of the fact that there does exist at present a report on the taxes collected and expenditures made in the various provinces. It means that it would not be proper for the government to give the house information on the correspondence exchanged between the Minister of Finance and his officials.

Mr. Speaker, there is seldom any smoke without fire. We saw in the newspapers that the report existed and proved that, in Quebec, hardly anything is spent as compared with the money spent in the other provinces. When we study the revenues and expenditures of any department at all, we soon see that there are real differences between what is spent in Quebec and what is spent in the other provinces, for instance, Ontario.

This morning, I learned about the expenses incurred by the Canadian National concerning railway crossings. In Ontario, where the population amounts to 6½ million, $37 million were spent, whereas in Quebec, where there is a population of 5½ million people, $11 million were spent. This means $26 million less in Quebec.

If we look at agriculture, it is the same thing. The federal government gives 25 times more to the other provinces, but it is almost impossible to get a federal farm loan in the province of Quebec. It is useless here to point out that we have provincial loans. The fact remains that it is impossible to get a farm loan from the federal government. Only this afternoon, I received another complaint. Applications from Quebec are driven from pillar to post and nobody is able to find a solution.

An hon. Member: Right.

Mr. Caouette: Why? In the province of Quebec, there is a provincial farm loans program which is strictly and entirely financed by the citizens of that province, while the latter are also contributing to the federal grants and farm loans. We are paying exactly the same taxes as other Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, those differences are strange. I understand that it is embarrassing for the Minister of Finance to give us this report. He has it in his hands; it really exists and it annoys the government. I admit that this does not apply only to the present government and that the same situation prevailed under the Conservative administration—

An hon. Member: Right.

Mr. Caouette: —and under the Liberal administration which preceded that of the Conservatives.

Mr. Grégoire: That is true.

Mr. Caouette: It has always been the same since 1867, since confederation became known as the Canadian confederation.

Mr. Speaker, time and again, we said that our group is not seeking any special treatment, but just and equitable treatment for the population of the province of Quebec.

We are prepared to pay our share and we are prepared to receive what we are entitled to, as a result of payment of our share.

The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) says that we receive more, whereas the figures compiled show that we pay $600 million in excess of what we receive annually from Ottawa.

Mr. Choquette: Produce your figures.

Mr. Caouette: Let the hon. member for Lotbinière see for himself what is happening in his own riding.

Mr. Choquette: Everything is fine.

Mr. Caouette: We will know about that next week, because I am going there.

Mr. Speaker, it is in the province of Quebec that we find the greatest number of unemployed as well as the greatest number of designated areas, as they are called. It is time to look after our own affairs, and I say this for the information of the hon. member for Lotbinière who keeps badgering us, on this side of the house. He should co-operate with us in order to obtain for his riding and his province as much equity and justice as we are ready to allow to all the other Canadian provinces.

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

Mr. Caouette: There is no question of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Caouette: He only has the privilege to speak in his turn.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière rises on a question of privilege.

Mr. Choquette: The hon. member for Villeneuve says that I should co-operate with him in order to help my riding. He thus wants to insinuate that I do not work for my constituency. I work for my constituency in co-operation with the ministers and, consequently, it would be worse to co-operate with the hon. member for Villeneuve, and I do not wish to see him in my riding.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about the question of privilege raised by the hon. member. I quoted the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) when he was not in his seat. As reported in *Hansard* on page 6532, left column, second last paragraph, he said, and I will read this over again for his own information:

> I say that those figures are wrong—

He is referring to my figures.

> —and that in due time, the Minister of Finance will reveal the true situation, as regards the taxes collected by the federal government in the province of Quebec and the redistribution of those taxes in that province.

This is what we are asking for and I say that the hon. member for Lotbinière is not co-operating with the other members to obtain the information requested, and yet he assured us himself that we would get the information.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. In my opinion, the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Lotbinière is not in order; the hon. member for Villeneuve should carry on with his remarks.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with you. In fact, and as usual, the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Lotbinière is a stupid question which does not in any way constitute a question of privilege.

He is always trying to give himself airs and to make it known that he is in favour of the farmers and the taxpayers in the province of Quebec. However, he is not taken seriously either in his own riding or by the members of his party in the House of Commons.

Mr. Choquette: The hon. member for Villeneuve is the least serious man in Canada.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, the repeated interruptions of the hon. member for Lotbinière do not frighten me.

Mr. Choquette: Joker.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned with these interruptions because the hon. member for Lotbinière is aware that his own party, that is the party in office, does not take him seriously. He is considered as a separatist.

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

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, he is considered as anti-logical—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It seems to me that the dispute or the fight between the members, one rising on a question of privilege, the other trying to reply, departs from the subject under consideration. In fact, the only matter under consideration is whether it is in order for the government to table certain documents, and the member who has the floor should merely advise the house whether or not he feels the said documents should be tabled. I would therefore ask him to restrict his remarks to this point and I ask the hon. member for Lotbinière to recognize that the hon. member for Villeneuve has the floor.

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

Mr. Grégoire: There is no question of privilege.

Mr. Choquette: The Speaker will decide.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, because falsehoods will appear in *Hansard* tomorrow, and I have the right to correct them. I feel that you should grant me this right under the rules of the house.

Unfounded accusations are being levelled against me. I must point out to the hon. member for Villeneuve that I am highly considered in my party, where a fine solidarity exists, as evidenced by the spontaneous applause now being heard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Choquette: The opposite situation prevails in his party; it is a divided and a schismatic party.

Mr. Grégoire: What a joker you are.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I point out to the hon. member for Lotbinière that there is no question of privilege, but that he is simply disagreeing with the hon. member for Villeneuve. He may, when the hon. member for Villeneuve has concluded his remarks, take part in the debate.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I shall revert to my remarks—

Mr. Choquette: Social Credit is like an earthworm; you cut it in two and it still lives.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, when you state that there is no question of privilege, you do not even take seriously the hon. member for Lotbinière, who is well known as a public joker, wherever he goes.

I shall therefore conclude my remarks, since I have no more time to lose on him, and I shall resume discussion of the matter—

Mr. Choquette: National jester.

Mr. Caouette: —of the question raised this afternoon.

Mr. Choquette: You are really an international jester.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the question of privilege, and this is well-founded, according to standing order 17.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I recognize the hon. member for Lapointe who intends to rise on a question of privilege, and I should invite the hon. member for Villeneuve to resume his seat while the hon. member for Lapointe rises on a question of privilege.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, there are standing orders in this house; we have a book of standing orders. Now, they provide that when an hon. member wants to speak, he should stand up and take off his hat. The hon. member for Lotbinière violates those standing orders. I do not say he should take off his hat, because it would fall on his shoulders, or rather, it would not even stand on his shoulders. But he breaks the standing orders of the house when he speaks from his seat and mouths stupidities, as he has been doing for some time.

Therefore, I would ask you to call him back to order and to point out to him that if he intends to speak he must rise and be recognized, which he does not do.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Villeneuve is chewing gum; this is contrary to standing order 12.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I invite the hon. members to co-operate with the Chair and other hon. members, so that we might proceed with the study of the question now before the house.

Mr. Caouette: Let us leave the hon. member for Lotbinière to his clowning, as usual.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, let him continue to act the buffoon—

Mr. Choquette: You are an interplanetary buffoon.

[Mr. Choquette.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I asked the hon. member for Villeneuve to co-operate with the Chair and to accept my suggestion that he should confine his remarks to the motion under consideration, and I am sure that he will do so.

Mr. Grégoire: You should also call to order the hon. member for Lotbinière.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I will respect your ruling, but I would like you to call the hon. member for Lotbinière to order, because he is always interrupting us.

Coming back to the matter under discussion with regard to the motion introduced by the hon. member for Lapointe asking for the production of papers showing the moneys collected and spent in the provinces, I feel that the hon. member for Lapointe is not talking through his hat. He knows what he is talking about, because he is aware that such a report exists.

In addition, we read in the papers a report which was denied of course by the Minister of Finance, to the effect that the minister is very much annoyed at the report submitted by his high officials and which points out that for a very long time the province of Quebec has not been treated as it should.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that it is not only the present administration which is to blame; the previous one carries its share of the responsibility.

The leader of the official opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) was in office for six years and, during that time, not only do we feel that less money was spent in Quebec, but the money collected there was used to pay western farmers, at election time, to nab people's votes, to try to win seats. This was done on three occasions.

Now, today we are insisting, and we shall keep on insisting, that the motion for papers proposed by the hon. member for Lapointe be implemented. Even if it is rejected, we shall keep on demanding the tabling of those documents, not at the country's expense, but to find out exactly what is going on.

If the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Pennell) tells us that it is not the procedure or the custom to make public communications between officials and ministers, we believe that the people who pay the taxes in Canada, that the citizens of the province of Quebec and the other provinces who pay federal taxes, have the right to know the truth as far as taxation is concerned, and the whole truth. I do not think that one should play hide and seek, as has been done before and as they are trying to do at this time.

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

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hour assigned for the consideration of private members' business has now expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to provisional standing order 39A it is my duty to inform the house that the following questions will be raised at ten o'clock:

The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis), Canadian coastguard service.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), Canada pension plan.

SUPPLY

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

INTERIM SUPPLY

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Chairman, when I was interrupted at five o'clock I was speaking on the need for extension of television service, and in particular on the need to make this service available to the interlake area of Manitoba. I had just begun to outline the history of the C.B.C. station in Winnipeg.

Station CBWT Winnipeg began operation in May 1954 on channel 4, with an antenna height of 192 feet, this height limitation being imposed because of its proximity to the Winnipeg airport. At that time channel 4, assigned to Winnipeg by the Department of Transport, was the best channel available to give maximum fringe area coverage. In July 1954 KXJB-TV, Valley City, North Dakota, went into operation on the same channel with a transmitter located only 192 air miles from Winnipeg, at a power of 100 kilowatts and tower heights of 1,090 feet. This resulted in considerable co-channel interference in the area north and south of Winnipeg.

Following a study of the problem, the C.B.C. decided to make a change from channel 4 to channel 3. This channel was selected since it entailed no change in the existing transmitter and antenna. This is what the C.B.C. said. Another consideration favouring the choice of channel 3 at that time was the fact that receiver antennae in fringe reception areas of CBWT would be almost as effective on channel 3 as they had been on channel 4. CBWT changed to channel 3 with a power of 57.8 kilowatts on April 16, 1958. However, people living beyond the A aid contour area had to purchase new antennae, and I have personal experience of this as my home is at Gimli, Manitoba, approximately 50 miles north of Winnipeg, and we could not operate with the former antenna. The limitation of power and tower height also meant that CBWT's coverage was correspondingly limited.

After the change took place from channel 4 to channel 3 the reception in most places north of Winnipeg became worse. The C.B.C. had assured everyone that this change would bring about better reception, but actually it was worse than ever before. This is the television service we are still getting today.

Following this changeover and the subsequent deterioration in t.v. reception I again pleaded the case for the need of improvement of t.v. services in the interlake area, and the C.B.C. advised me as follows:

> Because of the heavy demands on capital budget due to general extension of the national service in t.v. and radio, no provision could be made to improve CBWT's coverage until 1962, when an application would be made to increase the power and move to a new transmitter location with an antenna 1,027 feet effective height above average terrain.

When it was learned that the C.B.C. planned these changes the people in the interlake area took it for granted that television service would now be made available to them. Subsequently they learned that the C.B.C. had a site selected at Starbuck, Manitoba, which is south of Winnipeg and therefore not likely to bring about substantial improvement in television reception for the interlake area.

Subsequently the C.B.C. made application for an increase in the effective radiated power, a change in channel and a change of antenna site for station CBWT. This application was heard by the board of broadcast governors in April 1962. The people of the interlake area organized and presented a brief requesting that the antenna be located at Argyle, Manitoba, which is an area north of interlake. At the hearing Mr. Joe Karsin, of Arborg, Manitoba, presented the brief and answered questions relating to it. I have a transcript of the

hearing that was held and will make some reference to it. I may say this is sessional paper 129A.

The feeling of the people in the interlake area was if the antenna were located north of Winnipeg it would serve all the interlake district. It would appear that there is little co-operation between the Department of Transport and the C.B.C. It now appears that most of the land within 25 miles north of Winnipeg is restricted to antenna heights which would not be suitable. This is most unfortunate and does not make for good planning. Subsequently the board of broadcast governors approved the application for the Starbuck site.

During the hearing, officials of the C.B.C. indicated their reason for wanting the Starbuck site was because it would serve a heavier populated area than the Argyle site. This, they said, was their only reason. By locating at Starbuck, the so-called "B contour" will reach 20 miles into the United States. The area south of Winnipeg is served by the private station CJOY, Winnipeg, whose antenna is located at Ste. Agathe, Manitoba. The south-western part of the province is served by Brandon, and there is a station just inside the U.S. border at Pembina. People in this part of Manitoba will have several choices of t.v. station, while people in the northern part of the interlake area will still be without television.

I maintain that the principle adopted here by the C.B.C. is wrong. It should have been its first duty to provide service to the people who at present are excluded. Every taxpayer in Canada is a shareholder in the C.B.C. and every shareholder is entitled to equal service.

I have asked questions in the house with regard to this changeover and wish to make brief reference to them. The questions are to be found at page 1218 of the 1963 *Hansard* and 2707 of *Hansard* for April 29, 1964. In the first question, I asked:

1. Did the B.B.G. approve a C.B.C. application for an increase in the effective radiated power, a change in channel, and a change of antenna site, of station CBWT, Winnipeg, Manitoba?

The answer was yes. In the second part of the question I asked:

2. If so, when was approval given and what changes are proposed in regard to video, audio, channel and antenna?

The answer to that part was:

The application was for an increase in effective radiated power from 57,800 watts ERP (video), 34,700 watts ERP (audio), to 100,000 watts ERP (video), 50,000 watts ERP (audio), a change in channel from channel 3 to channel 6 and an increase in the effective height above average terrain from 196 feet to 1,027 feet. The board's recommendation for the approval of this application was contained in its public announcement of April 18, 1962.

[Mr. Stefanson.]

One of the questions I asked was:

What site was chosen for the location of the new antenna; when was the property purchased, from whom, and at what cost?

The site chosen, I was informed, is at Starbuck, Manitoba. I asked whether any other sites were considered. The answer to this question was: "Yes, and the most suitable site acquired". Well, the C.B.C. said it would serve the most heavily populated area, but it will not provide a service in a large part of the northern area of Manitoba.

Another question I asked was when work on the project would be completed, and the answer given was, October, 1964. Mr. Chairman, we are near the end of October, now, and so far this change has not taken place.

On April 29 I asked further questions. I again asked when it was expected that the new service would come into operation and the answer, once more, was October, 1964. I asked, also:

Will this changeover improve television reception for the interlake area of Manitoba and, if not, how soon can one expect action to be taken to bring about this much needed improvement?

The answer to this question was:

It is anticipated that some areas of the interlake region will receive an improved reception but it is not possible to guarantee reception in specific areas.

I had also asked:

Should these changes fail to bring about an improvement in television viewing in the interlake area, what action will the C.B.C. or the B.B.G. take?

The answer was:

The corporation intends to conduct a survey of reception in the area following the completion of the proposed changes. The results of this survey will be used to determine what action if any should be taken.

At the hearing the C.B.C. officials made it abundantly clear that they could not guarantee that this change would improve the service in the interlake area. The applicants expressed the fear that if they did not get reception as a result of this changeover they would be left without television for many years to come. Remember, this is an area right in the middle of Manitoba; it is not an outlying area; it is not an area in the north. Surely, a situation like this should not be allowed to exist.

I wish to quote briefly at this point from the transcript of the hearing as reported in sessional paper No. 129. Mr. Pearson, for the

board of broadcast governors, is questioning Mr. Karsin who appeared for the interlake people. He is referring to a contour map of the Department of Transport where the original B contour of CBWT cuts across north of Teulon over, roughly, to lake Francis. The exchange reads as follows:

Mr. Pearson: And the B contour will now pass somewhere up south of Oak Island Marsh and across Lundar and Mill End and Camp Morton—they would all be within the B contour? Would this not give beyond that some better signal than is presently received?

Mr. Karsin: Maybe a bit better, but not good enough for us.

Mr. Pearson: I appreciate your position, Mr. Karsin, that you feel if this application is granted, as requested, the interlake will forever remain a hinterland without television?

Mr. Karsin: Yes. You can tell by the channel 7 map—

Incidentally, channel 7 is a private station. When it was established in Winnipeg the people in the interlake area thought they would get a television service. But the station built its antennae south of Winnipeg and reception did not extend to the northern part of the interlake area. Mr. Karsin's answer continued:

—we have a map there from CJAY and the fringe just goes north of Teulon and it does come in at times—it depends on atmospheric conditions. It does come in; sometimes it is good and at other times it is not, so this at Starbuck on channel 6 with 100,000 watts would be about the same—we would get reception just some of the time.

As I have said, the fear was expressed that adoption of this proposal would leave the area without television service for a long time to come. There are a couple of questions and answers toward the conclusion of the hearing to which I would like to refer. This is the part I want to quote. Dr. Stewart is now putting questions to an official of the C.B.C.:

Dr. Stewart: I am not sure if I missed this point, but supposing you were wrong and Mr. Karsin is even underestimating the deficiencies in this interlake area—supposing you make your move and it is still obviously quite inadequate service in the significant part of the interlake area, is it technically possible on a VHF band to correct this?

Mr. Fraser: You are thinking of a satellite?

Dr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Fraser: It would be technically possible, but I think this would be a matter of economics. Here again, depending on the number of population to be served—the population in that area is quite scattered—they are quite small communities—and a satellite normally doesn't cover a large geographical area. That would be a matter that would have to be figured out.

Dr. Stewart: I thought Mr. Karsin left the impression that if this didn't work, then the interlake area was lost for all time, in so far as service. Technically this is not so?

Mr. Fraser: Technically this is not true.

That is right. Technically, it is not true. At the same time the people of the interlake area fear that if the present set-up will not provide improved service they will be there for a long time without any service whatsoever.

An hon. Member: Carried.

Mr. Stefanson: No, it is not carried yet. I want to point out that station CBWT in Winnipeg went on the air in 1954. From 1954 to 1958 it was on channel 4. In 1958 it switched to channel 3 and the service became worse. It has been on channel 3 ever since. Next month, I presume, it will be changing to channel 6 and it has been indicated to me that as a result of this change the people in the area will have to buy new antennae at an expenditure to them of between $40 and $50 each. It seems to me there has been poor planning on the part of the C.B.C., otherwise they would not have had to switch the station twice.

Mr. Orlikow: Why are they not enjoying private t.v.?

Mr. Stefanson: Private television does not provide coverage for the northern part of the area. The C.B.C. is serving only the more populated area; it is not providing service for the other areas at all. I now ask this question: When can people living in the following areas expect to get television service: Norway House, Grand Rapids, Dauphin River, Matheson Island? I would remind the committee that Norway House has a population of more than 2,000 people.

In closing I would recommend that the officials of the C.B.C. announce the precise date on which the changeover will take place. They should do this as quickly as possible and, in addition, inform the people concerned what antenna changes are required. If the changeover is to take place next month, or a little later, this is the time when the corporation should be announcing the date so that the viewers concerned can prepare themselves and go ahead with the alterations in their antennae which are needed. In the hearing they tried to say no changes would be required, but this has been proven false before and all the people in this area are of the opinion that they will require new antennae.

I trust that the corporation, upon completion of the changeover, will immediately start a survey of reception in the area to determine whether this changeover has effected any improvement in television reception. I am thinking particularly of areas such as Gypsumville, St. Martin, Steep Rock, Moosehorn, Ashern, Eriksdale, Lundar, Poplarfield, Broad Valley, Fisher Branch, Hodgson, Dallas—

Some hon. Members: All aboard.

Mr. Stefanson: —Koostatak, Arborg, Riverton, Hecla and Matheson Island.

Some hon. Members: All aboard.

Mr. Stefanson: Yes, you can all say "All aboard". All these areas are entitled to television service.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stefanson: If there is not a substantial improvement for these areas, I am sure there will be a flood of protests submitted by the people from this area to the C.B.C. and to myself.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could for a moment bring the committee back from the reaches of the C.B.C. and its service to Canada, or lack of service to Canada, to present some ideas on our trade policy, because I see little opportunity of being able to do this on the minister's estimates. Perhaps we will never see them again this session; therefore I have decided to seize this opportunity because I can then deal with the estimates of two departments which will be concerned with what I have to speak of this evening, the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Department of External Affairs.

It used to be said that war was merely an extension of diplomatic policy. I would suggest that today that conception should be changed to read that trade and the credits on which trade can be financed should form part of the diplomatic policy of any country. But Canada, I am sure we are all glad to know and realize, has only had one foreign policy for a very long time, and that is a policy of maintaining and promoting peace throughout the world. We are being called on to follow this policy in some rather strenuous ways. This summer, when I had the opportunity to see one of these forces that we have supplied for action in the Middle East, it occurred to me that perhaps Canadians have been somewhat suckers in this regard, in that we have meekly accepted these responsibilities without having demanded any powers to seek some solutions.

This summer I was fortunate enough to receive invitations from two governments to visit their countries as their guests; not, as some of my friends in the press gallery have been suggesting to the people, to indulge in elderly gambolling in Europe, but it was a very strenuous fact-finding tour of Egypt and of Israel. I must say that I left the Middle East profoundly depressed at the situation there, which leaves one wondering whether the men in the Gaza strip who represent the force we have had there for eight years will be represented 80 years from now with a similar force, because we are doing nothing to deal with this problem. I would suggest this is an area in which our trade policies should play a very important role.

During my quite extensive tour of Egypt I was taken to a number of their developments in which it seemed to me Canada is ideally placed to take part. I was taken to the Aswan dam, and to visit the large fertilizer factory, the CIMA factory, which turns out some 400,000 tons of fertilizer per year; it has been in operation for about 1½ years. This factory, together with a similar factory near Cairo, turns out only just over 50 per cent of the requirements of the country, according to the director of this plant at Aswan. It seemed to me that here was a place in which Canada could well play a role in aiding the Egyptians in the frightful struggle they have at the present time to make their food production keep pace with their increasing population.

We were taken to the area west of Alexandria where the Egyptians are developing a new province, with desert reclamation. This was a very impressive project, but the young director who showed me around all day pointed out that he lacked adequate modern, agricultural machinery. He had been in North America; he had been sent to the Imperial Valley and to Berkeley, the University of California. He was aware—and told me of it—that the only place in which this sort of machinery could be obtained would be in North America, either in the United States or in Canada; that he was seriously handicapped by lack of it, and handicapped by lack of fertilizer to promote growth in that area.

I noticed, in the new town of Aswan that has been built, that in the big department store there was a tremendous preponderance of German household goods of every kind on the shelves. Again it occurred to me that here

perhaps was a place in which Canada could play a part. When I was taken to the Gaza strip, as I say, I found our forces there stalemated, getting no further ahead. The Arab-Israeli dispute was still holding everything at a standstill. When I left the Middle East I was profoundly depressed, as I have said, because I realized that this is an area that calls out loudly for an integrated development. I may say that the Israelis need the Arabs just as much as the Arabs need the Israelis. I admit there are terrific problems to be solved, but I think one of the first problems to be solved is that of improving the living conditions in the Arab countries, which are in many instances very bad.

In Egypt they are making tremendous strides, but they are making tremendous strides against fearful odds; the growing population, the large scale illiteracy, and last but not least, the perfectly appalling climate, which makes many operations extremely difficult. It seems to me that our first step in seeking a peaceful solution of the situation in the Middle East is to remove some of the hardships under which the Arab people live at the present time; to give them every aid that we can in the development of their countries. I may say that when I was at Aswan I watched the construction work on the Aswan dam and saw the Russian equipment, and I knew of the Russian technicians who were working there. I felt it was a great tragedy that the late John Foster Dulles was not gathered to his fathers many years before, because he of course was responsible for this development in that area, having pulled the rug from under the Egyptian government with the projected loan that was to be given by the United States and Britain and the world bank. This forced the Egyptian government into the arms of Russia. However, that has been done. Now it seems to me we should try to retrace our steps to some extent and aid in the development of a country whose people have suffered for many, many years from colonial domination; people who were the subject of a savage attack only eight years ago, an unprovoked attack from Israel, Britain and France.

This brings me to the other aspect of the problem, that of releasing our men from service in the United Nations emergency force, and the disbandment of that force. While the major problem may very well be an economic one enveloping the whole area, I think we have to remember there are other aspects too, of bitter memory which are going to be very hard to overcome.

I hesitate to venture onto what I know is very delicate ground, as most of us are emotionally involved in the maintenance of the state of Israel due, I think, to our consciousness—a certain guilt consciousness perhaps—that it was people of our culture, of European culture, who committed such obscene atrocities against the Jewish people. I think that fact has coloured most of our thinking with regard to the state of Israel. I have reached the conclusion that it has led us to the point where we are not prepared to be objective in the assessment of the situation in the Middle East. For instance, I found very great difficulty in persuading people in Israel—though I did persuade some of them—to admit some of the very black spots in the history of the new state of Israel. To me it is extremely tragic that the people who have suffered the appalling treatment the Jewish people suffered at the hands of the nazis should themselves have been capable of the disgraceful conduct of which they were guilty at the time of the establishment of the state of Israel. Some of them finally admitted to me that there was savage destruction and slaughter in Arab villages which had the effect of terrifying the Arab population and driving them out, to become the now festering sore which is the refugee problem in the Middle East.

I have mentioned the attack on the Suez canal, which is of more recent history, though the memory is still very green. It seems to me that if Canada is going to accept the sort of responsibilities which we have been shouldering for the last eight years we must also demand the right to take steps to seek a permanent solution. Our government must be prepared to insist in the United Nations that the state of Israel, for which all of us have the very greatest sympathy and I take it the greatest admiration for what they have done, should accept the resolutions of the United Nations, if it is to be considered a good member of that organization. Among those resolutions—and there are many of them passed by the general assembly—perhaps the most important is the acceptance of responsibility for the plight of the Arab refugees in the neighbouring Arab states. I saw the plight of those refugees, and while I know it is said—there may be some truth in it too—that they are maintained in their present position by the Arab states as a weapon in this war of nerves with the state of Israel, I also think we have to fact the fact that the Arab states are at present not in any economic situation to absorb this large body of refugees.

I do not think, and I have argued with my Arab friends on this score, that it is a reason-

able idea that they should be resettled in Israel. If I were an Arab refugee I have a doubt whether I would care to be settled in Israel. I think that our government should be taking steps to bring pressure on Israel to accept some of this responsibility, to see that this sore in the heart of the Middle East is permanently cured; and we, as a member of the United Nations, should be prepared to play our part in financing the sort of development that is going to be required.

However, first of all there must be, as I have told some of my Israeli friends, the conviction of sin before there can be any steps taken on the path toward salvation, and they are not helping the problem by attempting to deny the facts of history. To me it is tragic that a people who have suffered at the hands of those who have habitually rewritten history should be attempting to rewrite it on their own behalf. So I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in pursuing our foreign policy, wherever we have accepted this sort of obligation the Canadian government should pursue a double-pronged policy: an economic policy, and the other a diplomatic policy. In this case we should provide credit to the Arab states to enable them to build up their economies, and at the same time we should use our position in the United Nations to bring pressure on the other side to this conflict.

It seems to me that a country which for eight years has maintained troops there, has again undertaken a similar task in Cyprus, and before that undertook a similar task in the Congo, is one which should demand that its voice be listened to with respect in the United Nations. It is one which should be able to bargain with the great powers which are so happy to leave these peace keeping operations to the nice, mild, powerless, middle-sized nations of the world. As I said before, Mr. Chairman, I have the feeling that Canada and the other six nations who comprise the United Nations emergency force on the Gaza strip are being made suckers of by the great powers of the world who, behind this nice police action which we are engaging in, holding the status quo, are still pursuing their oil and military machinations and private policies behind the scenes. I think it is time that we woke up. Most Canadians are proud of the role which Canada has played in these affairs, and I think we would be much prouder if, before we make one of these efforts again, we and our partners were vested with full authority from the United Nations to seek a permanent solution instead of merely acting as international cops—an international police force to stand there and maintain the status quo.

[Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

There is another aspect to this. I have mentioned the necessity to my mind of providing credit to the Arab countries for their development. There is something else which should be done too. We hear a great deal about the boycott which the Arab nations have imposed on a number of firms who have been dealing with the state of Israel, and this is a situation which I deplore. I think that a boycott of this sort is thoroughly evil. But we should not forget that there is another boycott, too, which is taking place simultaneously right here in Canada, where powerful interests are preventing any growing trade with the Arab countries, involving Canada without our knowledge in this war between the two forces in the Middle East. This should also be brought to a full stop if we are to seek a permanent solution in that sad and tragic part of the world.

I should like to conclude, Mr. Chairman, by expressing publicly my great gratitude and appreciation to the government of Egypt and the government of Israel which tendered me this invitation to visit them and who were both so generous and hospitable while I was there. It seems to me that the best service I could render both those governments is to try and persuade the government of Canada to take some positive steps toward seeking a solution to their joint problems in that area; and to my mind trade is one of the major steps which should be taken at this time.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Byrne: Oh no.

Mr. Roxburgh: God forbid.

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I have just read an article in the newspaper which criticizes the way some members handle themselves in debate. I should like to say that it is that kind of howling and interruption on the part of backbenchers on the Liberal side which is ruining parliament, and I would ask you as chairman to bring them to order. The hon. member for Acadia has just risen in his place to make a speech and even before he starts to speak he is already being heckled and shouted at by people not interested in the dignity of parliament.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I should like to thank the hon. member for Bow River for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few remarks, but if the hon. member for Kootenay East wishes to rise in his place and make a speech for me, or for himself, I will be glad to resume my seat and allow him to do so. It seems he is forever making interruptions from his seat.

Mr. Byrne: I would not want to make one of your speeches.

The Chairman: Order, please.

An hon. Member: He has no brains when he is on his feet.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Someone has said he has no brains when he is on his feet. Perhaps that is why he rarely stands up to make a speech.

An hon. Member: He has none, period.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Someone has now said that he has no brains, period.

Mr. Byrne: What do you say?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I do not think he has shown any evidence of having brains since his coming to this house.

The Chairman: Order. May I invite the hon. member to forget the interruptions which greeted him at the commencement of his remarks.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words quietly and sincerely about a subject that has consumed a great deal of time in this chamber in the past few days.

A number of government members, as well as members on this side, have condemned the C.B.C. because of several of its programs. We are now being asked to vote one eighth or one ninth of total government spending for a period of two months. I am pleased to be a member of a party which suggested during the last interim supply debate that interim supply should be granted for a period of three months so we would not be called upon frequently to carry on debate on interim supply, thereby allowing this house to get on with more important business. Before that amount of money is passed by this committee I think hon. members in this chamber feel duty bound to comment on how the government is spending this money—whether it is being spent wisely, with caution and with scrutiny as recommended by the Glassco commission. Is this corporation paying attention to the recommendations of the Auditor General?

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of question that entered my mind during this debate. A great deal of discussion has taken place regarding the C.B.C. I was a member of the last working broadcasting committee in 1959 and 1961. At that time I took a very active interest in the operations of this corporation. I must say that I was slightly shocked at the manner in which the corporation works. I am not witch hunting because of certain C.B.C. programs, but I am wondering about its general policies and its responsibility to parliament.

This parliament should not act as a censor of the C.B.C. Many programs are shown by the corporation which I do not enjoy. I am sure, however, that many other viewers appreciate that type of program, and I accept that fact. But I am concerned with the corporate structure of the C.B.C. and its relation and responsibility to parliament. The C.B.C. is a public body and should be responsible, through parliament, to the people of Canada.

During an early speech the Minister of Agriculture stated that the C.B.C. was spending more money than his whole department spent in aid to farmers in Canada. I do not know whether that is an accurate comparison, but I point it out to indicate the size of the corporation and its expenditures. A royal commission in the 1930's suggested that Canada needed a national network. The C.B.C. was established to create and operate a radio network system. Since that time this corporation has branched into the television field. Late in the 1950's the board of broadcast governors was established as a regulatory body. I think it was generally accepted at that time, as now, that such a regulatory body performs a useful function. However, I am concerned about the mammoth growth of this C.B.C. structure. There are no real controls over it in respect of expenditure. The corporation is supposed to bring forward a five year capital expansion program. I suppose it has done this, but I have yet to see any real, long range growth policy. The C.B.C. places its expansion program before treasury board and treasury board rules as to whether or not the corporation will receive the required amount of money. What is happening as a result of this procedure? This corporate structure is continuing to grow without aim or direction, and certainly without any controlling reins held by the elected representatives of the people.

I think the whole question of policy of the C.B.C. needs to be closely reconsidered. The

corporation should be considered in light of what it is doing and the direction it is moving. The board of broadcast governors should examine this corporation very closely. In earlier years Canada required a national network system. Does Canada still require such a system? Is there a need for a government subsidized body in this field of communications? Most areas of Canada are now being served by the C.B.C., as well as by private radio and television networks, many of which are affiliated with the C.B.C. Perhaps we no longer need this crown corporation.

Mr. Chairman, most of the questions I have posed this evening should be considered and answered. One other question that has been of some concern to me relates to the 55 per cent Canadian content regulation. What does that regulation mean? Does it mean that 55 per cent of the actors must be Canadian? Does it mean that 55 per cent of the actors must be of Canadian origin? Does it mean that the film must be produced by Canadian photographers? I suggest if this regulation is carefully examined one will discover that it means the film must be produced by a crew which is at least 55 per cent Canadian, and that is all. Is compliance with this regulation going to mean that Canadians will have a greater part in the television industry? I suggest the obvious answer is, not necessarily.

Has the C.B.C. gone along with, accepted or rejected the recommendations of the Glassco commission? Not exactly. The Auditor General made some comments a year ago with regard to the financing of the C.B.C. He found it a bit odd, to say the least. I think that was the gist of his remarks when the public accounts committee was studying the financing of the C.B.C. These are questions that I think should be examined by a broadcasting committee.

The whole question of Canadianism is causing a great deal of trouble across Canada today. Is it the C.B.C.'s responsibility to project their image of Canadianism across Canada? Are they the ones who should interpret what they think Canada should be or should evolve into in the years ahead? Should they portray this image to the Canadian public, whether or not they are right in their projection or in their vision? In other words, is it their job as a corporate entity directly responsible to parliament to interpret Canadianism in the years ahead? This is what they seem to think at times.

Questions have been asked in broadcasting committees in the past with regard to whether or not certain expenditures should be made, and from time to time we have had examples of amounts such as $120,000 or $150,000 being spent on various programs which, to say the least, did not receive wide approval across Canada and which did in fact cause a great deal of apprehension in many homes. Is this the kind of business in which the people of Canada want the C.B.C. to be engaged? In other words, is it the C.B.C.'s job to enter into competition with Hollywood? I do not think so. Even the socialist government of the 40's and 50's in Saskatchewan did not go to that extent. They got into many businesses but they did not try to compete with Hollywood in such a risky business as the production of acceptable films. They did not try anything as risky as that. They stuck to shoe leather, bricks, boxes and many other things that one could mention.

We find the C.B.C. now engaged in the business of the production of films in competition with Hollywood and other private enterprises. I think this whole question should be examined in the light of the future policy of this corporate structure, which is now spending over $100 million a year, with nobody holding the pursestrings. Where is it going to end? The member of our party who spoke just before me mentioned the vast interlake area of Manitoba which is receiving no television service. Is the C.B.C. making a worth-while effort to go into those areas where there is no television reception? Is the C.B.C. making a worth-while effort so far as radio is concerned, or have they forgotten about their obligations in the field of radio? These are some of the questions that I think should be examined by a broadcasting committee. Many members have urged the setting up of a broadcasting committee during this debate and I certainly agree with that suggestion.

Some member interjected a while ago that this was a private matter. When I first became a member of the house I know that television reception in my own constituency of Acadia was practically nil. But then ambitious, enterprising, private television stations moved in, long before the C.B.C. In fact, the C.B.C. has been rather reluctant to move into the east central part of Alberta, a vast area which was not able to enjoy television reception for a number of years until the growth of private television stations.

I say this in a somewhat derogatory sense so far as the C.B.C. is concerned, because surely they must feel it is their duty to make radio and television services available across Canada for all Canadians. I know they have

said so from time to time in the committee, but I have seen the evidence of how they have carried out this duty. It took the private stations or affiliated stations to move into the area I represent in order for the people there to have television reception second to none. So there are many areas with regard to which the C.B.C. should be subjected to close cross-examination.

I will not go into great detail about the matter of program content, but many members have spoken about the program last Sunday evening in which the nazi leader in the United States was portrayed for 12 minutes. I do not think the C.B.C. should be spending Canadian money to put this type of leader before the Canadian people. But they have done it, and who am I to censor? Maybe a few people enjoyed watching the program; I do not know. But the main complaint I have with regard to the C.B.C. is that this corporate structure is growing, growing, ever growing, with no suggested limit and no suggested aim.

Mr. Byrne: Like the Tory party.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): There is that famous member speaking again from his seat. He makes more interjections than any other ten members of the house.

Mr. Cashin: Better to speak from your seat than through your hat.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): If he would only rise to his feet and make a speech I am sure we would all listen. His interjections are so wise, so well thought out that if he ever rose to make a speech I am sure he would have the ear of every member of the house. Mr. Chairman, I was saying I feel that in many respects the C.B.C. has done a tremendous job. It is a national network and we need such a network for some things, but I do not believe we should allow this structure to continue to grow without any aim or basic policy.

We should have a national network to serve as a news medium and as an educational medium, but it should get out of competition with Hollywood.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Some hon. members on the Liberal side clap their hands. I can well understand this because the C.B.C. tried its hand at making a Hollywood film of their leader and failed so badly that they would not let it be shown.

An hon. Member: They should make one of the galloping ghost.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): More interjections, Mr. Chairman. They filibustered this debate all day yesterday.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): They intend to filibuster it all day today, but from their seats. The risky business of making entertainment films should be left to free enterprise.

Mr. Cashin: Good for Barry; he is going to carry three states in Alberta.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I have got another hour, Mr. Chairman. If they want to continue to interrupt me, that is fine. If they take this matter so lightly as to laugh about it, that is fine. That is the way the government takes most problems in Canada today. We saw them bring in one bill after another —the pension plan, on again off again; the labour code, in again out again; and with the farm legislation, because they had bullheaded Harry behind it they bulled it through to the benefit of few farmers across the country. We have seen their type of arrogance.

Some ten minutes ago I was trying to summarize my remarks by suggesting parliament should not be a censor of programs shown on the C.B.C., but I do think parliament should give guidance to the general aims and policy of the corporate structure. The capital cost of the C.B.C. continues to grow, and as the capital structure of the C.B.C. grows so will the cost. This is inevitable. The C.B.C. should not be in competition with Hollywood. Let them sell, let them lease, let them do what they may with their film studios, but let them get out of competition with Hollywood in such a risky business.

The C.B.C. can do good work as a news and educational medium. It can educate Canadians on various industries located across the country, and if we feel purely Canadian films should be made, let us leave that up to the national film board, which is another corporate body. We have two corporate bodies and, to quote my hon. friend across the way, they are actually in competition with one another, one having no limit on the amount of money it can spend. That is practically the case with regard to the C.B.C.

Mr. Grégoire: Carried.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): My friends from deep left field are all in favour of the C.B.C. That is the way I interpret them.

Mr. Woolliams: They must have left friends in Quebec.

Mr. Caouette: Amen.

Mr. Grégoire: Alouette.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): We should have a broadcasting committee established, and the chairman of the C.B.C. should appear before it to outline some of his thoughts and aims on where this octopus is going. Surely parliament should be given some idea where it is going. Some time ago the minister who is responsible for the C.B.C. said, "If it doesn't do what the government wants it to do, heads will roll." That is not good enough. The C.B.C. should not be held under the thumb of this or any government. It should be responsible to parliament and should be given guidance and a general outline on aims by parliament.

This can only be done in a committee composed of all parties, perhaps of all hon. members, and if that committee wished the C.B.C. to continue in competition with Hollywood, then fine, but I believe the majority of my constituents feel the C.B.C. should get out of making entertainment films. From time to time many members have complained about C.B.C. programs, and the C.B.C. has striven to project its image far and beyond what it should.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I have said enough. Many expenses with which I do not agree are being incurred across this country, but in order to facilitate the passage of interim supply I have limited my remarks to the subject of the C.B.C.—

An hon. Member: Time.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): This should not be interpreted as meaning that I am in complete agreement with the way in which most of the money now requested is to be spent by the government—

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): I have allowed the hon. member a few extra minutes on account of various interruptions he suffered but I am afraid, now, that he will have to terminate his interesting speech.

Some hon. Members: Encore.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, I wish to take advantage of this debate on interim supply to state my views on the economic situation generally prevailing in Canada, and especially on the financial situation of the province of Quebec and its population. I also wish to draw the attention of this house to certain special and abnormal situations.

More than ever the Canadian economy is going around in circles; it marks time, shuffles along, bogs down and moves backward. At present, the worker must face the constant progress of automation. He faces the constant progress of the various modern techniques of production. Facing technological, scientific and other progress, the worker is increasingly threatened by insecurity, hardship and unemployment.

The worker is becoming more and more enslaved and destitute due to mechanization and science, which stemmed in the human brain. Progress came through man and the present government offers no economic solution which would enable him to lead a better life than he did before he brought forth this progress.

The worker should lead a better life, as a result of progress and production, than he did before the mechanization of production.

This problem must be solved by the governments which should allow the workers, through economic solutions in accordance with progress, to enjoy the benefits of progress, that is, the production resulting from machinery, automation, mechanization or science.

The economists in our present system appear on television or write articles to say that two thirds of the human race are underfed. I agree with them, because this is proved by world statistics. The same economists who, on television as well as in their writings, talk about underfed people throughout the world, also tell us about overproduction. They speak to us of underfed people and at the same time of overproduction. And they do so quite seriously. How can the same economists mention in the same breath underfed people and overproduction?

Scarcity means malnutrition, want and poverty. Abundance would mean prosperity. But how can our economists tell us there is abundance of production in the world, while two thirds of the population of the world are underfed?

The solution is very easy. But why is it not applied? Because our governments are slaves to finance, which maintains people in poverty through its monetary and financial system.

Our monetary or financial system should be controlled by the government, so that money be based on production, that it serve production and that production may meet the needs, and by needs I mean consumption.

At the moment, our financial system is topsy-turvy; the contrary is happening, and two thirds of the human race are suffering under such conditions. Finance leads the government, whereas the government should lead finance, as we want it to do.

Mr. Chairman, why has the Bank of Canada, a federal government agency, loaned recently to the Bank of England an amount which is said to be about $50 million, at an interest rate which, we are told, amounts to .075 per cent?

Why can't this bank grant loans to our municipalities, our school boards, our cities at this same rate of interest, that is .075 per cent, for the development of our municipalities, our cities and our school boards?

Our school taxes or our municipal taxes would certainly be reduced by 50 per cent at least, should the Bank of Canada serve our Canadian institutions instead of serving foreigners.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Rondeau: I hear the hon. member for St. Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) say "shame". Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is a shame.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I must point out to the hon. member for Shefford that I did not at any time say "shame", as I am not interested at all in his speech.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the point of order is not well taken, but I think I heard a member of the caucus surrounding the hon. member say that word.

In any event this Liberal government grants loans to foreigners while taxing and burdening the Canadian people. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) told us that we ought to save the pound sterling. The loan to the Bank of England was to rescue the pound sterling. To rescue others but let our people croak, that is the policy of the present Minister of Finance.

Mr. Caouette: That is quite true.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, I should also like to say a few words about our Canadian agriculture. Farming, too, is ruined by finance. At the present time the Canadian farmer, and especially the eastern farmer, is as far in debt and mortgages as he can go.

Yet he has received a lot from the Liberal party during the last election, but he cannot pay with promises made by the Liberal party in 1962 or 1963. He cannot make a living for his family with those promises. He cannot meet his obligations with those promises either. Having no farm income, he has to borrow—that is the achievement of the Liberal party: to borrow—from year to year until the farm loan organization or his creditors take his farm away from him because without income, he is unable to meet his obligations.

Mr. Grégoire: That is true.

Mr. Rondeau: And when he has lost his farm, he will become a worker on the socialist collective farms of the federal government.

Mr. Prud'homme: Bona.

Mr. Rondeau: In Cuba they had the land reform. In Canada we have ARDA.

Mr. Prud'homme: Bona.

Mr. Caouette: It is the same with Bona.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity which would not be given to me otherwise to tell the house, during the debate on this $740 million interim supply motion, the dramatic situation, the inhuman fate and the shameful discrimination borne now by the Montreal harbour dockers who are deprived of their jobs and run the risk of losing great sums of money invested by them in the retirement fund administered by the shipping federation and the international longshoremen's association.

Before coming to the core of my remarks, I should like to set a distinction between the international unions which may have rendered invaluable service to Canadian industries and those which work against our companies. The facts I should like to bring to your attention tonight:

1—Concern the Department of Labour which administers labour legislation in Canada.

2—The department is also interested because it is entrusted with the application of the Unemployment Insurance Act.

3—Those facts also concern the Department of Transport which looks after the administration of national harbours.

4—They are also of interest to the House of Commons and to all Canadians because they indicate that the Canadian Bill of Rights passed by parliament is being violated by the American unions which deprive Montreal harbour longshoremen of their right to choose the union they like.

5—Those facts also show that simple regulations adopted by the international longshoremen's association, a U.S. union which

has its head office in New York, have precedence over Canadian legislation such as the Industrial Relations Act which was enacted by parliament and which governs labour conditions and employment of longshoremen in Montreal harbour.

During the past six months Montreal longshoremen went on strike three times and the strangest part of it all is that none of those strikes were organized by the international longshoremen's association, the American union which is negotiating a labour contract on behalf of the longshoremen. Neither were they directed against the employers, the shipping federation of Canada. They were decided by the dockers against their own union which omits to defend them, to represent them properly or to supply its members with the required information concerning the use made of the pension fund administered jointly by the employers and the American union.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, and as the Minister of Labour is also aware, since he appointed him himself, Judge René Lippé was appointed to investigate the pension system of the dockers and the administration of some $6 million in that pension fund.

The report prepared and published by Judge Lippé last August does not satisfy the dockers because it does not say how the pension fund is administered; it does not say where that money is invested, how much it yields, and especially, that report makes no recommendation with a view to improving the lot of dockers being pensioned.

What are the demands of the Montreal harbour dockers?

The dockers' grievances are based on three points:

(1) the pension plan, (2) the security conditions on wharves, (3) the material vexations they endure in their work.

The Montreal harbour dockers now pay an amount of 12 cents per hour into a pension fund.

In 1963, in Montreal, 2,500 dockers worked a total of 3,689,257 hours on the waterfront, which means a payment of almost half a million dollars for only one year and a payment of $200 per docker in 1963.

They would gladly pay that amount if they were sure to retire on a suitable pension. But that is not the case, Mr. Chairman. It is so hard to qualify for a pension that most stevedores will never get one, and all the money they have thus invested during all the years they have been working will remain in the retirement fund which is jointly

administered by the employers and the international longshoremen's association.

Normally, to qualify for a pension, a stevedore must be 65 years of age. Should he quit his job and cease to be a stevedore at the age of 64 years, 11 months and 30 days, the poor man loses his contributions to the fund and his right to a pension. But even if he does work until 65, the Montreal stevedore is not sure to receive a pension; he must first be a paying member and must have paid up his dues with the American union, he must have worked on the water front continuously for at least 25 years, that is between the age of 40 and 65; he must have worked an average of 600 hours per year between the age of 60 and 65 years and have worked at least 1,500 hours in all, or an average of 300 hours a year.

If the stevedore meets all of those requirements—brace yourself—he gets a monthly pension of $50. A monthly pension of $50 when he has contributed to the retirement fund 12 cents an hour during 25 years. Is it not ridiculous? Do you not think, Mr. Chairman, that stevedores are entitled to ask questions, to ask how this money is being administered and to demand that a pension be paid out of the fund to stevedores who, because of old age or because they are no longer physically fit to do the hard jobs required of them on the waterfront, have to leave their employment before having reached 65 years?

For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, the longshoremen of the harbour of Montreal are unhappy with the administration of the international longshoremen's association, and they have decided this summer, within the limits provided by the Industrial Relations Act, to join another union which, they believe, would protect their interest in a better way, namely the syndicat national des débardeurs which is affiliated with the national trade unions federation.

It was at that time that the international longshoremen's association decided to show its teeth and strike hard, seeing that it would lose the benefits and administration of a pension fund which, some people say, is worth over $6 million, and according to the longshoremen themselves, it is worth over $10 million in view of the amounts they have been paying into it since 1953.

Threats were phoned in, and obvious intimidation borne against the longshoremen who wanted to transfer their union allegiance. Some phone callers said: "We'll break your legs", while others asserted: "When there's a war, rebels are shot."

Things got so bad that the national trade union federation had to appeal to the Quebec courts to put an end to the threats and the intimidation against the longshoremen by the international longshoremen's association.

More than that, the international longshoremen's association, not content with making threats, started to act.

They ordered the dissenting longshoremen to appear before the executive of the international union on August 17, 1964 for the following reasons:

He incited members of local 375 to leave our ranks and to join another longshoremen's association.

Everything subject to fine, suspension for a definite period or expulsion by the executive committee.

Then, on August 27 last, the national trade union federation secured from Mr. Justice Lamarre, of the superior court in Montreal, an interim injunction specifying this:

Consequently, by Thursday September 10, 1964, at noon, we enjoin the defendants to cease:

(a) molesting or trying to molest, intimidating, threatening or trying to threaten by intimidation or otherwise present or future members of the applicant the syndicat national des débardeurs du port de Montréal (C.S.N.);

(b) interfering in any way with the formation and legal activities of the applicant, the syndicat national des débardeurs du port de Montréal;

(c) suspending, dismissing, threatening to dismiss or to cause the dismissal, in any way, present or future members of the applicant, the syndicat national des débardeurs du port de Montréal (C.S.N.) or depriving them directly or indirectly of their right to work; because they signed, are signing or will sign a membership card to join the applicant union;

(d) seeking to convince, either by threats, intimidations or imposition of a penalty or by any other means, longshoremen not to join the applicant (C.S.N.) or not to take part in its activities;

(e) ordering and/or trying to order, instructing and/or trying to instruct, advising and/or trying to advise any person whatever to take part in the commission of any or all of the above mentioned acts.

(Signed) Philippe Lamarre
Justice of superior court.

However, on September 21, Mr. Justice Tellier of the same court, without pronouncing judgment on the facts quashed the temporary injunction of Mr. Justice Lamarre, because the affidavits signed by the longshoremen in this case, had been signed before the application was filed. Therefore, the injunction was quashed for legal and technical reasons. Three days after the injunction was quashed, the international longshoremen's association renewed its reprisals and the dissenters received the following letter:

Dear Sir and Brother:

This is to advise you that the executive committee of local 375 of the international longshoremen's association rendered a unanimous decision on the complaint laid against you and heard at the special meeting held on August 28, 1964, at 8 o'clock p.m., in our offices located at 250 St. Paul east, in the city of Montreal.

The executive committee finds Mr. ....., registration No. ....., guilty of the charge heard on August 28, 1964, at 8 o'clock p.m., and decides to suspend the said Mr. ..... for a definite period, that is until December 31, 1965, this suspension taking effect immediately. Unanimously passed on September 24, 1964.

Under the circumstances, all your rights as a member of local 375 are suspended until December 31, 1965.

Please comply therewith.

Yours truly,
Adrien Lemoine,
Secretary-Treasurer.

But what is the meaning of this expulsion by local 375 of the international longshoremen's association?

1. It means that the longshoremen will lose the right to work on the Montreal docks, because the shipping federation of Canada is bound to hire only members who have paid their fees to the international longshoremen's association; therefore, the first result is the loss of their livelihood.

2. Because, in several cases the expulsion of the dissenting longshoremen is decreed up to December 31, 1965, the longshoremen involved will inevitably lose their right to the pension fund, since they will have failed to work the number of hours required to be entitled to their pension.

3. The health insurance, paid by the longshoremen to protect themselves and their families, lapses and the suspended workers, as well as their families, are deprived of coverage against the cost of illness.

4. These workers experience difficulty with unemployment insurance, and they have not received one cent in benefits from the beginning of their expulsion, as confirmed by a letter from the unemployment insurance office, dated September 23, 1964.

An appeal from this decision was lodged and will be heard by the arbitration board on October 30. In their claims for benefits the expelled longshoremen, who are earning $2.53 per hour on the docks, stated they were available for work and able to work as longshoremen, and in fact they reported for work. But work was refused to them by the shipping federation of Canada, on account of the suspension decreed by the international longshoremen's association.

Mr. Chairman, this is a human problem, which cannot leave the members of the house indifferent, and above all, I imagine, the Minister of Labour, who is responsible for the administration of the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, and also of the Unemployment Insurance Act.

Mr. Chairman, paragraph 4 of section 7 of the Industrial Relations and Disputes Act, chapter 152, reads as follows:

> Where a collective agreement is in force, the application for a new certification may be made at any time after the expiry of ten months of the term of the collective agreement.

The dockers tried to become members of another union within legal limits because the existing agreement between the international longshoremen's association was concluded on January 1, 1963 and will remain in force until December 31, 1965.

Therefore, the collective agreement has been in existence for 22 months and the dockers, under a right guaranteed by the law, can freely join another union if they wish to.

It is true that the constitution of the international longshoremen's association stipulates that any attempt to introduce another union among the dockers is liable to expulsion and fine.

How come, Mr. Chairman, that the regulations of the American union prevail over a Canadian law?

How is it possible that Canadian workers cannot change their union allegiance, are denied their trade union freedom because it is forbidden by the constitution of an American union? How can the American unions, just as an ex-president of an American union at the present time, thus ignore our laws and scoff with impunity at the Canadian Bill of Rights which guarantees freedom of association?

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister of Labour to intervene and to see that a serious study is made of this matter, to ensure that the freedom of our unions and their members is respected, and that those workers, until such time as they go back to their jobs, or to any job, receive the unemployment insurance to which human beings in their position are entitled.

[*Text*]

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, I want to take advantage of interim supply to make a proposal which I sincerely set out for the consideration of the house, and of those who may be interested in it. It comes technically under the estimates of the privy council and relates particularly to the centennial commission. The suggestion I want to make is basically directed toward this commission and I am hoping it will be taken into consideration when the spending estimates for special projects are considered.

Very briefly I am going to present a confederation student exchange program. By way of background I should like to point out that all who have studied Canada's problems, political, social and economic, agree that they arise from its immense size and diversity of interest. We have really six regions in Canada —the maritimes, Quebec, Ontario, the prairies, British Columbia and the north. Our problems are magnified by a lack of understanding in each area of the outlook of the others. It applies not only as between all regions of Canada. Lack of understanding is most dramatic with the province of Quebec and the other provinces because of difficulty in communication; but other regional differences are just as great and are often overlooked.

It has seemed to me that one of the great opportunities of our centennial celebrations is to do something positive toward removing these areas of misunderstanding. There is no longer any excuse from a transportation or communication aspect. The means of transportation is there; bus, rail, air and motor vehicle travel facilities are fast and plentiful. The beauty and magnitude and diversity of Canada has hardly been explored by Canadians either young or old, but it is the young people in whom the hope of the future lies and who deserve the best we can give them in preparation for building a better Canada.

In this context I propose a confederation student exchange of a magnitude and nature not previously undertaken, and one which only a central body such as the federal government or the centennial commission can sponsor and underwrite. Several public minded organizations are presently sponsoring student exchanges in Canada within the limits of their own resources. Visite interprovinciale and the Canadian council of Christians and Jews are two worth mentioning. They sponsor trips from two weeks to a month, and this year about 3,000 students will have visited other parts of Canada. The plan I propose, however, is different in both magnitude and depth. If accepted, it will throw the resources of the nation into a real effort to create a unified and self-confident Canada.

The fundamentals of the plan are these: first, a home to home exchange of students among the various regions of Canada, for one full school term, for students in their third

and later years in secondary school; second, a home to home exchange for the summer months for students who cannot take a whole school term. Registration and administrative arrangements would be handled by the centennial commission. Transportation would be provided by the federal government. Local arrangements for personal supervision, health and education would be made with the provinces. Parents would provide room, board and school necessities for the visiting student. Clothes and spending money would come from home. The exchange would be voluntary, open to all students within the selected grades, provided only that the student had passed his or her previous year's examination. The exchange would be massive, as I see it, geared to make a noticeable impact on Canadian life and its youth, with a target of 100,000 students in 1967 and a continuing program thereafter.

In detail, the idea is that parents of a student desiring to exchange would be hosts to another student of the same age, sex and school grade for one school term, while their child becomes the guest of the other home. The students, in short, would exchange homes. The foster parents would provide for the visiting student as they would for their own child. The friends of the home and absent student would form a circle into which the visiting student would easily fit. Such an exchange would be available to all, and would cost the student and his family nothing. For one school term, he or she would become a part of the life of the new family, town, school and province.

While the idea seems simple in its conception, there are real and practical difficulties to be worked out. Technical problems of educational standards, jurisdiction and registration on the one hand, and personal problems of environment, standards of living, religion and adaptability of both parents and children on the other, are the most apparent. But after giving it a good deal of thought I am convinced they can be overcome.

With regard to registration, parents or students desiring to exchange would make application to the central body on a prescribed application form which could and would be made up for use in a computing machine. The particulars of the child to be exchanged and his home circumstances, as well as province, religion and school the child wished to attend would be indicated on the application. Computers would match up the cards and provide applicants with names of matching families.

A period of time would be allowed in which direct correspondence would take place between families. When a suitable exchange was arranged, both applicants would notify the central agency. Except for the services provided, the arrangement would be a private one, with applicants accepting all responsibilities between themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I should now like to move to a consideration of the services which would be provided by the public. In the first place, the federal government would provide return transportation for the student, as well as one visit home at Christmas or Easter during the term. The provincial or territorial government would provide the educational facilities to the visiting student. They would provide the exchange of records and matching curriculum, as far as possible. The province would also provide supervisory services. I think for such supervisory services the best agencies available would be children's aid societies, or welfare agencies within the provinces. Each home would be visited in advance and reported upon by the children's aid society. It would be improper to ask these agencies to evaluate these homes, therefore my suggestion is that the only report which would be made in advance would designate the home as either suitable or unsuitable for exchange while the student is in the foster home, the agency would make visits at regular intervals to see that both student and foster parents were satisfied with the arrangements. A completely homesick or unsatisfied child could return home without prejudicing the other student. No liability would devolve on the welfare agency while acting in good faith in its duties.

Mr. Chairman, I have given some serious thought to the question of what type of student would qualify for such an exchange. When the original centennial commission was set up some years ago a proposal somewhat similar to this was made, and in the general outline there was similarity. The report of that commission suggested that children of the ages from 15 years to 17 years would be eligible for exchange. I have suggested, however, that students in the third and fourth years of secondary school who have completed their previous year's examinations and were in good standing would be eligible to partake in such an exchange. The question of age is one of some difficulty. I felt that in the first or second year of high school many students would be too young to make such an exchange and properly fit into their new homes.

Mr. Chairman, I did mention a second type of exchange. The one I have just outlined is

a school term exchange. There should also be provision for a number of students who could not properly make an exchange during a school year. In this category there would be students in their final year of secondary school, whose education should not be disturbed. If these students wanted to make an exchange they might find that the standards of education were so different in the province visited that they would not be able to pass the different examinations. There should also be a summer exchange for students who desire to make an exchange with students in areas not having a comparable curriculum.

There would be a third group of students who would not take the whole year. They would be those who wanted to exchange for cultural or language purposes and who could not properly fit into the language area and get any results from their schooling. These would be people who desired to exchange from one language area to another, to move into a home environment in the other language and acquire fluency in that second language. Such an exchange could work both ways. By that I mean it could be partly in the one province and partly in the other, for one month in the one province and one month in the other for each of the students.

Summer exchanges would be based on the same principles as the others, except that they would be of shorter duration and would not involve any educational problem of any kind. I know of several very successful experiments that have been made in this type of home to home exchange. I know that this summer a large number of students from the province of Ontario who live in English language communities moved into various French language communities in Quebec, stayed there for one or two weeks and returned home bringing their guests with them for a similar period. This experiment was entered upon with a great deal of hesitation by some of these children because they were not sure what they were going to get into. That is the reason why I suggested in my original plan that when there is an exchange there should be supervision by some sort of agency which would verify that the home is proper for the child to go into and, on the other hand, that the new parents are satisfied with the child who has been placed with them.

There is one difficulty that undoubtedly will come to mind and that is the question of religion. There are many situations where religion might cause difficulty, even though other exchange factors would be satisfactory.

[Mr. Aiken.]

The plan I envisage would include the question of religion as part of the application particulars, and if necessary the computers could match up the cards of the student and the parents. But in many cases there would be no problem and as I see it the sole requirement would be that the foster parents agree, as part of their general undertaking, to send the student to a church designated by the parents. There is no real problem but it is undoubtedly one matter that would cause some concern.

As to the time of commencement of this plan, I should like to set as a target date the school term of 1966-67, which is roughly two years away. I have had discussions with people who are interested and who have operated exchange programs and they feel that a two year period would be quite sufficient to enable them to be prepared to carry out this program. I am not putting forward this project as a pipe dream because I have discussed it with people who have been in the field, and it can be done and can make a very significant impact on Canada for the future. I would suggest that the summer exchanges start in 1967, and after 1966 and 1967 these exchanges would be on a continuing basis as students reach the grades designated.

There are about a million students in Canada's secondary schools and about 400,000 of these are in their third or subsequent years and would come under the plan I have mentioned. I have selected this age group because they are mature enough to travel but young enough to adapt to new surroundings. Allowances will have to be made for those who find some disturbance in curriculum, because they will have compensated for it in experience. Final year students who are preparing for university entrance should probably only participate in the summer exchange.

I have discussed this plan with a number of experts in the field. The technical difficulties can be ironed out. Computers can handle the matching of registration cards, provincial curricula can be equated, and the plan can work.

I can think of no better way to meet our obligation to the coming generation, to take a great step toward national understanding, to substitute personal experience and direct exposure for book learning, and to provide a living and meaningful centennial project. For the cost of one public building and one military aircraft, or for the amount the federal government spends in one day, this

plan can be operated for one year. The money would all be spent in Canada and for transportation on facilities already running. The centennial commission is now operating and no new body will have to be set up. Every parent who participates in the program will be making a personal contribution to the centennial and will be receiving something from it for his or her own child. Every person in every community can give something to the country in accepting and welcoming the visiting student.

May I conclude by saying that the centennial can become a meaningful experience so that when the bunting comes down, the buildings are emptied and a second look is taken at many of the centennial projects which are expensive and unproductive, there will be a deep satisfaction in knowing that we have taken a real step ahead, one that will be rewarding and permanent. May I call it ten o'clock?

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the genial acting house leader if he can give us an indication not only of the business for tomorrow but the business for Monday and Tuesday?

Mr. MacNaught: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue the discussion of interim supply. Then we will take up the balance of the estimates of the Minister of Industry, namely the balance of defence production, the national research council and atomic energy. Then we will take up the Department of Forestry followed by the Department of National Revenue. I regret I cannot forecast the items of business for Monday.

Mr. Lambert: Does the acting house leader anticipate that he will be able to indicate tomorrow the business for Monday?

Mr. MacNaught: If we should be so unfortunate as to be still considering interim supply tomorrow night, we shall go on with interim supply on Monday.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

CANADIAN COASTGUARD—APPOINTMENT OF ADMINISTRATOR FOR TRAINING COLLEGE

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that under the new rules, although hon. members are given an opportunity to put forward questions at this time, the responsible minister is not required to be present. Yesterday I asked the Minister of Transport a question, and I might say that his attitude was rather petulant, in fact ridiculous, in that he expected me to preface my question with a speech welcoming him back to the house, something he had already received from a member of the N.D.P. and a Conservative member.

I know, regardless of what prepared answer someone on the Liberal side may have to give me, it will not in any way, shape or form be a reasonable or accurate answer to the problem before us at this time. My question to the Minister of Transport was:

> Was it necessary for the department to reach into the ranks of the retired to find an administrator for the proposed coastguard college at Point Eward?

Mr. Speaker, I do not mind too often remarks made in the house while members are sitting in the house, but I don't see why I have to put up with members behind the curtain making all this noise. I would very much appreciate a little order, especially from those standing behind the curtains.

In his answer to the question, the Minister of Transport in his usual, complete disregard for the truth had this to say—

Mr. McIlraith: Order.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, we now have the President of the Privy Council calling for order without allowing me to prove he has complete disregard for the truth. If the rules permitted it I would apply the word usually used in that respect. In answer to my question this is what the Minister of Transport said:

> The hon. gentleman, as is not unusual, has his facts wrong. No appointment has been made to this position, because the college has not yet been established.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, I have here what we would probably consider an official press release from the Department of Transport, and if the President of the Privy Council wants to take objection to this, he can also. The first paragraph reads:

> No. 84-64 October 16, 1964
>
> Ottawa—Captain Eric Brand of Ottawa, former director of marine operations for the Department of Transport marine services, has been appointed

planning officer of the Canadian coastguard college, it was announced today by Transport Minister J. W. Pickersgill.

We have a complete contradiction here —the answer I received yesterday from the minister completely contradicted by a press release put out under his name on October 16 when this appointment was definitely announced. The Minister of Transport said no such appointment was made because the college has yet to be established. Further on in his answers he tried to give reasons why Captain Brand was appointed.

What amazes me is that the Department of National Defence, despite their efforts and their claims that they were going to reduce the overhead costs of that department, in the year 1963-64 came up with a budget in excess of any other budget since 1956-57 when the Liberals were last in office. This department claims to have brought about a great deal of saving in its expenditures and as part of this economy program they are dismissing men from the Royal Canadian Navy in advance of their normal time for retirement—men of high qualifications; I could start with Admiral Brock and go down the list to show that the government has retired any number of competent men prematurely, men well capable of filling this situation. Yet this government, a government so anxious to save the taxpayers' money, is now reaching into the retired field to come up with the appointment announced on October 16, 1964. This announcement was made in the name of the Minister of Transport who yesterday in this house tried to maintain again, I repeat, with a complete disregard for the truth, that no such appointment had been made. This is why I say it is most unfortunate that when members have an opportunity to bring questions forward at this time the responsible minister is not present to reply to the charges.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): The question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Cape Breton South was:

Was it necessary for the department to reach into the ranks of the retired to find an administrator for the proposed coastguard college at Point Edward?

Of course, the answer is that no administrator has been appointed for the proposed coastguard college at Point Edward. It is clear from the hon. member's remarks that he objects to the appointment of Captain Eric Brand as planning officer to do the organizational work in setting up this coastguard college. The hon. member argues that it was not necessary to have a retired officer to do this job. I would merely reply that he is quite right. It was not necessary, but anyone who knows anything about the subject of the coastguard college or the qualifications of Captain Brand would agree at once that it is highly desirable that the government should reach into the ranks of the retired to get such an outstanding person on a limited contract basis to do the necessary planning to set up this college. In this way, it will be possible to provide the finest training for young persons who need such training before entering upon any of the activities which are open to them by way of careers whether in the Department of Transport, the shipping industry or related activities which they may wish to pursue.

Having known something of the quality of Captain Brand's work at the time the maritime commission legislation was prepared and enacted—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; the minister's time has expired.

PENSIONS—CANADA PLAN—REQUEST FOR EARLY CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are aware, I have been asking for the resolution which precedes the new Canada pension plan to be called for debate at an early date. I have pointed out that our new rules will limit such a debate to one day and therefore, if this item of government business could be called, we could have the bill introduced and move one step further toward the adoption of this desirable measure.

When I put a further question about this matter to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) on orders of the day this afternoon he suggested that interim supply had higher priority, and in answer to a supplementary question he said that a day or two would not make any difference to the Canada pension plan. That of course was the reason I gave notice I would raise this question in the overtime period tonight. Putting this pension plan off for a day or two may not sound serious, but this is what has been going on since the present government came to power in the early part of 1963. We have been put off and put off with respect to this legislation until some of us wonder whether we will ever really get it.

I recognize, as all hon. members do, that the government has the full say as to what

items of business will be called in government time, and I am not trying to usurp that right of the government. But the government also has an obligation to pay some attention to its promises. On the second day of this session the Prime Minister said in the house, in answer to a question of mine, that we would proceed with the Canada pension plan in the early days of this session. That was back in February. Prior to Easter, in response to further questions, he gave the assurance that we would deal with this matter before Easter; in fact, that we would get it to the special committee to be established for it. Then we were told later that this would be done before the summer recess. I suppose the excuse is that we did not have a summer recess.

So it has gone right throughout the months of this session; we keep being told that we are going to get this legislation soon. At last it is on the order paper in the form of the resolution that precedes the latest version of the Canada pension plan. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the government is failing in its duty and is missing a golden opportunity by not calling this item tomorrow or Monday, or Tuesday at the latest. Let me repeat that once it is called it has to be dealt with within one day, so no time is lost. The government says that interim supply has top priority. I recognize the priority of interim supply, but I would point out what all of us who have been around here for any time are aware of, namely that the present interim supply debate is not a debate that is going to take place for a certain number of days; it is a debate that is going to take place until a certain date—probably about November 5, and on that date there may be a blow-up of some kind and it will be all over. We all know what is involved here. Just as soon as we get close to the brink, or just as soon as civil service salaries are in danger of not being paid, this debate will end. Therefore any day taken out of the present interim supply debate will not postpone the passing of interim supply; as a matter of fact it will save a day's debate on interim supply, and we will have had the debate on the resolution stage of the Canada pension plan and thus get the bill.

I submit further, Mr. Speaker, that if the government would have this one day's debate, which is the limit the rules allow, on the resolution preceding the Canada pension plan bill, we would then have the bill before us and this would be taken by all members of the house and all parties as a sign of good faith that the government intends to go ahead with this legislation. I also think it would have an effect on the temper of this house; I believe it would help the house to realize there is a firm intention to proceed during the next few weeks of this session with important and significant legislation.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I do not like the way we have been put off with respect to this matter week after week, month after month, for the past 18 months or so; and I do not think it is enough for the Prime Minister to say that another day or two will not make any difference. I say that it would make a difference if we were to take a day now on this resolution; otherwise such a day would just be lost in the interim supply debate. We should use that day to get the resolution stage over and get the bill introduced and given first reading. Then we will have the bill before us, it will be printed, it will be there for us all to see and for the country to see; and it will in fact be a sign of good faith that the government intends to proceed with this kind of important legislation, rather than with something else that might just take time and drag things out. If the government would agree to this course being followed we could thus make this session the significant and worth-while one that I believe we would yet like it to be, rather than just the longest session in history.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the announcement has already been made tonight that we are going to have interim supply tomorrow and Monday, I put to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. McIlraith), who I take it is the minister who is going to answer me, this simple question: Will the government not reconsider my proposal and call the resolution preceding the Canada pension plan tomorrow or Monday, or not later than Tuesday, so we may take this step forward with respect to this important piece of legislation?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that the government is just as anxious to bring forward the Canada pension plan as is the hon. member. I must tell him that the government, as it sees its responsibility, considers that the first priority must be given to interim supply. I think that is elementary. That being the case interim supply has been indicated as the business for tomorrow and I think we will have to proceed in that way.

The next item of priority is, of course, the Canada pension plan resolution. The hon. member developed the argument, or really asserted the proposition, that the debate on interim supply would end at a certain date

and that one day out of the period between now and that date would not make any difference. Perhaps I should refrain from picking up that argument now either one way or the other, but its inference is pretty clear. I would merely say that I will look at the point raised by the hon. member. In the light of his remarks if it is clear that the interim supply debate is going to end on a certain day anyway regardless of how much time is given to it in the meantime, I will certainly think over this argument and seek to bring forward the Canada pension plan at the earliest possible date that it can be brought forward.

Mr. Knowles: Early next week, let us hope.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.19 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 30, 1964

The house met at 11 a.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. DEACHMAN—REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF PRESS RELEASE RESPECTING FLAG COMMITTEE

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, in view of the publication of a story by me in the Ottawa *Citizen* yesterday a few minutes before the report of the flag committee was tabled, and in view of what was said about that in the house yesterday, I respectfully request Your Honour to have this matter referred to the committee on privileges and elections.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra made a suggestion to the house, but it would require an order of the house to carry out that suggestion. Before any action is taken one way or the other I feel it my duty to make one or two points.

It is undoubtedly a very serious thing to attack the conduct of any member of the House of Commons, and in that respect a specific charge should always be made, not a general charge. I am confirmed in this opinion by an excellent ruling, it seems to me, given by Mr. Speaker Michener on June 19, 1959, which appears at pages 583 and 584 of the *Journals*. I should like to refer to two short sentences in that ruling. I read from page 583:

> It has been strongly urged by some members that the house should not set in motion its power to try and to judge the conduct of a member unless such member is charged with a specific offence. It is urged further that not only must he be charged, but that he must be charged by a member of the House of Commons standing in his place.

These are the words of Mr. Speaker Michener:

> 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.

Later on the same page, 584, I read:

> In the case before us no honourable member has taken the responsibility of making a specific charge against the honourable member for Peel.

The practice in the Canadian House of Commons, up to the present, has been to give notice of intention. Of course a true question of privilege can be raised at any time, but it should be raised immediately. It seems to me that the matter was referred to yesterday in fairly strong terms, and under the heading of "earliest opportunity" I think it conforms, in view of my statement that I was taken by surprise and would look into the matter.

The role of the Speaker is outlined in Beauchesne, citation 104, subsection 2. I must say that, accordingly, if the house wishes to refer this matter to the committee on privileges and elections, so be it. In my opinion it should not be concerned with the conduct of the member but should be more of an investigation into the matter. However, that is up to the house to decide. Since there is nothing before the Chair, I suggest that if it is the desire to look into this matter an order of the house should issue.

Is it the pleasure of the house to refer this matter to the committee on privileges and elections?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, if a motion were introduced to that effect, I would move an amendment to it. Unfortunately, there is none before the house.

If you simply ask that the matter be referred to the committee on privileges and elections, I would like to move an amendment; it would be my own suggestion regarding a motion designed to refer other related matters to the committee on privileges and elections.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. There is no motion before the house at the moment, so obviously there cannot be any amendment. If the hon. member wishes to do anything he will have to take the responsibility of moving his own motion.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): May I be permitted to say something, Mr. Speaker, concerning your reference to your

surprise yesterday on the question of privilege?

Mr. Speaker: I do not see how any purpose could be served by that. I considered it my duty this morning to point out these few facts, which are very important, namely that no general charge should be made. In the circumstances I propose to continue by calling for the presenting of reports by standing and special committees.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TRIBUTES TO CLERK ASSISTANT ON RETIREMENT

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the house to an event which has for all of us its element of sadness, as I am sure it has for the gentleman concerned, although perhaps there is also an element of release and anticipation. I refer to the fact that this is the last day our Clerk Assistant, Mr. Montgomery, will be in his chair in the House of Commons.

Mr. Montgomery joined the public service in 1912 and entered the service of the House of Commons in 1915. He is in his fiftieth year of service to the house. With his service to the house he has combined other forms of public service, community service, civil service, war charities and war activities, and for all this over so many years we owe him a debt of gratitude which I am sure we are all very proud and happy to acknowledge this morning. We thank him for what he has done in the public service of Canada, and we wish him many years of happiness and enjoyment ahead.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this is one of those times when there is unity in the House of Commons as we do an unusual honour to one who has devoted his life to the public service. The Prime Minister has spoken in detail of that service. All of us who have sat in this chamber know what Mr. Montgomery's contribution has meant. He has been kindly, courteous and always devoted to the welfare of those in this chamber. There will be universal regret that after a half century of service he is about to retire.

We have no means of showing our appreciation for those that serve us well. We have no decoration such as the Victorian Order in the United Kingdom, which permits the sovereign on behalf of the nation to show the appreciation of the nation. We take this means of saying to Mr. Montgomery how deeply grateful we have been, and indeed are, to him and to all those who serve us in this chamber in the capacity of Clerk, Clerk Assistant and the other officials who give of their best to their country. Too often we do not pay tribute to civil servants who serve us so well. This is one occasion when, through Mr. Montgomery, we can pay our tribute not only to him in affection, but also to all those who serve in the civil service in devotion to their country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I think you and all hon. members will realize that had it not been for the top priority afforded the Prime Minister I should have risen in my place and spoken to a question of privilege on this day, which is a sad occasion for this House of Commons.

All of us are aware of the loyalty and ability Mr. Montgomery as Clerk Assistant has given to the House of Commons collectively and to members individually. In order to complete the record of Mr. Montgomery's services I should like to add to the words of the right hon. Prime Minister, and record in *Hansard* the fact that Mr. Montgomery, the Clerk Assistant of this house, has been a federal civil servant for fifty years and four months. Added to that record is the astounding fact that he has been an employee of the House of Commons for forty-nine years and three months, and for the past 13 years has been Clerk Assistant.

In addition to these services Mr. Montgomery has accepted other responsibilities from time to time. He has had a keen interest in and knowledge of the commonwealth parliamentary association. For the past 13 years he has been either assistant secretary or secretary of that association. I doubt whether there is any man in the commonwealth, except perhaps at the head office in London, who knows more of the details about that association and its work.

Although Mr. Montgomery today is resigning from his position as Clerk Assistant, we in the commonwealth parliamentary association are very pleased that at our last executive meeting he offered to continue his services and lend his knowledge to the work that association must do, commencing next month, in preparing for the commonwealth parliamentary association conference which will be held in

Canada in 1967. I am sure I express the appreciation and gratitude of all of us to Mr. Montgomery, who has informed the executive of the C.P.A. of his availability. That offer demonstrates just why we hold him in such affection and believe that although retiring from one position, he will yet be available to serve Canada in years to come.

On behalf of this group, sir, I add our expression of good will and our wishes for his good health and his opportunity to serve Canada for many years ahead.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure to be able to say a few words in support of the remarks made by the Prime Minister and representatives of the other parties with regard to our respected and beloved fellow worker in the House of Commons, Mr. Montgomery. In the few short years it has been my privilege to be a member of the house I have come to appreciate in a very special way his constant and continual friendly helpfulness. This applies not only to his official responsibilities, but has been carried over so many times beyond the normal call of duty to little things that he was under no obligation to do. I think this is one of the reasons those of us who have come to know him on that basis refer to him affectionately as "Monty." We regard him as more than just a fellow worker and friend. We regard him as what he truly is, a devoted and dedicated public servant and citizen of Canada.

On behalf of myself personally as well as the other members of our group may I say that he is certainly worthy of all the kindly words that have been uttered, and the brevity of my remarks in no way reflects the depth of our appreciation for him. We appreciate the fact that he is going to continue to be with us. We join in the remarks that have just been made with regard to the tremendous contribution he has made to the commonwealth parliamentary association, and we are indeed pleased that in serving that important organization he will continue to be with us.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, we gladly endorse the words spoken by the Prime Minister regarding an exemplary official, Mr. Montgomery, who has always performed his duties with tact and complete devotion.

We, members of the Ralliement Créditiste, also wish to Mr. Montgomery many years of good health and happiness outside the House of Commons. We are sorry to see him go, but we extend to him our best wishes for the future.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: There are a few occasions on which the Speaker is permitted to utter some pleasant words and this is one of them, inasmuch as the recipient of all these tributes cannot speak for himself, nor can the Clerk, the second clerk assistant or at this moment the Deputy Speaker or the deputy chairman of committees. Perhaps hon. members would allow me to say that since occupying this exalted and privileged position I have had the utmost loyalty from Mr. Montgomery, together with great efficiency of service and kindness. We regret that circumstances of health and one or two other reasons force him to take this decision, but we hope that his well earned leave and rest will be very pleasant and that he will enjoy many years of leisure and even co-operative effort in regard to certain government activities.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CHANGE IN GOVERNMENT HOUSE LEADERSHIP

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I should like to make an announcement which may be of interest to the house. Some weeks ago the Minister of Justice, the house leader on this side, indicated to me his desire to be relieved from the functions of house leader because of the responsibilities he was bearing as Minister of Justice and leader of the party in Quebec. He made known his desire in this matter in the House of Commons as well. At that time I asked him if he would remain in his position as house leader until the summer recess.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: I think it is fairly clear now that there is not going to be a summer recess, at least not this summer. I have therefore acceded to the request of the Minister of Justice to be relieved of his functions as house leader, and I have asked the President of the Privy Council to take on the functions of house leader for the remainder of this session.

NEWSPAPER SPECULATION AS TO EARLY ELECTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. According to

some newspaper headlines a general election could take place soon. Could the right hon. Prime Minister tell the house whether the government favours an early election?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should not believe all that he reads in the newspapers.

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING CONFINEMENT OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-133, to amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act.

He said: The Fauteux committee on judicial services recommended, among other things, that children or juveniles of the age of 16 years or less should not be confined in a penitentiary or other jail or lock-up where adults are also confined. This was brought forcibly to our attention when during a visit to St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary we met and spoke with a young lad of 15 years of age at that institution.

The purpose of this bill is to put into effect that particular recommendation of the Fauteux committee and, because the language of the act at the present time is not as precise as it could be, there are some changes proposed in the definition of "child" in order to make it clear that the purpose of the bill is to provide that no child of the age of 16 or under shall be confined in a penal institution where adults are also confined.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

POSSIBLE ACTION RESPECTING ONTARIO SUPREME COURT JUDGE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): In the absence of the Minister of Justice I direct this question to the Prime Minister. It has to do with a matter which was raised some days ago regarding Mr. Justice Landreville, who was granted leave of absence during the period in which this case was before the courts.

I have seen in the press that on Monday he intends to resume his judicial duties. Has the government made a decision that no commission shall be appointed to look into this question; and does not the Prime Minister feel that in all the circumstances, the evidence having been what it was, if a decision has not been made on the question of a commission, leave of absence should be continued until a determination is made as to what the government will do in this connection?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): My colleague the Minister of Justice, answering a similar question the other day, said he would be making a statement on this matter. I have nothing to add to that. When he has a statement ready it will be made to the house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I point out that the judge will resume his sittings on Monday, while this matter remains unsettled by the government; and the administration of justice naturally demands that whatever decision is made should be made before his lordship goes back on the bench.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

DELAY IN APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER RESPECTING RUN-THROUGHS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Can the Prime Minister give an indication of the reasons for the delay in appointing a commission of inquiry into the railway matter which developed last week?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The delay has certainly not been a long one, but I regret even a short delay. A commissioner was approached and we had hoped he would accept the appointment; he gave us some reason to believe it would be possible. We have now learned it will not be possible for him to do so, and we are making inquiries of another suitable commissioner. I hope we shall be able to make an announcement very shortly.

COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

SOUTHERN RHODESIA—INQUIRY AS TO DEVELOPMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): In the light of press reports that the strong action taken by the Prime Minister of Great Britain with regard to the critical situation in Rhodesia has received strong support from the government of Canada and the governments of other commonwealth countries, could the Secretary of State for External Affairs give a report to the house on the latest developments in the policy of independence which is being pursued by the prime minister of Rhodesia?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The prime minister of Southern Rhodesia has announced that the referendum shortly to be held in Southern Rhodesia will not be regarded by his government as a mandate for a unilateral declaration of independence.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CYPRUS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PRESENT POSITION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs?

Could he tell us what is the present situation of our troops in Cyprus and what our Canadians are achieving on that island?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian troops, which are part of the United Nations force, are still performing the duties which that force was asked to perform, that is, to maintain peace as it exists presently at Cyprus.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question?

Is the hon. minister aware that, or can we accept the truthfulness of a statement to the effect that soldiers from other countries lead the life of pashas in Cyprus while our Canadian soldiers live like pariahs?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept this statement which was mentioned in the house this morning.

I read an article which was written recently in a newspaper on that subject. We examined those insinuations, and we can assure the house that they are not well founded.

[*Text*]

EDUCATION

REQUEST OF UNIVERSITIES FOR INCREASE IN PER CAPITA PAYMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I would direct a question to the Prime Minister. Did the national conference of Canadian universities ask for any increase in the per capita amounts now paid to the various universities? In the light of the view he expressed, that education should be free, does the right hon. gentleman agree that the time has come for an increase in these per capita payments, particularly because of the very great increase in the operating costs of universities since 1962, when the last increase was brought in, which had the effect of doubling the grant previously paid?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Whether or not the recent meeting of the universities council discussed this matter I am not sure, though I suspect it did. But no request for additional assistance has been received from that meeting which, as a matter of fact, closed only last night. I do not know whether such a request will be made.

With regard to the observation made by the right hon. gentleman, however, I would point out that the amount of direct assistance from the federal treasury to the universities of Canada this year reaches a figure of $224 million, which is much greater than has been the case in any year in the past.

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): A supplementary question. In his speech to the association the Prime Minister underlined the laudable desirability of free higher education for young Canadians. Does this mean that the government is about to announce a federal university scholarship plan? My second question is this. Will the government soon announce its priorities in the field of social interests, inasmuch as we are also about to discuss a pension scheme and questions of importance relating to a national health plan?

Mr. Pearson: As far as the first question is concerned, perhaps the hon. member did not read the text of what I said. While I personally approve of education being free for all Canadians who are able to qualify for it, I said this was an ideal which would not be possible of realization for some time. As a matter of fact, at the present time there are educational experts who would not consider that to top their list of priorities, though I still believe that is eventually the ideal that should be realized.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: So far as the second question is concerned, it is a much wider question of policy and priorities generally, and when a statement of that kind can be made it will be made in the house—and I hope before long—in connection with the present program of work. Perhaps we will be discussing that at the party leaders' meeting on Monday morning.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the answer of the Prime Minister indicates the death knell of the vaunted university scholarship plan.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, that scheme is far from being dead.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I see; just dormant.

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Do the government plan to contribute financially to the recently announced expansion of medical, dental and nursing training facilities in Ontario, and in particular will they consider contributing the 50 per cent recommended by the Hall commission report?

STUDENT LOANS—INQUIRY AS TO NUMBER PARTICIPATING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. I wonder whether the Minister of Finance has any recent figures as to the number of students who have taken advantage of the student loans program.

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have not an up to date assessment but a meeting has been called for about the middle of next month to discuss with provincial officials the effectiveness of the scheme and the way it is going. After that meeting has taken place I may have some figures, in which case I would be very glad to supply them.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): A supplementary question. When the minister is making his statement to the house to the student loans program I wonder whether he would have those figures broken down by provinces.

Mr. Gordon: I would be very glad to do that, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe). Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Could the Minister of Finance tell us whether his department has handed over to the province of Quebec the share that is due to that province under the student loans program?

Could he tell the amount the province of Quebec received under this program?

[Mr. Pearson.]

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to do that. I would remind my hon. friend that the government of the province of Quebec is perfectly qualified and, believe me, it usually proceeds to look after the best interests of that province.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Does the Minister of Finance mean to imply that members from Quebec ought not to ask questions in the house and that it is neither in their interest nor in the interest of the population to ask questions?

If that is what the Minister of Finance means to imply, Mr. Speaker, this arrogance—

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understood the Minister of Finance to say the members from Quebec were extremely capable and efficient.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I agree with your statement, but that is not what the Minister of Finance said.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is no question of privilege here. There was no implication in the remarks of the minister; quite the contrary.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: When you read *Hansard* tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, you will see that there were grounds for the question of privilege.

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance.

Whenever a Canadian student goes to the United States in order to carry on his schooling, can the students' assistance scheme be used in that case, so that the Canadian student attending an institution in the United States can take advantage of the loans guaranteed by the federal government?

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the university in question is designated by the province in question.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST THAT PENDING LEGISLATION BE CONSIDERED BY HOUSE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which was for the Minister of Labour but in his absence I will direct it to his parliamentary secretary, who from his seat is always asking for a question. It is a matter of importance to the maritime members. I wonder if the parliamentary secretary could advise the house whether the Minister of Labour has received a wire from the maritime motor transport association regarding Bill No. C-126, which asks that the matter be referred to the standing committee on industrial relations. If the minister has received this wire, what decision if any has been reached on it?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to receive the question on behalf of the Minister of Labour and to inform the hon. member that a number of telegrams have been received with respect to Bill No. C-126. All of them are being given active consideration. I shall bring this specific question to the minister's attention when he returns later today.

IMMIGRATION

REPORTED PRESENCE IN CANADA OF U.S. NAZI LEADER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, and because of the importance of this question to our security, I would like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. I ask whether the Prime Minister will have inquiries made to see whether one George Lincoln Rockwell, the president of the nazi party in the United States, was registered within the last week under his own name in the Hotel Georgia in the city of Vancouver, B.C.; and if so, whether he would also cause an inquiry to be made into the operations of the immigration branch to discover how it is that, to use Mr. Rockwell's own words in the program "This Hour has Seven Days", this creep was permitted to come into Canada.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, he crept in.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: I will be happy to make inquiries along the lines indicated, because he is not the kind of man we want in this country—even as a visitor.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. With regard to his reference to how Rockwell got into Canada, are we now to understand that Mr. Banks took the same route out?

An hon. Member: He rode out in his Cadillac.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

NON-PARTICIPATION BY INDIANS IN DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Skeena asked me a question about the conference on Indian affairs which is now taking place. I have had this question looked into, and am informed that several individuals objected to the holding of this conference without Indian representation and that a telegram was received from the president of the native brotherhood of British Columbia by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration on October 28, the evening before the conference started. Mr. Williams, the president, in effect said that the conference was a step in the right direction, but that it would be wrong and undemocratic for any agreement to be reached between the federal and provincial governments without the British Columbia Indians participating. He said the Indians must be consulted and fully informed. That is also the position of the federal government.

The purpose of this conference is to discover—and this is its only purpose, or an important one—whether it is possible for the federal government to formulate programs with each of the provinces for submission to Indians and consideration by them. If it is found as a result of this conference that progress can be made in bringing services needed in Indian communities through provincial facilities, then the matter will be discussed with the Indians. The federal government has made clear, and I am glad to confirm this, that at each step the Indians must be consulted in advance of changes which affect them in any way.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether I could ask the Prime Minister if he is aware that the province of Ontario

brought to the conference, as one of its delegates, a native Indian person. Could not the federal government have done likewise and invited native people to attend the conference, even if they had to do it by way of attaching those native people to the federal government's delegation?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of the fact, but I do agree that if the circumstances make it possible to attach an Indian to a federal delegation at a conference of this kind, that would be a very proper course to follow.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

INQUIRY AS TO MEASURES TO BE CONSIDERED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister. Is it the intention of the right hon. gentleman to make any concrete proposals to the house with regard to the organization of parliamentary business over the next several weeks, which will enable the house to get on with important legislation such as the Canada pension plan before being forced to deal with his pet project, the flag?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is no doubt a matter that the party leaders and perhaps the house leaders will be discussing. Certainly we will be having a meeting, as I have said, on Monday, when the question of parliamentary business will be discussed.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR INCREASES IN PENSIONS AND ALLOWANCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. W. Groos (Victoria, B.C.): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. On several occasions over the past eight or ten weeks the minister indicated that by the end of this month he would be in a position to make a statement to the house with regard to war veterans allowances and other veterans pensions. Is he now in a position to make such a statement?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is quite correct that during the last eight or ten weeks in answer to questions, including one from the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, I indicated that I hoped to be in a position to make a recommendation by the end of this month. I am now in a position to inform the house that there will be a government announcement within the next two weeks with respect to these matters.

UNITED NATIONS

CANADIAN POSITION ON ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

In view of the fact that the new Labour government in London has declared its intention to support communist China's admission to the United Nations at the December 1 meeting, can the minister assure us that Canada will not support the English government in this move?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I suggest the hon. member study the statement I made in this house on May 22 last.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I should remind the Secretary of State for External Affairs that on May 22 there was no Labour government in London and Great Britain had not announced her intention of supporting communist China's admission to the United Nations.

Now that a Labour government is in office, can the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell us whether he will support Great Britain in this matter?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is making a statement.

TRANSPORT

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—USE OF ICEBREAKERS TO CLEAR CHANNEL

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Pierre Côté (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport.

Inasmuch as the breakwater now being built near Champlain bridge will not be completed before the next spring break up, is the Minister of Transport considering the possibility of using icebreakers to keep the St. Lawrence river ice-free this coming winter,

so the islands where the world fair is to be located may be protected?

[*Text*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to look into that and answer on Monday.

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Can the minister assure the house that there will be no extension of subsidies for winter navigation to provide extended ice-breaker services at the expense of the ports of Saint John and Halifax?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, that is a pretty complicated question which I think I should consider very carefully over the week end, and I will give an answer to the hon. gentleman on Monday.

POWER

ONTARIO—LOCATION AND CAPACITY OF PROPOSED NUCLEAR PLANT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Fred F. Stenson (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry. I should like to ask the minister whether the capacity of the nuclear electric station to be built under a federal-Ontario agreement for Ontario hydro is being increased to two million kilowatts. I should also like to ask him whether a site for this station has yet been chosen.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): With respect to the last part of the question may I say Ontario hydro has submitted a proposed site to the atomic energy control board of Canada for approval. In response to the first part of the question, Ontario hydro is giving consideration to enlarging the capacity of the plant at a future date from one million to in excess of two million kilowatts.

WATER RESOURCES

ONTARIO—CONSERVATION WORKS ON CREDIT RIVER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources told us we would soon have a decision on the urgent matter of the Credit river conservation scheme in Toronto. In view of the urgency of this matter has a decision been reached and, if so, what is the nature of the decision? If no decision has been reached, when can we expect one?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the inquiry of the hon. member was prompted by a story which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* two days ago, in which it was intimated that a favourable decision might be forthcoming in this matter.

We are still considering this proposal and may be for a short while yet, and I want to tell my hon. friend why. The benefit is almost 71 per cent applicable to recreation as against other uses, in other words the purposes of flood control, avoidance of possible flood damage, and so on. I am going to admit very frankly that this heavy proportion of recreational use applicable under the act is worrying my officials. It has been suggested, and it was suggested in the article, that there might be a division of responsibility among the first, second and third phases and the final phase, and we are looking into that matter now.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Battle River-Camrose): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of international importance for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. First I should like to congratulate the minister on having been elected honorary president for Canada for the international co-operation year. In the light of his new interest in international co-operation I should like to ask him whether he has given consideration to the appointment of the hon. member for Red Deer, a man of wide African experience, as the Canadian adviser to the Zambian space program.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would treat this question as one of great seriousness coming as it does from such an erudite and scholarly student of international problems. I may say that I have not given consideration to this particular proposal, but I do recognize that the hon. member for Red Deer is perhaps one of those members of this house best qualified to speak with some authority on African affairs.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

VANCOUVER—POSSIBLE USE OF FORMER R.C.A.F. BASE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Industry whether he is now

in a position to advise, as was generally indicated would be the case, that a decision has been made by October 28 relative to the Kitsilano park property in British Columbia and the request on the part of the C.B.C. for part of that property. Will the minister say what is the present position in this connection?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, the house will be aware that some time ago a delegation from the city of Vancouver came to Ottawa to discuss alternative proposals concerning the use by the C.B.C. of the property at Kitsilano. Discussion arose, and in particular it was suggested that the use of the building at Kitsilano by the C.B.C. would be acceptable to the city of Vancouver if it were for a temporary period. An examination is now being made to determine whether the limited period tentatively proposed by the city would in fact be economically practicable.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister and ask him what that period was.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, that period was 15 years.

CANADIAN COASTGUARD

POSSIBLE APPOINTMENT OF RETIRED NAVAL OFFICER AS ADMINISTRATOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Associate Minister of National Defence. Is there a naval officer who has recently retired, or about to be retired, who is qualified as a planning officer for the coastguard college?

Mr. Speaker: Surely this is a question requiring at least a little research, and I suggest that the hon. member put it on the order paper.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, we have been informed in the past by the minister that this research in relation to retiring officers prior to their normal retirement is continually going on, and I believe that any such officers retiring prematurely should be placed in these other positions.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is making a statement. There was no dispute about his question. It is a normal, average question which should be placed on the order paper.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, you referred to my question as an average question. That is exactly right. We have been informed that research in this regard is going on each and every day by departments of government. I am only asking whether there is any co-operation among the departments, and whether there is a naval officer qualified for the position to which I refer.

SUPPLY

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

INTERIM SUPPLY

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $740,710,-974.77, being the aggregate of

(a) two twelfths of that total of all of the items to be voted in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965, as reduced, except finance item 15, mines and technical surveys item 25, national research council item 10, and transport items 15 and 25 for which the proportion is one twelfth and atomic energy item 5, external affairs item 20, forestry item 25 and legislation item 20 for which no proportion is being released, $651,-829,576.84;

(b) an additional two twelfths of the amount of public works item 70 (schedule A), of the said main estimates, $666,666.67;

(c) an additional one twelfth of the amount of fisheries items 5 and 10, legislation item 5, mines and technical surveys item 70, post office item 1 and public works item 40 (schedule B), of the said main estimates, $20,263,800.00;

(d) two twelfths of all of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (A), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, except national defence item 56a, and loans, investments and advances items L12a, L17a and L37a for which no proportion is being released, $20,612,522.50;

(e) an additional two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103a (schedule C), of the said supplementary estimates (A), $872,966.67;

(f) nine twelfths of the total of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (B), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, $46,215,108.75;

(g) two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103b (schedule D), of the said supplementary estimates (B), $250,333.34;

be granted to Her Majesty on account of the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, during the last few days in committee of supply we have been talking about the C.B.C. Yesterday I attempted to discuss another problem, but I was ruled out of order. Today I wish to change the subject somewhat.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: I am pleased to be met with such approval, and I hope that approval will remain throughout the remarks I intend to make. One of the most striking questions

which face this nation today is whether we are going to retain the kind of strong central government which the Fathers of Confederation planned when this country became a union of four nations, or four provinces, in 1867.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Woolliams: I have hardly got started, but if you have a question I will try to answer it.

Mr. Regan: Am I to understand the hon. member is a supporter of the compact theory of confederation, which seemed to have been disposed of by the late Hon. Norman Rogers in the 1930's? Am I to further understand that the hon. member is suggesting that there were four nations which joined together in 1867? Is the hon. member not aware that the union between Ontario and Quebec preceded that event by some 25 years?

Mr. Woolliams: I do not intend to get into an argument about constitutional law with my good friend, but I am always very interested in his questions. I am sure if he listens to the address I have prepared he will understand what I feel should be taking place in reference to a strong central government in Ottawa. Perhaps I should answer his question in this way. I do not believe this nation can survive if we are to have ten balkan states. We cannot exist with the kind of loose network of federalism which has been perpetuated by this government.

The present government makes reference to co-operative federalism. I believe it was this party which actually coined that expression. Unfortunately coined words are used in different ways. This government is placing a different interpretation on that coined expression than was intended. The charge I make is that the Pearson government is Canada's assassin, and that you are all honorary pallbearers to this nation. I did not intend to get into that type of address immediately but did so because of the question the hon. member posed.

Canada is still a very young nation made up of people with many cultures and traditions. The population in western Canada, which is made up of people of many ethnic origins, feel very deeply about this fact. They realize that this nation was created by people who came to this land from all the countries of Europe and Asia with deep rooted hatred and prejudice toward one another. These prejudices, hatreds and animosities were the result of European wars fought by their fathers and grandfathers. One could perhaps say that in Europe the Germans hated the French, the British disliked them both, while the Russians disliked all three.

These people came to Canada in search of a new nation and a new destiny with these prejudices, animosities and hatreds buried in their hearts and bosoms. They found, whether they settled in villages, towns or on farms, and whatever avocations the neighbours over the back fences had chosen, be they German, English, French or of another ethnic origin, they were the same kind of people. These people realized that the neighbours had different cultures, traditions and backgrounds, but they had also come to Canada in search of a new destiny, and that they were all friends after all.

The most important thing we must keep in mind in dealing with a nation is that these prejudices and animosities were buried long ago. I believe Canada was the first country to legislate in respect of freedom of religion. I think Canada did so even before Great Britain and other countries, who are looked upon as the mothers of liberty and freedom.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: Surely the hon. member is not going to take the position that the rules of law and tradition we inherited from the Anglo Saxon system are bad. I have always maintained that the rules of law we have in our democracy represent the kind of freedoms that all Canadians enjoy. We do enjoy these freedoms because of those rules of law. A very simple example can be found in the fact that our children can leave their homes, whether they be in Scarborough, Calgary or Montreal, travel to school and return home safely. That is the case not because of the efforts of any one province but because of the protection given to individuals by the rules of law against infringement by the state or other individuals.

Many people feel that Canada is a union of two nations. If they mean that this nation is a union of two great cultures and traditions I agree completely. If they mean that this nation is a union of two completely different states, then I cannot agree. It is now a union of ten provinces. Canada began as a union of four provinces, whether that union took place ten years or 25 years after a union between two provinces. The nation finally became a union of ten provinces.

That is the kind of country we have, but I say that if we are now to weaken the very fabric of confederation by taking away the

powers of the strong, central federal government we will end up as 10 nations, 10 balkanized states, and the nation will finally dissolve.

An hon. Member: You are exaggerating.

Mr. Woolliams: My friend says I am exaggerating. He would know something about exaggeration, because he is a master of exaggeration and imagination. I do not want to get into an argument with him and perhaps he might bear with me. I have listened to his views, and I have learned a lot from the hon. member. I admit that he takes a different position from mine. I was born and raised in another province with a different culture. We who were born and raised in western Canada have our culture, our traditions and our heritage. Are we not permitted to present our arguments with regard to confederation? Is this not one Canada? Is the argument to be all one sided, with only one doctrine preached and not both sides of the picture? How can we ever hold the country together in that way? If we all think alike there is no thinking. That is my answer to that hon. member.

Let us take a look at what has really gone on. I say and I really believe that the present government—this may be strong language—has been Canada's assassin and is now acting as honorary pallbearer at its funeral.

An hon. Member: Oh, well—

Mr. Woolliams: Somebody says "oh, well". I want to say this afternoon—it is afternoon by now—that in the minds of the people of western Canada this government has been playing the grasshopper game. What do I mean by that? The two great players in this game are the present Prime Minister and Mr. Lesage. They are the players in the grasshopper game, and they hop in and hop out of certain federal economic programs.

We have some proven programs. We have the winter works program, the vocational training program, even unemployment insurance. Let us deal with unemployment insurance. When it was first brought before the House of Commons in the days of R. B. Bennett it was charged that the act was unconstitutional, but after an amendment to the constitution unemployment insurance finally became the law and applied to all Canadians.

I am going to have something to say about the British North America Act itself, but surely under confederation those things that apply to all Canadians and are common to all of us, those things which are not of local concern to the province of Quebec or Alberta or Ontario, are national in scope. Sometimes we have had to get agreement on the part of the provinces because of the wording of the act, but I say that any federal government that makes deals with Mr. Lesage or any other premier to hop in and out of economic programs which have already been proven is an assassin of the country and is acting as honorary pallbearer at its funeral.

Mr. Pepin: Those words will come back to you.

Mr. Woolliams: I hear my friend saying something. The Liberals do not like what I am saying because they know it is true. I want to deal with my second point, the constitution itself. A question was put to the Prime Minister yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition, and the Prime Minister, I believe, answered that there was no change in the new formula for amendment of the constitution from that sponsored by Hon. Davie Fulton, the former minister of justice.

I say that is untrue. It is not intellectually correct and it is not legally correct. I see the Minister of Transport looking at me. I look upon him as one of the intellectuals of the house in this regard, and I think he will be able to look at the act and see that intellectually speaking what the Prime Minister said was not correct. I do not say any more than that. I do not think the Prime Minister deliberately got up and gave a false opinion. I do say you will find that intellectually there is a difference in the formula. That is my first charge.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. gentleman has put a question to me, and if he will give me the page I should like to answer it. Could the hon. gentleman give me the page in *Hansard*?

Mr. Woolliams: I may be thinking of another question, but that is the way it seemed to me yesterday.

Mr. Pickersgill: I listened to the Prime Minister, and I would rather read exactly what he said.

Mr. Woolliams: Let us read what he said.

Mr. Pickersgill: If somebody can find the page faster than I can—

Mr. Woolliams: Anyway, let us have your interpretation.

Mr. Pickersgill: I do not want to give any interpretation. I want to read it.

Mr. Woolliams: If the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate wants to make a speech

when I am finished and contradict me, let him do so. He was going to ask a question. I do not think he has risen on a question of privilege. He has not addressed the Chair and I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I have the floor and I have only 20 minutes left. I have a lot to say as far as the constitution is concerned, and I would appreciate it if the minister would resume his seat and allow me to proceed.

Mr. Pickersgill: I have it right here and I can read it right away. I think I can satisfy the hon. gentleman completely.

Mr. Woolliams: Have you asked permission of the Chair to get on your feet?

Mr. Pickersgill: I thought I had permission but, of course, if the hon. gentleman does not want me to—

Mr. Woolliams: Would the minister then be prepared to agree to the extension of my time by the amount of my time he is taking now?

Mr. Pickersgill: Delighted. I love to hear the hon. gentleman speak.

Mr. Woolliams: Fine.

Mr. Pickersgill: Here is what the Prime Minister said, Mr. Chairman, as found on page 9547 of *Hansard*:

> Mr. Speaker, in so far as the delegation of federal powers to the provinces is concerned there is no difference.

He was referring to the delegation of federal powers to the provinces. I believe there is a slight difference with regard to the delegation of provincial powers to this parliament but in so far as the delegation of federal powers is concerned, that is decentralization, the Prime Minister said yesterday that the formula was identical with the Fulton formula, and I believe that can be ascertained by any person competent to read.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Page the Winnipeg *Free Press*.

Mr. Woolliams: For two reasons I am not going to be as nasty as the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate. First, he has been ill and has just returned to the House of Commons. Second, I have always looked upon those men who were members of the house before I arrived here as my seniors. Therefore I am not going to hand back that kind of sarcasm.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: Hon. members can laugh. I see that one of the backbenchers on the other side has now moved up to the front bench but that is neither here nor there. You can laugh, but I say to the minister that when he implies I am not competent to read I will let the record speak for me. That is what the minister implied. I am not going to be sidetracked, but I will say in answer—

Mr. Pickersgill: I did not imply that.

Mr. Woolliams: —to the minister—

Mr. Pickersgill: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might be allowed to apologize to the hon. gentleman. I was not implying for one minute that he was not competent to read. I was just suggesting that perhaps he had not yet had the time to do so.

Mr. Woolliams: Again we have sarcasm and we have the boys who laugh at the sarcasm. I will answer in this vein. The other day I picked up an article which was very critical of myself and another member because we had said certain things in the house. I should like to say, and I hope the press is listening—I do not like saying this because many on the other side are my friends—that when we were on the government side of the house there was never anything to equal the howling and shouting of the backbenchers of the Liberal party at this time. You laugh, you scoff, you shout. If a member does work to prepare a speech he might as well pack it up, because he is howled and shouted down by the backbenchers in the Liberal party. I see one of the distinguished members of the Liberal party sitting back there, and I am sure he will agree with me that if you differ with what I say and have something to say yourself, you should have the decency and courtesy to get on your feet and argue like gentlemen rather than howling like wolves. I come back now to what the minister said.

An hon. Member: Say something intelligent.

Mr. Woolliams: You say "is that intelligent". I am not going to be sidetracked. I ask the chairman to bring the committee to order. I intend to finish my remarks in spite of the howling and shouting in which members on the other side are now engaged.

This is my answer to the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate. I have not checked this, but when this matter was first brought before the house it was my interpretation of the Prime Minister's language that he meant

that in a day or two this matter would be debated and quickly approved because the 10 provincial premiers had approved it and the government had approved it.

But this is too serious a matter for that kind of treatment. That is why a member of the New Democratic party quite properly rose and said they were going to fight it. I would ask the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate to take a look at what the Winnipeg *Free Press* has had to say in this regard. He will find there an entirely different slant placed on the interpretation of the Fulton formula and the present Liberal government formula. I believe that in the guise of bringing the constitution home and in the guise of toadying to the separatists in the province of Quebec, the Liberal government was slipping a fast one over on the people of Canada.

Why do I say that? I say that because we all know, every political science student knows, that certain powers were delegated to Ottawa and certain powers were delegated to the provinces. I think it is fair to say that this division of powers was preserved under the Fulton formula, but what happens to them under the formula laid down by the Liberal party?

Mr. Pickersgill: There is no difference in that.

Mr. Woolliams: The minister says there is no difference. I would be interested in hearing him explain this; I should like to get him on the record. I have always thought the Winnipeg *Free Press* was a fairly reliable newspaper, even though I have not agreed with it because it seems to be pro Liberal and I am pro Conservative. In the days of Mr. Dafoe all of us in Canada, wherever we lived, realized it was a newspaper of national importance because of the way the editorials were written on those issues affecting the nation as a whole. I wonder if the minister has had occasion to read the issue of October 26, 1964, which carries the editorial headed "A Formula for Constitutional Chaos". The premier's draft of changes in the B.N.A. Act is also set out on the same page.

If I have time I will place some of this editorial on the record. The minister will find there exactly what I suggest our position is. I am going to repeat the charge I level at this government, and it is a serious charge. This is a very important issue. It is not something to be played with, because our whole country is at stake when we change the constitution. It is through these powers that parliament operates.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder if the hon. gentleman would allow me to ask him a question.

Mr. Woolliams: I wonder if I can finish my remarks, please.

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes, of course; I would not think of intruding.

Mr. Woolliams: I do not want to be rude, but I have hurt my friend's feelings. If he will bear with me, I should like to hear what he has to say when I have completed my remarks. As I say, I should like to get him on record about this matter.

I should like to make my personal recommendation to the government right now. I hope the government will allow the top constitutional lawyers, the top political scientists of this country, to examine this proposal thoroughly. Let us have it out in the open. I have a deep suspicion—and I think this is why the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate keeps asking me questions—that under the guise of bringing home the constitution we are in danger of weakening the powers of the central government and dividing up this country into ten balkan states. You, sir, give in to the separatists of the province of Quebec.

An hon. Member: Now you are starting to divide Canada.

Mr. Woolliams: I hear some of them shouting about the province of Quebec. I believe this, and I will say it not only in this house but elsewhere; I believe the people of Quebec want a strong country just as those in any other part of the nation do. It is time that we spoke up like leaders instead of trying to soft soap the whole problem we have in this country. You are never going to cure the patient by giving him these weak soda pills. If the patient has something wrong and he needs surgery, we have to use surgery. All you are doing is saying yes. In fact I often think of that song from the famous play "Oklahoma", "I'm just a girl who can't say no". Now, you never say no. You never measure up to your responsibilities.

There were certain powers delegated to the central government, and certain powers delegated to the provinces. This party has been on record for years in favour of bringing the constitution home so that Canada can attain full nationhood in every respect. I am in favour of it, and this party has been in favour of it. I believe everyone in Canada

is in favour of it. If under the guise of bringing home the constitution, because everybody is so happy to see it come home, we carve up and destroy this nation, then I say to the Liberal party that the responsibility rests on their shoulders. You are the assassins of this country.

When they talk about separatists they laugh. We do not even have to go to the province of Quebec to find separatists now. We have one man, a Liberal premier, who has said that if anything happens, if things go wrong, he will join with the United States. I am referring to Mr. Thatcher, the premier of Saskatchewan. This is his latest pronouncement made in Montreal. He was going down to Montreal to appease these people to whom this government will not say no and to whom this government should say no. If the government of Alberta, even though it is my home province, wanted to do something which was detrimental to this country I should hope this government would exercise the kind of responsibility it should exercise, and say no. I would hope that if I were the premier of that province and asked for something that would destroy Canada, this government would say no. The charge I make against you is that you are not statesmen, you are politicians. You never do anything that will prevent the Liberals from winning; let us destroy Canada. This is the charge I make.

I say this. You should pick out the ten top constitutional men or women—

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Woolliams: No, I am going to finish. This is the thing about which I have complained before. As soon as you get to some point that is important, they want to ask questions. These Liberal backbenchers are not allowed to speak for themselves, and any time you get up to say something that represents Canada as a whole you get nothing but interruptions, especially from the hon. member for York-Scarborough. If he wants to hold a meeting, let him go to Hull and hold a meeting; that is where meetings are held. We should have a committee composed of the top men and women in this country to examine what the Grits are doing. Let us place this matter carefully before a committee. Let us not rush into a situation that is going to result in this nation being carved up and those powers guaranteed under the B.N.A. Act being changed.

What does the Winnipeg *Free Press* say might happen under this formula? I believe the man who wrote this article, Maurice Western, is one of our top students at the University of Saskatchewan. You should argue the merits of this question with Maurice Western. This is what the Winnipeg *Free Press* says—I see you are watching and listening, and I am pleased about this, because this is an important issue. A province may not agree with the appointment of judges by the federal government. Some people agree that today some of these appointments are not of the calibre they should be. Premier Manning might say "We have no Social Crediters on the bench," and indeed it may be difficult to find any in that province. Then what about trade? Are we going to build up tariffs across Alberta, across Quebec and across Ontario? If you continue to erode the powers of the central government you destroy this nation.

I say to you that if you are ready to implement what you say you are going to implement, then you are going to destroy this nation, and as a result of that I charge you with being Canada's assassin. You are the honorary pallbearers at the funeral. There are so few ministers on the front benches that there will be very few pallbearers at the funeral.

Mr. Pickersgill: There is no one on the front benches on the hon. member's side.

Mr. Woolliams: I suppose you are right. The minister is getting a big laugh to acknowledge his remarks. I say this. You have the responsibility of government; you are the people who were going to govern with responsibility. I say that you have done everything but be responsible. You have been most irresponsible in carving up and destroying this nation.

Let us look at another picture. This is the second point I make. First, you have played the economic grasshopper game; then you have attempted to destroy the constitution of this nation. I want to come to something now to which everyone seems afraid to refer.

When the Queen came to Canada, what did the government do? What was the response from the government? I say you brought the crown, not the Queen—the Queen is a person but the crown is an integral part of parliament—into politics. If the Prime Minister of this country had had his way he would have had her unfurl a new flag, a flag which represented one of the most divisive issues in this country. He would have dragged the crown, an integral part of the parliamentary system of this country, down into the gutter of politics.

If the Prime Minister were here he would be saying that I am dragging this matter into the gutter. Well, I want to say to him this; that there will be more of us sitting on the curb, dragging our feet in the gutter if he has his way, because he will be there too.

I protest on three points. One is the economic grasshopper game you are playing; the second is what you are doing to the constitution, and the third is what you are doing to the crown. You are responsible for carving up and disrupting the nation. I should like to hear from the minister. There are two ministers over there.

An hon. Member: Three.

Mr. Woolliams: Three.

An hon. Member: Four.

Mr. Woolliams: All right, there are four. Anyhow, I will say this to the minister. I should like him to get up now and answer this question. Are you prepared to have your formula analysed carefully by top constitutional men, top political scientists, so that you know exactly what you are doing in bringing home the constitution?

An hon. Member: I thought you knew.

Mr. Woolliams: Here is a fellow who says "I thought you knew". Let me answer that for a moment. I see the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice here, but I am not going to say anything to him. You know what I am thinking. You know what he said, but he never measures up. Be careful. I know exactly what you said to the committee, and you never measured up. I do not want to be interrupted by you because I may say something I shall regret.

I say this to the member behind you, the man who said "I thought you knew". Do you think there is anything wrong with the idea? What are you hiding? I think you will agree with me that the Prime Minister is not a constitutional man. There are very few who understand fully the conditions of the constitution. We have had the judicial committee of the privy council, we have had the Supreme Court of Canada interpret this act ever since confederation. When you compare it with the United States, they had a weak central government and strong state governments. The purpose of our confederation was to have a strong central government and weaker provincial governments. The courts have interpreted the constitution in Canada so as to erode somewhat the central government, but at least we have that interpretation; we know where we stand. But if we put into the hands of the provinces the right to change the powers given to the federal government we will destroy this country and create a new parliament; we will create a council almost equal to the council which used to sit around Khrushchev in this respect, that they were all powerful.

I think the provincial premiers have faced up to their responsibilities, but what you will have done is destroy this House of Commons and substitute provincial premiers to run this nation as ten balkan states. That is the charge I make. I say that in changing the constitution what you have done is this; you have given the provinces the right to change the powers given to the central government and delegate them to the provinces. That is the charge, and that is why it should be called "a formula for constitutional chaos".

You might say why did the provinces not raise their voice? Well, if the provinces come down for something and get something plus, through their premiers, are they going to say no? So this thing should be carefully gone into. If the government has any knowledge or understanding of the constitution why are they acting under the guise of bringing home the constitution, to destroy this nation? I say that some time should be spent on this, and it is surely a reasonable request. It should be examined carefully by a committee of this House of Commons, carefully selected, and then we will have the answers. But we will never get those answers from ministers who are hiding the facts and who since they took office have been Canada's assassins and pallbearers at Canada's funeral.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. gentleman challenged me, and I wanted to ask him a question. I have some doubts, I may say, whether it is in order in committee of supply to discuss a matter which is not before parliament and which has nothing to do with supply. But I suppose, since the hon. gentleman has been allowed to deal with this subject, I shall be allowed to clarify the issue.

Mr. Woolliams: It is something which appertains to the whole nation.

Mr. Pickersgill: Well, it has nothing to do with any of the estimates which are now before the house. This is a project which has not been brought before the house and which the Prime Minister indicated yesterday will not be brought before the house for some considerable time. It ought to be debated when it is before the house and not before,

when, as the hon. gentleman himself admitted, the facts are not known. Certainly the authoritative interpretations he wanted are not known.

I do not think there is anybody in the government who would hesitate for one minute to ask all the legal and constitutional experts to examine this question as fully as they wish. Indeed, I am sure they will, because this is one of the most important matters which will ever come before the parliament of Canada—when it does come before the parliament of Canada.

But I intend to deal only with a simple question of fact. Before doing so, however, I should like to read part of part II of the document which I understand was tabled in the house while I was away and which is available to hon. members to read. It deals with the proposal to delegate to provincial legislatures the power to legislate with respect to certain matters which normally are under the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of parliament.

Mr. Woolliams: Can I ask the minister one question? Are you dealing with the residuary powers only when you refer to those exclusively under federal jurisdiction?

Mr. Pickersgill: Of course. All the powers that are in section 91.

Mr. Woolliams: Well.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. gentleman knows section 91, I hope. He is a member of the bar and I am only an unlearned layman, but I would assume he had read the constitution of Canada.

Mr. Woolliams: Don't be sarcastic.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. gentleman is so tempting that it is very hard not to be led astray, but I will try to resist his blandishments. As I say, there are two parts to this document, but I feel that far and away the more important part is the part which would enable provincial governments to delegate their powers to this parliament. I am sure most people would degard this as being the more important part. We all know there are certain provinces which would like to have parliament exercise powers and assume responsibilities which are given to them. And that part, the part providing for the delegation of power from a provincial legislature or legislatures to parliament, is only slightly altered from the Fulton formula, very slightly.

In so far as the words relating to the delegation of power from this parliament to the provinces is concerned there has been no change whatsoever; not even one comma has been changed, as I understand it, though I have not examined the punctuation. In other words, as far as the delegation of powers of the federal parliament to the provincial legislatures is concerned—and that is what the hon. member was talking about—the document which the ten provinces agreed to recommend to their legislatures and which this government agreed to recommend to this parliament is precisely the document which Mr. Fulton submitted, and precisely the document which was recommended to all the provinces by the Diefenbaker government. There has not been one change. It is precisely the same in every particular. It requires, before this delegation of powers can operate, that four provincial legislatures shall have agreed and that the parliament of Canada shall have agreed. Before there can be any delegation there must be agreement by four provincial legislatures and the parliament of Canada.

That was what Mr. Fulton recommended and that was what the Diefenbaker government, after that conference, asked all the provinces to approve. We had rather expected that they would not deny the parentage of their own child, because we were generous enough, honest enough and fair enough to give them full credit for it.

Mr. Woolliams: That is what makes it so dangerous, when you do that.

Mr. Pickersgill: Now they are trying to suggest something else because they think they can get some kind of political advantage out of misrepresenting it. The right hon. gentleman said yesterday that it was not true, when any person who will take the trouble to read can see that the words are precisely the same; there is absolutely no difference whatever.

Mr. Woolliams: Would the minister permit a question now?

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes.

Mr. Woolliams: Would he mind answering a question at this point. I do not want to interrupt his speech, as mine was interrupted—

An hon. Member: Yes, you do. You wouldn't accept a question.

Mr. Woolliams: All I want to do—

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I do not mind the hon. gentleman interrupting me, but I do not like him debating with others.

Mr. Woolliams: Would the minister explain, as he sees it, how those powers delegated to the central government can be amended, under the formula he is talking about?

Mr. Pickersgill: I do not even understand that question, and I think the hon. gentleman will realize why when he looks at *Hansard*. I would not like to be so rude as to say it does not make much sense.

Mr. Woolliams: I will put this question to you.

Mr. Pickersgill: No, the hon. gentleman won't. I will treat the hon. gentleman a little more politely than he treated some hon. gentlemen over here who wanted to ask him questions. When I have concluded I will be glad to answer a question from the hon. gentleman, but before I conclude I think it would be desirable to have this point made very clear. As I said before, if parliament and the ten provincial legislatures see fit to accept these recommendations, the power of delegation to provincial legislatures, the power for provincial legislatures to exercise legislative authority with respect to any matter mentioned in section 91, could only be exercised after four provincial legislatures and this parliament had all agreed to it, and only for so long as that agreement continued.

That is why I did not think Mr. Fulton's suggestion was any danger at all to the powers of the federal parliament. I do not think the right hon. gentleman, who prides himself on being a great lawyer, would ever have recommended it, as he did, to all the provinces if that had been the case. His government circulated it to all the provinces and begged them to accept it, and castigated the former government of Saskatchewan because they would not accept it. It was not that the former government of Saskatchewan objected to this part of it; the former government of Saskatchewan, as I understand it—and this was repeated by the hon. member for Greenwood the other day—and the New Democratic party were not objecting to this power of delegation at all; they were objecting to the inflexibility, as they put it, which provides that in a great many cases no powers can be transferred one way or the other without the approval of all ten provinces. They say that is too inflexible. I do not happen to agree with them, but at least it is an honest point of view, put forward honestly with reference to real facts and not to fictions.

It is astonishing that the right hon. gentleman, who himself sponsored this formula, goes on television—and even does this in the house—and misrepresents the facts about this matter. That is what he has done. This is the thing for which he took responsibility as head of the government of Canada, and when we put it forward in precisely the same terms he condemns our government for doing something that he did, that we approved of and agree should continue to be done.

Those are the facts. I do not think this is a proper place to discuss their interpretation. Of course if the right hon. gentleman thinks he made a grave mistake at that time and wants to change his mind, he can get up honestly and say "I made a fool of myself when I was prime minister. I was willing, when I was prime minister, to surrender these powers. Now I am not. I am sorry. I will put on sackcloth and ashes and admit that I made an awful fool of myself. But I am going to fight it now because it is being put forward by another government." If he wanted to do that, that would be honest; but he goes on television and says "This is different from what we did", when any person who will take the trouble to read can see there is not one syllable of difference. That is not what I would call political honesty.

Of course I am rather simple about these things; I do not have that power to make black appear white and white appear black which seems to be the outstanding quality of some other politicians in this country whose practices I have no desire to emulate. I rather prefer what was said by an honest and honourable gentleman who sat in this house as minister of justice for a number of years, though I did not agree with the government he belonged to and often disagreed with him.

Mr. Woolliams: They are always honest when they are not here, but dishonest when they are here.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. gentleman can look through all the pages of *Hansard* and all the debates I had with Mr. Fulton—and there were a great many—when we were on opposite sides of the house, and nowhere will he find any occasion when either of us ever imputed any dishonest motive to the other.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes; but let him end up as leader and then see what you do with him.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I can tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that if they ever hope to get back in office again they will have a great deal more chance with him as leader than with the kind of leadership they are getting now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Rhéaume: Tell us about your leadership.

Mr. Pickersgill: All I want to do, sir—

Mr. Rhéaume: Where is the UN-man?

Mr. Pickersgill: I apologize again for taking any time at all. I want to read from the Montreal *Star* of Thursday, October 15, a Canadian Press dispatch from Kamloops, British Columbia, dated October 15. It reads as follows:

> E. Davie Fulton, former Conservative justice minister, said today he is "extremely pleased" with the federal-provincial agreement on a formula for amending Canada's constitution.
>
> "I welcome the agreement on the constitution-amending formula as a major achievement of Canadians in gaining custody and control of our own constitution", Mr. Fulton said in a telephone interview from his home.
>
> "The fact that it has taken such a short time to reach agreement since discussions were resumed is a conclusive indication that the formula we worked out in 1960 and 1961 was a satisfactory basis for action", said Mr. Fulton, now British Columbia Progressive Conservative leader.

I think all of us know that Mr. Fulton was a good lawyer and an honest man—

Mr. Rhéaume: How would you recognize that?

Mr. Pickersgill: —and we are not ashamed of the fact that we built on the foundation that he laid when he was minister. But we are astonished when that foundation is attacked by the man who was the head of the government when it was laid; the man who is now misrepresenting and denigrating the work that his own government did, and is repudiating one of the very few achievements he had when he was prime minister of this country.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, in one way I agree with what has been said by the last speaker and the speaker who preceded him; that is that the matter of very great importance has been introduced into this debate in connection with our discussion at this time of the interim supply motion. I have no hesitation in saying that in my opinion it is completely in order, and I follow without any hesitation the example of the Minister of Transport who also addressed himself to the matter.

I think the subject is important because at some time in the not too distant future the proposed amendments to the British North America Act in the form of an address will be introduced, and it is most desirable that there should be the fullest exploration, discussion and debate of the matter not only in this house but in the country at large, so that when the government comes to take the responsibility for bringing these matters before parliament and seeking the approval of the United Kingdom parliament they may be assisted by what has been said here and will be said throughout the country.

For this to happen I think it is necessary to initiate the discussion now and, as I say, I have no hesitation in taking part in the debate at this time. And I hope others will do so. I also hope that ministers of the crown will take part in the debate and will make some defence of the proposals, if defences are available. Any time spent at this stage would, I am sure, be of the utmost benefit to the house and to the country.

I do not propose to involve myself—I do not think I need to—in the discussion as to whether the proposed amendments which have been tabled and of which we are in possession are the same as those which were labelled as the so-called Fulton formula. As far as I am concerned I do not think that matters. My own personal view is that there are many aspects of them which I do not like. I know nothing as to the details of the proposals made in 1961. If they had been produced in 1961 or in 1962 I would have been opposed to them then as I am opposed to them now.

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question. The hon. gentleman said "if they had been disclosed in 1961". I am sure the hon. gentleman has not forgotten that they were disclosed and published and circulated by the government which he supported at that time, and they were well known throughout the country.

Mr. Baldwin: Let me put it this way. If they had been disclosed to the point of being introduced into the house and had been the subject of debate in which I could have participated, then I would have opposed them. As far as disclosure is concerned, the generality of the proposals might have been available, but I say quite categorically that if the details in the form they are now in had been before the house and available for debate, my position then would have been precisely the same as it is now; that the dangerous pitfalls

which lie ahead for this country if they are adopted. These I propose to indicate.

There is no better way of disclosing these pitfalls than by making this point. It may well be that a strong decisive government such as existed in 1961, one not subject to the pressures of provincial governments or required, in order to preserve its political life, to take advantage of and yield to pressures from provincial governments, would not have found such proposals dangerous. But a weak, indecisive government not knowing which way it is going or where it is going, like the hero in Stephen Leacock's book "riding madly in all directions", would find them dangerous, and they will be very dangerous in the future. I do not think I am compelled to take any part in this argument; I simply say I am opposed to it and I intend to give a few of the reasons for taking this position at this time.

In introducing the subject let me say that I think there is a complete misstatement in the wording of the communiqué which accompanied the proposed changes. According to the communiqué of October 14, 1964:

> The conference of the federal and provincial governments, meeting in Ottawa on October 14, unanimously agreed on a formula to repatriate the constitution of Canada.

And later:

> As a result, our constitution will have become, for the first time in the history of Canada, truly and wholly Canadian.

What nonsense is this? Even if these changes are approved by the parliament of Canada in an address, and even if they are approved in their present form without the substitution of a comma or the addition of a period, they will still form part of an act of the United Kingdom. The constitution does not become repatriated; it is still an act of the parliament of the United Kingdom and subject to repeal or amendment not only in Canada but in the parliament of the United Kingdom. I do not think there is any question of that.

If this precise formula is adopted I envisage this situation. Let us say that six of the most populous and wealthy provinces—

Mr. Pickersgill: Could I put another question to the hon. gentleman. He has raised a point of very great interest to me. He is suggesting that by accepting an address of this character and by adopting an act of this character the parliament of the United Kingdom would in words be divesting itself of legislative power. I assume that under the doctrine of the omnicompetence of parliament what they do they can undo. I suggest that under the doctrine of the omnicompetence of parliament that is quite true; but has the hon. gentleman addressed himself to the other and very interesting question, that once this address was passed and the power vested in the parliament of this country we would no longer, in our courts or anywhere else, pay the slightest attention to any further legislation of the United Kingdom parliament even if their parliament were silly enough to do what might theoretically be possible.

Mr. Baldwin: I think the minister is assuming something which may not be correct. For example, once this address has been passed, let us assume that for some length of time no action is taken on it, even in Canada. In that case the courts of Canada will still be interpreting the constitution in the terms of a statute of the parliament of the United Kingdom, and I doubt very much whether the proposition suggested by the minister is a correct proposition at all. The constitution will continue to exist in Canada because it is a statute, and it is a statute of the United Kingdom.

However, that is not the point I am making. The point I am making is that the communiqué is completely erroneous in its assumption that there has been a repatriation of the constitution. There has not been a repatriation of the constitution. There has simply been in a limited way an extension to Canada of the right to amend the constitution under certain conditions.

May I call it one o'clock?

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, just at the one o'clock adjournment I said that technically and theoretically even with this new proposed amendment we would still be in a position where the United Kingdom parliament could at any time amend or repeal the British North America Act, because to them it is just an act of parliament, although to us it is the constitution. Even in a practical sense that could be done, and I envisage a situation where the six most populous and wealthy provinces, along with the government of Canada, would be in favour of making a constitutional amendment. Under those circumstances the government of Canada would be strongly supported in this house, and would decide that it was in the best interests

of the country to go ahead with the amendment. This situation still exists that the United Kingdom parliament still has custody and control of the constitution.

I suggest to you that if that were the case and the proposed amendment was a very necessary and imperative one, there is no doubt in my mind that even though the four small and least wealthy provinces vetoed the amendment, approaches could be made to the United Kingdom parliament, in spite of the amendment now proposed, to make the change which was considered essential and necessary. The United Kingdom parliament would be placed in a most embarrassing and difficult position by being asked by the Canadian government, which had the overwhelming endorsation and support of the country and of the governments and legislatures of the six largest provinces, to change the constitution, in the face of a veto made possible by the new proposed change.

Mr. Chairman, I should like at this point to deal briefly with the question of delegation. I shall do so as quickly as possible within the short period of time I have at my disposal. I see great dangers inherent in this situation. Let us look very briefly at what is given and what is taken.

Under the proposal, matters falling within clauses 6, 10, 13 and 16 of section 92, which is the section giving jurisdiction to the provinces, would be subject to a delegation of powers. What are those powers? Subsection 13 deals with property and civil rights. If the federal parliament today legislates in matters within its jurisdiction, but trespasses on property and civil rights, it is notorious that it has the right to do so. Very little is entailed in this concession, and the same thing applies to subsection 16 dealing with generally all matters of a merely local or private nature.

Subsections 6 and 10 of section 92 deal with the establishment of reformatory prisons in the provinces, and local works and undertakings. There is a very minor concession in this regard. On the other hand every matter referred to in section 91 may be the subject of the delegation of authority from the federal government to the provincial governments. But not only those subjects under section 9 are affected, but any matter at all of which the federal government is now seized of jurisdiction under the B.N.A. Act may be the subject of delegation. I think all we need do is turn to that part of the proposed amendment subclause 3 of the proposed new section 94A which says:

> Notwithstanding anything in this or any other act, the legislature of a province may make laws in the province in relation to any matter coming within the legislative jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada.

Certainly there is no equality there. Any matter at all with which the federal government is now seized of jurisdiction may be the subject of delegation of authority. In exchange, the provinces have yielded up virtually nothing. This is a most inadequate, unfair and one-sided bargain.

It is my submission that while this might always not necessarily be dangerous, in a situation where we have a weak and indecisive federal government, such as we now have, which has showed itself prepared to concede and yield in almost every case to the provinces, there is a grave and dangerous situation likely to occur. We have been told this is all because of the desire of the federal government to co-operate. It may have been so in the beginning, but what once may have started out as a gentle zephyr of co-operation has now become a howling gale of appeasement and I see nothing to suggest it is going to be brought to a stop.

I have not got too much time but I do not want to leave that subject without pointing out this danger. In a country such as ours with wide disparities economically and geographically it is essential that we do what we can to hold people together, to try to keep within reasonable limits the social, cultural, economic and political levels of the people of all sections of this country. I know you cannot make them uniform, this is impossible. But you must have a situation where, when people move from Vancouver to Edmonton, to Winnipeg, to Toronto, to Montreal, to Halifax, to St. John's, there will be something of a sameness in those conditions which I have pointed out. The danger as I see it is in a weak federal government yielding consistently to pressure from the provinces and delegating authority to provinces to legislate in federal matters. I can see it might frequently happen that a situation could arise where the federal government might find itself in the position of having to make a decision that would be popular in some areas but would definitely be repugnant to other sections of the country, and the simplest and easiest political way to extricate oneself would be to say: We will delegate the authority to do this to the provinces that want it and we simply will not touch it in respect of the other provinces. You will get a situation where, with pyramiding of the use of delega-

tion you will find differing conditions in one part of the country from the other

No country can exist under such a situation. Abraham Lincoln said it much better than I can when he said that a nation cannot live half slave and half free. What he meant by that was that the social and political conditions peculiar to slavery in one part of a country with the other areas where slavery is not allowed are not consistent with the maintenance of a national identity. If I may paraphrase that in a limited way, precisely the same situation appears here, and it is my submission that we will see a constantly increasing delegation of authority from the federal to the provincial governments resulting in a variation of conditions which is inconsistent with the maintenance of our nation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, much of the blame has been placed at the door of one province, the province of Quebec, and I have no doubt that that province and its premier have been instrumental in pressing for these things. But I think some of the other provinces must take their share of the blame particularly when they realize, as I have said before, that they have been dealing with a weak and indecisive federal government willing to go to great lengths to make present promises without too much regard to the bitter fruits of those promises in the future.

I am one of those who have considerable sympathy with the vitality, lift and resurgence of the people of the province of Quebec and I hope they achieve their requirements with a fresh and vigorous approach which will advance the people of that province. But I would think that the responsible people of Quebec, who in my view are in the vast majority, would realize the dangers of pursuing a course which strengthens one or all of the provinces at the expense of the national government.

Under a federal system the central government must have the power, the strength and the responsibility to govern in the national interest and this must include without any impairment the right to decide fiscal and monetary policies, aspects of foreign exchange, external affairs, external and internal trade and commerce, immigration, national defence and so on. The federal government must have strength to initiate and continue programs and policies in those fields designed to lift up the people of the country within reasonable limits to the same level of economic, cultural and social well-being.

Surely it must be apparent to many of the provincial leaders that a weak central government from which has been stripped real authority and power cannot hope to fulfil these functions. They must realize that by continuing along this course they will surely find that the central government has been so stripped. I make this appeal because it seems that the federal government we now have is not prepared to recognize this and in my view this places some responsibility on the provinces to do so.

There are those who feel that maybe we would not lose much if this country did disintegrate, but I do not think so. I think the world has been a better place because we on the northern half of this continent have seen fit to bring into being a nation which may well be pursuing a course that will lead to the same result as in the case of the people in the southern half of the continent, but which is pursuing it along different roads. I think that if we continue, as we have been doing under this administration, to weaken the federal government and strengthen the provincial governments this experiment is bound to come to failure.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I am not either a very loquacious or a very controversial person but I would not care to allow this opportunity to pass without saying a few words about what I consider the most important subject I have ever heard discussed in this chamber. It is something which in my opinion transcends all other matters to which we have been giving our attention, not only in this parliament but in many preceding ones.

My qualifications are not as good as those of the members who have preceded me. The hon. member for Bow River is a lawyer, the hon. member for Peace River is a lawyer, and the Minister of Transport almost became a lawyer. The closest I ever came to being a lawyer was to wonder one time whether I should go into law or theology, but for some strange reason I chose politics.

The question we are now discussing is a vital one and it is so serious as to cause us to wonder about the very future and form of the chamber in which we are speaking today. We see, as preceding members have said, the very fabric of our federation seriously and dangerously undermined at this particular time, and perhaps it would be well in these days of easy accommodation and diplomatic acquiescence to pause for a moment and look at the kind of political structure which is Canada's.

We call ourselves a federation. Indeed, some of the more precise political scientists say that our federal institution was created so strong that we are not in fact a federal state, because the constituent and component parts have much less power than in many federations and certainly nothing approaching co-equal powers. We know that our nation began as the result of many of our founding fathers desiring a unitary state. This they did not achieve. But they got something which they thought was close to it, and when over 100 years ago the agreement reached in our capital city of Charlottetown was presented to the then Canadian legislature the founding father number one, John A. Macdonald, described it in this manner:

> We have strengthened the general government. We have given the general legislature all the great subjects of legislation. We have conferred on them, not only specifically and in detail, all the powers which are incident to sovereignty.

Then he went on to say that this was the great mistake made in the United States where powers had been conferred upon the states and only the residue given to the central authority. He ended with a sentence which I believe is more timely in 1964 than in 1865.

> We thereby strengthen the central parliament and make the confederation one people and one government, instead of five peoples and five governments, with merely a point of authority connecting us to a limited and insufficient extent.

The figure 5 came, Mr. Chairman, because at that time he no doubt thought Prince Edward Island would be one of the original members of confederation. It took a little more effort to get Prince Edward Island in six years later. This strong society is revealed in our British North America Act, to which reference was made this morning. Under this act the dominion government was given not only all those powers enumerated in section 91, but all powers except those given to the local legislatures. A tremendous array of legislative powers were vested in the central government. Beyond that, the central government was given a special power which is rarely if ever given in a federation. To indicate the strength of our federation, it was given the power of disallowance. As if that were not enough to indicate that this was an unusually strong federation, it was followed up by a provision whereby the dominion parliament could legislate in exclusively provincial fields if necessary to remedy an injustice upon the people of any province. We know that remedial legislation was very much an issue around the turn of the century.

We know, too, that in any federation there are counterpressures against the central government. Provincial rights is not a new cry. John A. Macdonald heard it before he was prime minister for very long. His political enemies used it against him. The leaders of the provinces used it against him and sought incessantly to chip away at the central authority which he considered necessary to build the country and to maintain the country. We know how frequently in those great days of stress and challenge it required a vigorous, aggressive dominion government to do the things that had to be done to make confederation a reality as well as a legality. I could cite the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway as one of those. Down through the years we often found that the provinces would be aided by the opposition group in the House of Commons. Macdonald was in for a generation, and in that time the Liberal party became a strong provincial rights party. This has often happened. John A. fought back. Without a fight the nation would have failed and would have dissolved into its original components, in all their weaknesses, inequality and diversity.

In that time it was found necessary, in order to preserve the nation, for the dominion government to disallow 66 provincial acts. As has been observed across the way, this was in the past. We find it impossible to divorce ourselves from the past. The dreams and intentions of the fathers failed of realization. The dominion government was inhibited and its effectiveness was attacked. Its resources were diminished. Then, as a result of a series of judicial interpretations and decisions, the cause of provincial rights was advanced at the expense of the dominion.

We are always aware that in a country like ours there is constant tension and conflict between the centripetal forces which move to the centre and the centrifugal forces which throw out to the extremities. This has been the warp and woof of our political history. The present era—I hope it will not really deserve the expression "era" because that generally implies a considerable length of time—the present phase of dominion-provincial relations is unique. I think one would look very carefully through the pages of Canadian history to find a situation similar to this one. In the first place, the rate of erosion of dominion powers is more rapid than ever before. The glacial attrition of earlier days has been replaced by a rapid stripping off, as if by the power and speed of an avalanche.

Second—and this is most surprising and intriguing in constitutional history, but I think it is very worrisome and should be worrisome to all Canadian citizens—the dominion government appears not to be the champion of dominion rights, but the willing and seemingly eager agent of increasing provincial rights. In an excellent series of addresses delivered over the C.B.C.—and the Massey lectures justifies the C.B.C. for many other things—Professor Underhill, a former curator of Laurier house has said:

> As things are, however, our national government in recent years has approached the ten lusty provincial governments, and especially that of Quebec, in an attitude of timorous politeness, as if apologizing for the fact of its own existence. And the Canadian people as a whole cannot apparently reach any agreement to entrust their fortunes to any one political party with a majority support. They watch apathetically while our unprotected federal quarterback, looking in vain for a pass receiver, is overrun by the big husky linemen of the provincial defensive team and thrown for another loss.

So says Professor Underhill, a man of eminent perception, learning and great objectivity. I was intrigued by a statement in a speech by the Minister of National Health and Welfare not long ago, delivered to the women's Canadian club in Quebec city on September 28. I always read her speeches with great care. I was intrigued by these few lines:

> Although I hardly think the time has come yet for the federal government to abdicate *all* its parental responsibilities and head for pasture or pension, I do think it is time to turn over to them the far greater measure of responsibility that they have earned. The federal government has an obligation to do everything within its power to assist all the provinces in realizing their ambitions, and yet at the same time ensuring minimum national standards.

Now, I will be fair to the hon. lady, as I always try to be to both ladies and gentlemen. There are other portions of her address that do not follow that particular golden text, and I would not suggest that was the theme of her remarks. However, it is surprising to find even that statement from anyone charged with dominion responsibility as a minister of the crown.

In order to illustrate further the uniqueness of our present situation, the very source which once seemed to gang up on strong dominion authority, now defends that authority. The opposition in this House of Commons I would list first, and then, of all people, the premiers of the provinces. The premier of Saskatchewan is quoted as having said not long ago after one dominion-provincial conference:

> At one dominion-provincial conference after another the provinces, faced with increasing costs are making ever greater financial demands on Ottawa. And year by year, the federal authorities, for the sake of national unity, have been forced to give ground.
>
> We believe the federal government must have adequate financial resources to cope with unemployment and economic recessions.

I wonder why he said that.

> Above all, we believe that Canadians, regardless of where they were born or happen to live, should have certain minimum living standards and, as a matter of right, a basic standard of education, health and welfare services.

While I would not expect provincial premiers to be in the forefront in the struggle to uphold the strength and effectiveness of federal powers I welcome this contribution and completely agree with the dangers he points out and the course he suggests.

The official leader of the Conservative party in British Columbia, a man who was lauded, and rightly lauded, this morning described confederation as being—

> —so designed that "in giving strength to the union—to the country—the parts would thereby make it so strong that all would derive strength from it. Strength to be given, strength to be received, strength to be shared, in a partnership within a union."

Then another strong provincial voice, the attorney general of Manitoba, Mr. McLean, the other day stressed the importance of a strong central government to the unity of Canada. He said:

> The founders of our nation believed that the predominant power must lie in a central government.

Must we look to the provincial politicians to preserve the dominion structure? If we look elsewhere we do not find that effort.

I am interested to note that the press of Canada has become very concerned about this matter—the Winnipeg *Free Press*, the great metropolitan dailies of Toronto as well as many other newspapers. I just happened to notice an editorial in the Moncton *Times* which reads in part as follows:

> The federal government is the string which prevents an object which is being whirled around in a circle from flying away. Only in this case the string has 10 major objects (the provinces) and two less large (the territories).
>
> If this string is cut the threat of these pieces which comprise Canada flying away (Balkanization) becomes very real.

So perhaps the people of this country are not as apathetic as Professor Underhill thought. I am glad they are not, because in

the preservation of a strong dominion lies the future of our great country.

Are there dangers? Is this really a vital issue? Are we setting up paper tigers or straw men? I say there is grave danger. I was interested to read an address by a cabinet minister in the province of Quebec not long ago. It is quoted in the *Gazette* of October 24; the first paragraph of the report reads:

> Revenue Minister Eric Kierans of Quebec says that federal ministries of industry, agriculture, fisheries and natural resources have become "superfluous" as far as Quebec province is concerned.

The headline above the article reporting this speech is "Minister Tells French Central Economy Now Passé". What does this mean? Do all these federal departments vanish from the province of Quebec if Mr. Kierans' suggestion is valid? Mr. Kierans is a very powerful and able man who obviously speaks with great authority not only in Quebec but beyond. What will happen to the operations of the dominion government if any province decides that it can "go it alone"? Will federal operations within the province be withdrawn? Do the employees of federal ministries working in the provinces go somewhere else? Does the Department of Agriculture, for example, become operative merely in nine of the provinces? If so, what would happen to its effectiveness? What would happen to the standardization of services? What will happen with regard to equality of opportunity as between one province and another? Perhaps Mr. Kierans is right and his province can cope with these matters, and cope with them better. Like my hon. friend from Peace River I would be the last to suggest that every opportunity should not be given to the people of Quebec to work out the changes in their society which they feel are necessary for their advancement at this time. But I am not sure the best method of dealing with this is within the rigid framework of dominion-provincial relations or that it is proper to justify the desire of one province by suggesting to all the other provinces that they should similarly move to take over responsibility because to do this, in my view, amounts to a massive attack upon the dominion structure, a great surrender of dominion efficiency.

Reference could be made to a subject which I believe is under discussion at this very moment at yet another dominion-provincial conference—the question of control of the Indians of Canada, a responsibility placed squarely upon the federal government. What is the next step to be? What about provincial banks, restraint of interprovincial trade, the wholesale opting out of joint sharing programs on the part of provinces which can operate on their own? It is a great mistake to discuss this vital question of dominion-provincial relations and focus one's attention only on the province of Quebec. It is not now, nor was it historically the only province to urge greater provincial rights.

Many of the great advances in social welfare and resource development which have brought benefit to all kinds of people in this country were initiated by the dominion government and carried out by co-operative effort between the dominion and the provincial governments. But can this sort of activity be carried on if there is a wholesale evacuation by a number of the provinces? What will be left to the authority of the central government?

I do not intend to discuss amending procedures because these were ably discussed by some of my colleagues this morning. Perhaps, in time, the development of legislation for social needs and the general development of our country may lead us to a situation where we should take a new look at the constitution and perhaps even consider a new constitution. We know the British North America Act is only part of our constitution. But it will be serious, it will be a tragedy, if in any effort to deal with contemporary problems we were to follow a general policy of acquiescing in the face of every provincial demand with the result that there is a complete dismantling of the central authority.

What was confederation all about? What did our predecessors have in mind in 1867? It was a merging together of peoples, a sharing of sacrifice, a sharing of poverty and a sharing of wealth. How many times have provinces less well endowed by nature with the resources for modern industrial wealth had to go to Ottawa for equalization payments, for assistance, for subsidies? Where will they go if, in the process of accommodation, of accelerating provincial rights, the national treasury is depleted and the cupboard make bare? It is not any wonder, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Thatcher of Saskatchewan should be concerned about this.

What about the provinces in the maritime area? Our forefathers made great sacrifices to enter confederation. Many people maintain that we were far better off before that, and indeed this produced our share of separatists. They were always of a law-abiding type, but they were separatists. We made our

sacrifices; we pooled our resources in a confederation, one principal purpose of which was to bring about some sharing of the wealth of the whole land, some equitable division of the benefits of the whole country. The great force for equalization must be the central government, which is supported by all the people and which is the only source of leadership for all the people.

We live in a world when many other countries are looking to supranational associations; we talk about the world of the super state. We will be terribly out of tune if we in 1964 should move in the other direction toward decentralization and the exalting of the parts to the disadvantage of the whole. This is a fundamental matter, Mr. Chairman. We can only get strong national leadership if we have strong national leaders; and they can be strong only if they have strong institutions in which to operate.

It is one of the great misfortunes of our day—perhaps one could use a stronger word than "misfortunes"—that at a time when the dominion structure is buffeted more than ever before, when we need a strong government more than ever before, we have an administration noted for its appalling weakness. We find that from the dominion-provincial conferences the provinces always emerge the victors. Sometimes one wonders if those who represent the dominion conceive themselves as mere arbiters between principals, diplomatically negotiating differences; or whether they conceive themselves as the spokesmen, the principals in the negotiations for the senior level of government, for the government whose actions affect the lives of every single Canadian.

The dangers are numerous and widespread; the loss of revenues has been tremendous. We now see that while provincial areas of jurisdiction remain sacrosanct, dominion areas are being opened, great financial resources are being moved back to the provinces. Can one imagine what funds in ten years time, if the pension plan goes through, will be available—not to the dominion but to the provinces? We see the situation arise where the dominion government is becoming the mere collector, the agent collecting moneys from the people for the benefit of the provinces. Can we, out of this, develop a stronger country? Will we get, out of this, a common purpose? Will we overcome our differences and difficulties, if we have no common rallying point? And where else could that be but at the national level, in the national capital, and from those charged with national responsibility to lead the whole country?

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

No one is suggesting, and it would be idiotic to suggest, that the provinces do not have legitimate needs and legitimate areas of operation; but we are living in an age where I submit the dominion authorities presently incumbent are engaging upon a course which is dismantling the dominion structure which they should be upholding. Many things have been charged to this government. They have made many mistakes; in fact, the multiplicity of their mistakes is not something new. Perhaps in this regard they are fortunate, because these mistakes come so often that no one gets really aroused about them for very long. But there is a big difference between the administrative blunders, bureaucratic flubs, alterations and changes which have characterized the government up to now, and the egregious error such as I am convinced they are making in not seeing the importance of sustaining the national institutions. It is their responsibility so to do. They can hardly expect those who operate on the provincial scene to do it for them; they can hardly expect the newspapers to do it for them; they can hardly expect the opposition to do it for them.

I would say that up to now they have been very fortunate in the assistance they have received from certain sources. I would say that if the present premier of Ontario were the kind of man that some of his predecessors were, Mr. Hepburn or Mr. Mowat, the fabric of confederation would not only be sagging, but it would be completely rent and dragging in the ground of a loose assocation of ten practically autonomous but terribly unequal states. Premier Robarts—and he has had other colleagues in this respect—has taken, albeit while a provincial premier and the spokesman of a province, a stand that shows a realization of the necessity of keeping this country strong and keeping it united. I think we can be very thankful that in Canada's most populous and largest province we have a man who, as the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* said the other day, "didn't make a show of strength but had strength enough to show restraint".

I have noticed that Premier Robarts has been very concerned about what is going on and he is going to give leadership in this field; because he realizes that the people of Ontario are also people of Canada. While we all have provincial loyalties—and I come from a province where sentimentality is deep; we love our homeland—Canadians, I maintain,

are Canadians before they are provincials of any province, and I think look for national leadership. If by some strange development this government began to give that leadership, they would be given the kind of support that has been denied them ever since the people gave them that uncertain mandate in April, 1963. I appeal to them to do so; to remember the importance of a strong dominion; to fight for it and to preserve it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, after listening to the remarks of the hon. member who just resumed his seat, according to whom a certain province would ask Ottawa to collect funds to give them back to it later, I must say that I do not share his opinion at all, and I shall tell you why.

More and more at the present time we hear about amendments to the Canadian constitution. These suggestions do not come from one province only but from the whole of Canada. The Ontario premier seems to recognize—and he is a Conservative—that our constitution must get a second sober thought.

Not very long ago Her Majesty the Queen was in Canada and she said, in Quebec city, that a protocol which dates back a hundred years is not adequate and does not meet present needs. This is not surprising. It must be noted that it is the Queen herself who declares that the constitution must be changed, and adapted to the needs of the times.

I do not accept either the statements made by the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) who makes a distinction between one province and the nine others.

We have no objection to other provinces claiming for themselves what the province of Quebec is claiming. We have no objection to the province of Ontario fighting for the recognition of its rights, provided that all the provinces continue to exist and constitute a nation with two cultures, the French and the English.

This reminds me of an example: let us take a Canadian family, no matter whether it is French or English speaking. If my friend from Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) brought up a family, he must have found out that when a family includes five, seven or ten children, no two of them are alike, and each of those children, upon growing and reaching maturity, endeavours to become independent. In other words, at 21 years of age, upon reaching majority, he wants to fly on his own, according to his aspirations, his possibilities, his capacities and his abilities. As soon as one lives on his own, he wants to raise a family, establish a home, operate a business or a farm.

It is strange to note that among five brothers or sisters issued from the same family, none is willing to take orders from a sister or a brother; they all insist upon exercising their full independence. None the less, Mr. Chairman, come Easter, Christmas, another feast, or the mother's or father's birthday, for instance, the whole family will gather and get along very well. Every member of the family is happy to reunite, and then a brother tells how he is getting along in life, whether he is successful or not, and narrates his personal life.

We can see, Mr. Chairman, that there is unity among that family, but every member wishes to retain his independence.

In my opinion the same situation exists on the federal level; we have a country called Canada; it is composed of ten provinces which wish that their own particular ways, customs and traditions be respected.

No province is entitled to infringe upon the liberty of another province. The province of Quebec has no right to infringe upon the liberty of Ontario or of Prince Edward Island, just as Prince Edward Island or Ontario is not entitled to infringe upon the rights of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Chairman, we are no longer in 1867, but in 1964 and the Canadian constitution must be suited to 1964 requirements, granting as much independence as possible to every province. On many occasions we suggested in the house some amendments to the constitution: give the provinces more latitude, give them the required financial means not through taxation, but by using new sources of credit to provide for a normal development of the provinces.

A few days ago my colleague from Lapointe indicated with good reason that the Bank of Canada is now being used to help to stabilize the English pound. Why not use the Bank of Canada to stabilize the economy in this country, to abolish unemployment and get the economy really moving in Canada?

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing to prevent the government from using the Bank of Canada for that purpose. But when the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) suggests that the provinces are asking Ottawa to collect money in the provinces to give it back to the provinces, it is not the case, that is not what is happening.

The provinces are asking Ottawa to withdraw from their own fiscal and taxation fields. In particular, that is what the province of Quebec is asking for.

We are not promoting any division or discord. We are simply asking to be understood as we understand others in Canada.

If the nine other provinces want to take part in a joint program with the federal government, want to be taxed provincially by the federal government and receive in turn federal equalization payments, they are quite free to do so. We will not encroach on the freedom of those provinces. But we want the province of Quebec to be respected by all the other provinces, for Quebec has every reason to ask for what it is now requesting.

Mr. Chairman, certainly there are matters that should remain under federal jurisdiction —we do not dispute that—defence, for instance, must remain a federal concern, as must transport and finance.

However, if those areas stay under federal jurisdiction the government must then—whether it be the present government or the next government, regardless of its political tag—establish branch offices of the Bank of Canada in each and every Canadian province, with specific instructions to make financially possible, in those provinces, what it is physically possible and desirable for them.

You will then see that there will be no need for any ARDA plan, any strait-jacket or socialist or communist-minded plans in an attempt to cast everybody in the same mould. At that time you will see the provinces blossom out, not only the province of Quebec, but also the others, because everyone of them without exception is faced not with a constitutional problem, not with a theoretical problem, but with a problem that goes to the core, if you will, in that they are all beset by the financial question.

When those poor provinces meet in Ottawa with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) or with the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne) and all federal ministers, what is the subject of their discussions? Monetary matters? No, they discuss fiscal matters. Ottawa takes too big a share and does not leave us enough. Both levels of government argue about which of them is going to deprive individuals of part of the fruit of their labour, in one word, which of them is going to tax the people. That is what causes the imbroglios which occur at all federal-provincial conferences. The purely monetary question of Canadian credit, of bank credit is never discussed. They are content to play the fiscal game and to share the crumbs or the little money in circulation among the Canadian people.

[Mr. Caouette.]

Social Credit has been advocating a solution for a long time. I mentioned it the other day. There are those who find it ridiculous but these same people find rational the system with which we have to cope at present. The hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) and others speak of national disunity, etc.

I read today on page 5 of *Le Devoir* that university students are meeting tonight at a dinner given in Toronto to study the evolution now taking place in English Canada. At the dinner tonight Mr. John Holmes will ask the following question: Is the commonwealth a factor of unification or of division?

Some suggest that the commonwealth constitutes an element of division while others say it is an element of unification. I personally think that each member nation of the commonwealth has the respect of the commonwealth as a whole and, therefore, that could constitute an element of union and not of division.

Certain countries, apart from Canada, for instance India, belong to the British commonwealth of nations, yet India is independent and amended its constitution several years ago; the same thing can be said of Ireland; in Africa, there are an increasing number of small countries remaining with the British commonwealth of nations while enjoying their full independence. Recently a small country, Zambia, obtained its independence or reached nationhood; in short, it became independent. In that country the first step taken, that is the selection of a flag, was not discussed as we see discussed here by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the Conservatives, the choice of a Canadian flag. Until recently, the union jack was the national flag of that country, but a distinctive flag was adopted, hoisted on public buildings and accepted as the distinctive national flag of that small country which has just reached its independence. The same thing happened in Jamaica. All those nations remain member countries of the British commonwealth of nations while remaining independent. They remain within the commonwealth because they feel they need to belong to an international organization which will help them and not oppress them.

Let Canada think along the same lines, let the federal members think in the same way, let us consider Canada as a sovereign state, part of the commonwealth, yes, but united and not divided, and where we would keep our own identity.

Yesterday I heard in an interview on the radio—"When I enter a social club, I do not

enter the club in my neighbour's shoes but in my own shoes." Then as a Canadian, as a French Canadian moreover, I think we can continue to be part of the commonwealth while keeping our own symbols, with our own Canadian organization, with the greatest respect for every other nation in the British commonwealth.

For that, of course, the constitution needs to be amended. I repeat once again that the Queen, very rightly and sensibly said in Quebec city that a protocol having existed for a century is not appropriate in 1964. There is nothing surprising about that.

Some members are trying here in the house to create the impression among the public that there really is a division between French Canadians and the rest of Canada. French Canadians, it has been said and I repeat it, ask not for special treatment. No, we merely ask permission to administer ourselves as we see fit in the province of Quebec without affecting the freedom of others, and without depriving others.

The province of Quebec has its own characteristics just like the province of Ontario has its own.

Let us respect each other; let us put a stop to untimely and unreasoned accusations against the province of Quebec saying, for instance, that the province of Quebec is overrun by separatists who want to break confederation at all cost.

I have evidence to that effect. A few weeks ago I received letters from English speaking people of the University of Toronto telling me that I had done wrong when I rose in this house to condemn certain disgraceful demonstrations which occurred in Quebec city on the occasion of the visit of Her Majesty the Queen. Those letters came from Irish people of the University of Toronto who blamed me and called me a coward because they say Canada has no business in the British empire.

If there are separatists in the province of Quebec, there are also some elsewhere in Canada. All those who attack the province of Quebec when the latter is asking that the constitution be amended to meet the needs of our time are separatist elements in Canada.

We want understanding, but real understanding. Real understanding is not a one way street. No one just asks for the co-operation of someone without being prepared to give the same co-operation. I think that every member of parliament, no matter his party, has a bounden responsibility, as a Canadian, as a representative in the federal government, to see to it that such co-operation, collaboration and understanding start right here in parliament.

I can understand that some hon. members are trying to play politics; they are thinking of the next election, and that they do not care at all about the people they represent in this house.

Well, if we are simply here to play politics —I heard this morning the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) who delivered a speech as if an election were going to be held very shortly—but we will not follow that lead.

Each member believes that he is a statesman, and I will point out to the house the difference between a statesman and a politician. A statesman is the one who thinks and acts with future generations in mind, while the politician thinks and acts in terms of the next election. That is the difference between a politician and a statesman. If hon. members were more truly statesmen—

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Duplessis said that.

Mr. Caouette: —Mr. Chairman, we would achieve better results than those we have obtained since the beginning of this session.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not elaborate any further, but I ask all hon. members, whether they be Liberals, Conservatives or New Democrats, to face Canada's future squarely, to recognize that the provinces are entitled to recognition and respect, each and every one of them, and that no province has the right to encroach upon the rights and freedoms of another. Quebec will not trespass on the rights of any other province but, on the other hand, Quebec will fight against those who will attempt to infringe on its freedoms and its right to be itself within confederation.

[*Text*]

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Chairman, after listening to the in so many ways, excellent speech delivered by the leader of the Creditiste party I cannot help but agree with much of what he has said, and I am sure that many other members will also. Most of my remarks this afternoon will relate to the constitutional amendment procedures which are about to be brought before us. When the resolution is brought before the House of Commons it is my intention to speak in greater detail on this subject. However, I think it is very important that at this time many members of the house make what I would characterize as keynote speeches as

we approach what will perhaps be one of the more important debates in the history of the House of Commons, certainly one of the more important since I became a member of the house six years ago.

My remarks at this time will in no way be irresponsible because, together with other people, I have done my very best to examine the general outline and details of the constitutional amendment procedures. I am not going to say now that these provisions alone constitute the seed from which an associate state can very well grow. However, the approach of the present government to this matter, together with other things that are going on in Canada at the present time, lead many responsible Canadians and members of the House of Commons to believe that, wittingly or unwittingly, the actions of the present government are sowing the seed of the possibility of an associate state coming about.

Just a few days ago I read that a minister of the province of Quebec, Mr. Kierans, had travelled overseas and had listed a number of departments now administered by the federal government which he said Quebec did not need any more because they were superfluous. This speech has gone unanswered. I know he spoke in what he thought was a responsible way but the fact is that his remarks have gone unanswered. There is also the fact that we are soon to be confronted with the constitutional amendment procedures that the government has in mind, and while I do not make any accusations at the present time there is a rumour which many people firmly believe that Mr. Lesage wants a consulate established in Paris. Then we can also add the fact that in regard to federal-provincial relations the Prime Minister is not leading the federal cause but is negotiating it. He was good at that sort of thing for many years, but once you become Prime Minister it is your obligation at all times, no matter what the situation is with regard to federal-provincial relations, to outline the federal case, to lead the federal cause and not to negotiate the federal government out of the capacity to govern at all.

Quite frankly, sir, a year ago I did not think it was possible that as a member of the house I would be speaking in this tenor at all because I remember getting up time and time again and asking the Prime minister and other ministers, including the Minister of Natonal Health and Welfare who is in her seat now, whether they had consulted with the provinces. A year ago federal-provincial relations were in a terrible state because this was before the present government had coined the idea of co-operative federalism. A year ago federal-provincial relations and, in fact, the whole domestic economic program of the government were floundering because the government had failed to consult the provinces, especially in matters of conjoint jurisdiction.

I feel that as a responsible opposition we did a good job in bringing this situation to the attention of the government on many occasions, and as a Conservative I must recognize that, everything else being equal, I believe strongly in local autonomy. This is a part of Conservative principles. We believe that very often people at the local level know what is best for them and how best they should govern their affairs. I believe in this kind of decentralization. But, Mr. Chairman, in the old world and in the new it has been a consistent principle of Conservatives to fight extremes wherever we find them.

Last year we fought the extreme of an unwitting centralization superimposed upon the provinces by a cabinet largely made up of ex-senior bureaucrats who did not understand the real meaning of co-operative federalism. It is unbelievable to me that in less than a year this same government has unwittingly gone from one extreme of the swing of the pendulum to the other. So I believe it is now one of the challenges facing the opposition to save confederation, to save the federal government, just as it was a challenge to Macdonald, Cartier and the Conservative party almost 100 years ago to forge the bonds of confederation in the first place.

Mr. Gelber: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Grafftey: Yes.

Mr. Gelber: I find it difficult to recognize the description of the hon. member for Queens, the hon. member for Peace River and the hon. member now speaking of the present trend in federal-provincial relations. Would he tell us whether federal powers have been eroded over the last 30 years or are we merely adjusting from the centralization resulting from the war? Has there been an erosion of power in the last 30 years?

Mr. Grafftey: That is a very good question and I hope to answer it in a general and perhaps in a detailed way as I proceed with my speech.

Mr. Choquette: A good answer.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Chairman, if I have said a few partisan things up to this point I hope I can say what I am about to say in a bipartisan spirit. We in the House of Commons recognize, and I think are beginning to recognize more and more no matter to what party we belong, that parliament as an institution only works well when each of us has done all he can in a positive and dynamic spirit of good will to unite the country. No matter what party we support in the House of Commons, we are now beginning to recognize that parliament as an institution really works well only when we have done all we can to improve federal-provincial relations.

I would be the first to recognize that the present government has been faced with a very difficult situation. Things have been moving very quickly in terms of federal-provincial relations, in fact, in an almost abnormal way in the last three or four years, and adjustments have had to be made rather rapidly. Possibly hon. members who support the government will say that I am being partisan but I think we are faced with a very serious situation so far as the attitude of the government is concerned, in that the pendulum has swung from where it was a year ago, when the government would not consult at all with the provinces and its whole economic program was floundering, to the point where many serious-minded Canadians are wondering whether we will have any federal government left at all if the Prime Minister continues on the same course.

I believe that four basic things must be done and probably must be done even before we consider the constitutional amendment procedures soon to come before the house in all their detail. Along with many Canadians I believe that before or certainly by 1967 we must have a modern constitution suited to modern times. I am not going into the niceties of whether or not we should completely scrap the one we have now and draft a new one, or whether we should simply drastically amend the one we have. I am convinced of one thing, Mr. Chairman, and I think there is great support for this in every corner of this house, that much sooner than later we must have a modern constitution suited to modern times.

Second, I should like to dwell on a point that I realize is repetitive coming from me. I am more than ever convinced, as I see things going on that are going on, that one of the reasons for our present ills relating to federal-provincial relations is the lack of permanent consultative machinery between Ottawa and the provinces. Again, I suggest the immediate establishment of a federal-provincial permanent secretariat at the heads of the governments level, based on the ARDA approach. I am not really interested in whether or not it is done in exactly this way, but I am interested in the immediate establishment of federal-provincial permanent consultative machinery.

When this is done, then the federal and provincial governments can meet and immediately plan priorities in the social and economic fields. This is something that must be done immediately. There must be co-operation between the federal and provincial authorities in planning priorities in the social and economic fields. Then we could have meetings on the constitution at different times and in different parts of the country in order that long before 1967, I hope, we can come up with a modern constitution suited to modern times.

Some people feel that Conservatives have preconceived ideas about whether the federal government should be strong or the provincial government should be strong, or whether there should be centralization or decentralization. This is a purely hypothetical debate so far as Conservatives are concerned because we do not approach federal-provincial relations in any doctrinaire sense at all. Some people have said that back in 1867 Macdonald and Cartier were strong defenders of central government. Of course they were. In 1867 there was no whole, there were just the parts. It was the great challenge to Macdonald and Cartier to form the whole out of the parts and to defend it. As I have said before, Conservatives fight extremes wherever they find them. As the pendulum swings too far in any direction I think you will find the approach from our side of the house, and I am sure very often from the other side of the house, is based on principle and not a doctrine that will not change.

I should like to say this, in my closing keynote remarks. As I said, when we bring the constitutional amendment procedures before the House of Commons, I should like to talk in more detail on the various clauses. I say this, Mr. Chairman, that representing Brome-Missisquoi in the province of Quebec, a constituency which is 70 per cent French speaking, I declare now that I have never met one separatist in my constituency. I have never met one. I notice the hon. member for Verdun is paying special attention to this remark, and I should like to congratulate

him upon the worth-while and laudable contribution he made to this debate a number of days ago. I know he is interested when I say, as an English speaking member from the province of Quebec representing a constituency which is 70 per cent French speaking, that I have never met one separatist. I believe the house should know that. The people I represent in the House of Commons want to remain in confederation, as do the majority of the people of the province of Quebec. The separatists do not stand for elective office, Mr. Chairman, because they know what the result would be in Quebec.

In Quebec today nearly 20 per cent of our urban families and over 85 per cent of our farmers are attempting to subsist—certainly not exist—on annual incomes of under $2,000. Great pockets of poverty exist. Since confederation, much has been improved. One of the primary roles of the federal government has been to attempt to guarantee minimum economic and social standards from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The people I represent, as do most Canadians, realize that when we are meeting the challenge today, when we are moving forward in social and economic spheres, we must have a strong federal government acting in a true spirit of co-operative federalism with strong provincial governments, both acting within their respective constitutional jurisdictions. I repeat, the federal government must remain strong.

This is one of the great debates of our time. I must say that the sooner we get to this debate the better. I hope there will be no other debate coming in between this debate and the one on the constitution which may tend to get us off on an unnecessary diversion. From 1867 up until today the two great languages, the two great cultures have lived side by side and now apply to the millions of Canadians who have since come to our shores from many lands. The melting pot theory cannot be superimposed on the Canadian mosaic. I believe, as I have always believed, that the people of the province of Quebec, in a special sense want a strong, united Canada, Mr. Chairman. The Conservative party, which in a spirit of optimism helped to build our confederation, is now called upon to defend the spirit of confederation. I should like to say to the leader of the Creditistes, and I do not say this in any electoral hustings sense, that this is the challenge in Canada. I ask the Prime Minister and Mr. Lesage to look at this challenge that is immediately in front of us. Here we are, the two founding races, living together in a positive spirit of good will.

In most organizations, it has been said that 90 per cent of events are caused by 10 per cent of the opportunities. The 90 per cent area is the area of problems, the headache area as it is sometimes called, and the 10 per cent area is the area of opportunity. In my view, in so far as these problems are concerned, we have devoted most of our energies to the 90 per cent problem area while the 10 per cent area of opportunity has been typically ignored. It seems to me that, in relation to national unity, in relation to questions of confederation, we have spent an inordinate amount of time on the 90 per cent problem area, while we have typically ignored the 10 per cent area of opportunity. Representing a constituency in which I have been able to witness at first hand how the two founding races live together in a dynamic and positive spirit of good will and national unity, I can only say that while mutual understanding, comprehension, and collaboration are good terms, simply by talking about these we are not being positive enough in emphasizing the dynamic, positive qualities which are contained in what I call "unity in diversity", which certainly can be applied to the Canadian scene.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, the Canadian constitution is the first one in the world to combine a federal system of government with a parliamentary system. I have always felt that a federal system of government should tend to combine a measure of unity with a measure of diversity.

In my opinion, Canada's unity has never been and will never be based on the melting-pot principle.

[*Text*]

I should like to say I tried to get a logical and literal translation of "melting pot". The word is "creuset" but it just doesn't apply.

[*Translation*]

Everybody knows that we have a thin population scattered over a great expanse of territory. I believe that even when we have a much larger population and means of communication are faster, our attitude toward Canada and its population should still be inspired by the slogan "unity in diversity". Our federalism is based on a particular psychology found among the various groups and in the various provinces, a psychology which makes union desirable, but not unity of language, culture, religion and so on.

Mr. Chairman, this "unity in diversity" approach should always be looked upon as a positive and dynamic factor in our national structure. True, the diversity which is basic to our national life often raises numerous problems during the development stage of the nation. We are faced with some of those problems at present. I believe that, when we are content with paying lip service to the need for mutual respect and understanding, we are adopting a "live and let live" attitude which is far from being positive enough. Of course, co-operation and understanding are essential elements of the attitude we should take, but the sooner we concentrate on the positive advantages of our diversity, the less we shall hear about a confederation crisis. Then we shall start turning our eyes towards the outside world instead of merely looking at ourselves.

[*Text*]

At this stage of our proceedings in this session of parliament I thought it was opportune for me to rise and put on record some general ideas relating to our constitution, some general ideas relating to our federal-provincial relations, some general ideas relating to what I consider to be the dynamic and positive aspects of unity in diversity, as one who speaks for a constituency in which the two great founding races, together with so many who have come to our shores from other countries during the past few decades, live together in this positive atmosphere. I thought this was a time for a general, keynote speech in this regard as we approach what I consider to be one of the most important debates, if not the most important debate, which has faced members of this parliament for a number of years.

Mr. Woolliams: I did not intend to speak twice today but I should like to answer certain arguments which were put forward by the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate. I wish to refer particularly to the charge he made that the formula proposed today is no different from the formula presented by Mr. Fulton. I wish also to say a few words about the personal attack he made on our leader in this regard.

I realize it is not easy to discuss a complex legal problem of this kind in the house. It is not easy for anyone, and I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult for me. I do assert—and in this I support what was said by the hon. member for Queens, the hon. member for Peace River and the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi—that we must have a strong central government in Canada if this country is to survive. What is the difference between these proposals? To answer that question I suggest we should take a look at the British North America Act for a few moments. I intend to refer to Dawson's book "The Government of Canada". All students of political science have studied this book and referred to it from time to time in their classes. It has been cited by the best constitutional lawyers. What are the powers of the central government as laid down originally by the Fathers of Confederation? Without going into too much legal phraseology, let us consider what those powers were. Then let us look at what the amendments had to say in 1949 and, lastly, at how the situation might be changed by the formula which apparently the present government intends to bring in.

I repeat my assertion that under the guise of bringing back the constitution we are whittling away the federal powers laid down by the British North America Act as drafted by the Fathers of Confederation who helped to bring it into law. What are these powers? They include: the public debt and property; the regulation of trade and commerce; the raising of money by any mode or system of taxation; the borrowing of money on the public credit; postal service; the census and statistics; militia, military and naval service, and defence; the fixing of and providing for the salaries and allowances of civil and other officers of the government of Canada; beacons, buoys, lighthouses, navigation and shipping; seacoast and inland fisheries; ferries between a province and any British or foreign country or between two provinces; currency and coinage; banking; incorporation of banks, and the issue of paper money; savings banks; weights and measures; bills of exchange and promissory notes; interest; legal tender; bankruptcy and insolvency; patents of invention and discovery; copyrights; Indians and lands reserved for Indians; naturalization and aliens.

What happened on December 16, 1949, when the amendment was brought in? Briefly, this is what happened as I see it. The federal government was put in a position where it could itself amend the constitution by the process of petitioning the imperial parliament, subject to certain reservations. That is where the power remains. Basically, of course, the imperial parliament alone has the power to amend the British North America Act which is a creature of the imperial parliament. It is the only power that

can do it. In actual fact, of course, no amendment would be made unless such a course were suggested by this House of Commons, or this parliament, to the imperial authority. I intend to refer at this point to the Winnipeg *Free Press* because I think that paper is on absolutely the right track in this regard. This is a difficult argument to present to parliament in the short time available to me, more particularly because of the kind of research which is needed.

I will digress for a moment. The research we need and the research the government needs should be carried out by ten or 12 top constitutional people in this country so as to make sure we are not making a mistake. I was happy to hear a previous speaker, a member who represents a constituency composed of French speaking Canadians to the extent of 75 per cent, tell us that what the people in the corner mean by central government and what I mean by central government may be two separate and different things. I was speaking to one of his friends in the corner—in fact to his leader; I am not giving away any confidences—and I am not sure we are so far apart. When we talk about what we mean by central government I do not mean the kind of central government we would have set up if we had had a legislative union. This would have meant that all the powers were given to a central government, which in turn delegated to the provinces whatever powers they possessed. Our confederation was the result of a compromise reached between John A. Macdonald, Cartier and others, in which the form of government and the powers of the dominion government were spelled out in a federal system. The federal residuary powers and the powers allotted to the provinces were spelled out, and where there was a conflict the residuary powers were placed in the hands of the federal central government. What is the difference? Mr. Fulton said:

> In so far as there is now incorporated by clause 6 a new provision which limits the federal power of amending the constitution in those respects which are of exclusively federal concern, (which power was contained in section 91(1) B.N.A. Act), by attempting to define the limits of what is of exclusively federal concern, there is a new policy question for consideration: are the limits thus defined reasonable, or are they unduly restrictive? But this is a question which does not, it seems to me, affect the integrity of the remainder of the amending formula as contained in the 1961 proposal.

But this is the point I want to make, and it is a difficult point to get across. If in the new formula which this government apparently has in mind and is contained in either the recent release or the document filed in the House of Commons, there is the kind of formula that by its interpretation confines the powers as laid down by section 91 of the British North America Act, then we are in fact limiting the powers of the central government as originally planned by the Fathers of Confederation.

Therein lies the difference between the Fulton formula and the formula before us today. When the Minister of Transport says that the Leader of the Opposition can make black white, or white black, and is misrepresenting the facts, I say with the greatest respect to his intellect, and without making any personal attack on him, that he does a great disservice to a man who has been in parliament since 1940, a man who has been a great leader of our party and one of the great, outstanding lawyers of our country and who pointed out on the occasion that has been referred to that there is a difference in the formulas.

I wish the Minister of Transport were in his place now to hear my answer to his remarks, but I know he is a good enough student that he will read it in *Hansard*, and if he wishes to answer me, he may do so. I know he will do so if he does not agree with me, because that is certainly his privilege as a member of this house and a minister.

I am calling it as I see it. I say, Mr. Chairman, that we are now, by the amendment, limiting the powers originally set up by section 91 of the British North America Act, and we are particularly limiting what was intended by the amendment of 1949. What did the amendment say? Let us look at it. I have read from page 609 those powers of the central government contained in section 91 of the British North America Act. This is what it says:

> Section 91 of the British North America Act, 1867 is hereby amended by renumbering Class 1 thereof as Class 1A and by inserting therein immediately before that Class the following as Class 1:
>
> "1. The amendment from time to time of the Constitution of Canada, except as regards matters coming within the classes of subjects by this act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces, or as regards rights or privileges by this or any other constitutional act granted or secured to the legislature or the government of a province, or to any class of persons with respect to schools or as regards the use of the English or the French language or as regards the requirements that there shall be a session of the Parliament of Canada at least one each year, and that no House of Commons shall continue for more than five years from the day of the return of the writs for choosing the house; provided, however, that a

House of Commons may in time of real or apprehended war, invasion or insurrection be continued by the Parliament of Canada if such continuation is not opposed by the votes of more than one third of the members of such house".

2. This act may be cited as The British North America (No. 2) Act, 1949, and shall be included among the acts which may be cited as The British North America Acts, 1867 to 1949.

Briefly, what does all that mean? It means, except those powers given to the provinces; except as to the English language; except as to the French language; except as to some of those other rights delegated to the provinces by the act itself, the federal parliament, by the proper methods, may petition the imperial parliament and they could amend and restrict or extend their own powers as defined. But under the new amending formula I say that the right of amending our own powers, the right of being master in our own household, has been assigned to the provinces. Therein lies the difference between the Fulton formula and the formula today. That is why I said this morning—and I want to repeat it—that if that formula goes through we will have carved up this country into ten Balkan states.

I listened with great interest to the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste and I am sure, after listening to his argument, that we are not far apart, even though we are many miles apart in a great country. It is a matter of definition; it is a matter of defining what we mean by "centralization". I say, Mr. Chairman, that this country cannot exist without a strong central government. When I refer to a strong central government, I do not mean a central government that erodes and usurps provincial rights; I mean a strong central government that has the power to control what those rights are under our constitution. The only protection we have are the rights spelled out in the constitution; we have those rights in law. What is the danger in the future? As one hon. member has said, we are today making history; we, in this institution, are as important as were the Fathers of Confederation; because it is not the government of today or the government of tomorrow, but it is our sons, daughters and grandchildren who will have to live with a constitution that may have whittled away and eroded the powers of the central government.

So when the Leader of the Opposition said there appears to be a difference between the Fulton formula and the formula today, and the Minister of Transport says on the other hand that the Leader of the Opposition has misrepresented the facts, I say that the Minister of Transport admitted he was not a constitutional lawyer and did not know too much about the British North America Act. I am not saying he was insincere in his remarks, but he failed to see the difference, and because of his failure to see that difference he accused the Leader of the Opposition of misrepresentation—

Miss LaMarsh: And lying.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I heard the Minister of National Health and Welfare say I have lied. Is that what the Minister of National Health and Welfare just said?

Mr. Churchill: She won't answer.

Mr. Woolliams: I would ask the minister whether she said that. That is what I heard.

Miss LaMarsh: I did not say you were lying.

Mr. Woolliams: Did you say the Leader of the Opposition lied? Mr. Chairman, if the minister said the Leader of the Opposition lied, or I lied, I would ask the minister to withdraw those words.

Mr. Churchill: Withdraw.

The Chairman: Order. I might say that the Chair did not hear the remark.

Mr. Churchill: That does not matter.

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, as a member of this house—

The Chairman: Order. If the minister says she made no such remark, there is no point raising a point of order.

Mr. Mackasey: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the remarks the minister made were to me, and about an entirely different topic.

Mr. Churchill: Oh, come on now.

Mr. Mackasey: Unfortunately for the hon. member for Bow River, we have not found anything he has yet said sufficiently interesting to pay attention to. I apologize for that, and—

Mr. Smallwood: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, this is ridiculous, if it is the kind of behaviour going on in the House of Commons. The minister was not talking to the hon. member who has just spoken. She looked directly over to the hon. member who was speaking and said he lied. This is the kind of attitude adopted by hon. members opposite, and it is ridiculous in this House of Commons.

Miss LaMarsh: It is nice to see you back in the house after two months.

Mr. Smallwood: We will deal with you on your pension plan.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to answer the hon. member for Verdun who said I have not said anything that is interesting; but I would like to suggest to him—and I do not say this sarcastically—with great respect, that I doubt he would understand the kind of constitutional point I am trying to get across at this moment; and I am not being an egotist when I say that. But if he would listen and pay a little more attention, he might learn something.

Mr. Mackasey: On a point of order—

Mr. Woolliams: I do not intend to get into an argument with the hon. member, because he wants to build himself up in the newspapers.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Chairman, I confess that I am not a lawyer but I did understand the clarity and simplicity with which the Minister of Transport pointed out the real facts. This I understood very well. If some time the hon. member for Bow River shows that degree of maturity in the house, I am sure I will be able to understand all that he says.

The Chairman: There is no point of order and I would ask the hon. member for Bow River to continue.

Mr. Woolliams: I am not going to answer the hon. member, because it would be beneath my dignity.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: But I am going to answer something for a few minutes.

Mr. Turner: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if I could suggest to the hon. member that it might also be beneath his dignity to impute motives to the hon. member for Verdun. After all, some of us did not expect he would be speaking in instalments today; and had the Minister of Transport expected a rebuttal to his speech of earlier today, he would have been in his seat. I would think perhaps the hon. member for Bow River would wish to continue without imputing motives to those on this side of the chamber for whom he has some affection.

[Mr. Smallwood).]

Mr. Woolliams: As far as I am concerned I did not impute motives. The minister of health called the Leader of the Opposition or myself—I heard it with my own ears and she looked right at me—a liar, or she said it was a lie, and it is that sort of thing which is ruining the dignity of parliament. However, I should like to answer the argument which has been put forward because I think it is only fair to answer it. I want to read something which might interest the Liberal government. I want to refer to "The Round Table", a quarterly review of British commonwealth affairs. I do not know whether the hon. member for Verdun will understand this, but this is what the writer says concerning the commonwealth:

Mr. Gordon—

I am not attacking Mr. Gordon but I must read everything; if I do not it will be said that I am talking out of context.

—the Minister of Finance has done something to redeem the calamitous errors of his first budget but is far from having won the complete confidence of the country, while Miss Judy LaMarsh, Minister of National Health and Welfare, has become notorious for her indiscreet utterances.

Then he goes on to say this, and this is one of the reasons I am concerned about the formula. Incidentally, these articles are written by the top people in the commonwealth.

Mr. Turner: To which article is my hon. friend referring?

Mr. Woolliams: If my hon. friend has read "The Round Table" he will know the writers of these articles are selected by a committee.

Mr. Turner: It is an unsigned article.

Mr. Woolliams: Of course it is. No article in the British commonwealth affairs review is signed.

Mr. Turner: Then you cannot read it.

Mr. Woolliams: We are not like the hon. member known as Mr. "Leakman", who signs his stuff. The writer goes on:

On the eve of the Liberal convention—

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Even on the assumption that the main tenor of the hon. member's speech is relevant, although the Chair has tolerated this line of argument all day I hardly see how the present intervention is relevant even to an irrelevant speech.

Mr. Woolliams: I am not going to get into an argument because the hon. member

may have an argument of his own to make in the future.

Mr. Rhéaume: I doubt that.

Mr. Woolliams: The hon. member is a good lawyer. If it is not relevant to discuss section 91 or the Fulton formula or the formula of the government, then I would ask him what is relevant here. This is what I was discussing before I was interrupted by the minister of health. I would ask hon. members opposite to read the article entitled "Futility in Parliament" and in particular what it says about their own members and their own government in this regard. That is all I am going to say about that.

Now I will go back to my original argument. I outlined a few moments ago the powers which are set out in section 91. I also pointed out that the amendment of 1949 gave parliament the right to petition to change its powers. Under the new formula that right to amend the powers of the central government which are set out in section 91—the residuary powers provided either by section 91 or section 92—have to a certain degree been given to the provinces. Therein lies the danger: The powers of the central government may be whittled down and lost.

Let us look at what the Winnipeg *Free Press* says about this in an article written by Maurice Western on the editorial page:

> It would be pleasant if all Canadians could join in the heady self-congratulatory mood of the federal and provincial governments over the scheme they have announced for making the British North America Act a Canadian document. In the fortnight that has passed since the scheme was unveiled it has become clear that no one at either level of government has the slightest intention of telling the whole story. On the contrary some of the premiers seem not even to comprehend the real meaning of what they have done; others have tried to throw a smokescreen around the whole subject.

The hon. member for Queens talked this afternoon about the contribution which the premier of Ontario made, and I think he made a good contribution. He gave a warning to the country about the whittling away of the powers of the central government. Because without the central government there will be no provincial governments; Canada will consist of ten states.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: Someone says "hear, hear". I think it must be Mr. Thatcher from Saskatchewan, but anyway that does not matter. The article continues:

> What is the truth behind all this obfuscation? What has really happened is that the ten provinces and the federal government have connived to bring about the most sweeping constitutional change in Canadian history, enormously enhancing provincial authority and introducing principles which could go a long way toward destroying the essential powers of the central government.

Those were my words this morning and they are the words of a competent newspaperman in this country and appear in a national newspaper. They are words of warning to Canadians that we as members of parliament may be endorsing a new and sweeping constitutional change.

Mr. McIlraith: Would the hon. member permit a question at this time?

Mr. Woolliams: Certainly.

Mr. McIlraith: Is he arguing that that undoubtedly responsible newspaperman is a better authority on constitutional law on this point than is Hon. Davie Fulton?

Mr. Woolliams: No. I want to read now what Mr. Fulton said to me about this. He agrees with the Winnipeg *Free Press*. I am glad the minister asked that question because Mr. Fulton says this:

> In so far as—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. Woolliams: There you are. As soon as I make a point in answer to the minister a point of order is raised. Surely there is no point of order here. The minister has asked me a question and I want to refer to what has been said in this regard.

The Chairman: A point of order when raised by an hon. member has to be submitted for the consideration of the Chair.

Mr. Grégoire: My point of order is completely in order and is meant only to facilitate the task of the hon. member for Bow River. May we know from what source he quotes Mr. Fulton, just to have it on the record? I do not want to insult the hon. member but I do want that on the record.

Mr. Woolliams: I am reading from a brief from Mr. Fulton. I have been in communication with him; he is a friend of mine, a former minister of justice and he is a Conservative. Naturally I am interested in his comments. I have my ideas and he has his ideas. No one suggests that law is an exact science; we have only to read the many cases concerning the interpretation of statutes to determine that.

Now I want to answer the minister because he asked me a perfectly proper question. I am now reading what Mr. Fulton

said to me and I should like to proceed. He said:

> In so far as there is now incorporated by clause 6 a new provision which limits the federal power of amending the constitution in those respects which are of exclusively federal concern (which power was contained in section 91 (1) B.N.A. Act), by attempting to define the limits of what is of exclusively federal concern, there is a new policy question for consideration:—

That is the point I was trying to make when I first rose in my place this afternoon, that this new policy is placing a brand new interpretation on the meaning of the delegated powers and residuary powers contained in section 91. If you attempt to define the limits of those words you trim down the powers of the central government. If you enlarge the limits of those words you enlarge the powers of the central government. That is exactly the position that I understand he takes.

I was referring to what was said by the Winnipeg *Free Press,* and I want to finish this quotation because some good examples are given. Let me take one example. If you were going to form two or three new provinces in the Northwest Territories, then I would ask this question—I think I know the answer but I may not be right: Do we have to get the consent of the other provinces to do this? If, for example, we want to whittle away the power of the central government in connection with banking as outlined in section 91, can the provinces then force an amendment to that section? Could they force an amendment on things other than under section 91, which are exclusively reserved to the federal government? These are the difficult questions that must be answered, and this is the kind of control I am talking about. This is where the erosion could take place. Again I repeat that this is not an easy subject to understand, and I have given it a great deal of study.

Would the government in Ottawa turn down such a request from four of the populous provinces in respect of monetary policy, external affairs and tariffs? In other words, have four provinces, with a sufficient population, the power to assign from the federal government by a constitutional change such things as banking, trade, tariffs or the forming of provinces? Therein lies the danger of this legislation and that is why these matters must be aired. That is why I recommended that we should have a committee before which the top men in this country could appear and explain this whole subject to those members who do not understand it. If they are not made to understand what is being done, and made aware of the dangers which are inherent, it may well be that we are about to endorse something of grave danger to the very unity of this country.

An hon. Member: This is just like the flag issue.

Mr. Woolliams: I heard someone say something about the flag question, but I am not going to get into that argument.

This is what Mr. Maurice Western had to say about this subject. I have said these things in a different way, but his statements give weight to my argument. Maurice Western wrote in an article which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press* on October 26, 1964, the following:

> Despite soothing official assurances, the patriation agreement announced by the 11 premiers involves a drastic amendment of the constitution, leading Canadians into country unexplored during our century of existence as a nation. A prudent parliament will wish, no doubt, to examine the project with some care, weighing the risks and probabilities before passing the address which will carry us past the point of no return.
>
> What is unfamiliar in the agreement is the principle of delegation, unknown to the constitution with which we have lived so long.

That delegation is, of course, spelled out by the law. The provinces have tried many times to erode federal powers. I recall when Mr. Aberhart first came into office. He wanted to take over the making of money, and he did issue some scrip. That legislation was declared unconstitutional. He tried to pass legislation in respect of the press, to make the situation more fair on the part of the press, but that act to control the press was declared unconstitutional.

An hon. Member: He was right.

Mr. Woolliams: He may have been right; I am just telling you what happened in the courts.

The province of Saskatchewan attempted to legislate in respect of the banking industry in reference to the farm security act but if you read the famous decision of the Supreme Court of Canada you will find that that legislation was declared ultra vires.

I suggest that four provinces with a sufficient population might be able to erode the powers of the federal government spelled out and defined in section 91 of the B.N.A. Act. Where would this country then be?

I suggest to those who are the most extreme supporters and promoters of this philosophy of strong provincial government that they ask themselves this question. If we erode the powers of the central government will the

provincial governments remain provincial governments, or will they in fact be national governments having all their own rights to tax each other, set tariffs, create their own exchange, and have their own rights in respect of trade and various other fields? When that time comes we will be the assassins of confederation, not the ones who have endeavoured to carry on the aims and ambitions of the Fathers of Confederation in an attempt to hold this country together and to unite it as it has never before been united.

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few remarks about the amount of money we are being asked by the government to vote in order that it may carry on its program for the next two months. I think we must look at government spending very carefully before passing interim supply. I think we should look very carefully at the operations of the famous C.B.C. corporation.

We have heard a great deal about this corporation. There are some people in this country, including the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond, who feel the C.B.C. should be untouchable. I think it is time that the public was enlightened about what the C.B.C. is doing and how it is wasting their money. If the programs shown by the C.B.C. are of a type that should not be shown, we as members of parliament have the right to stand in this house and say so.

Mr. Chairman, on March 2, 1964, I rose in my place in this house and complained about the program "Quest". I have in my hand a file of letters I have received from people across Canada thanking me for the action I took on that occasion. I might say that it contains hundreds of letters. I received two letters expressing opposition to the action I took.

Of course, there are these so-called intellectuals and critics in this country, such as Frank Moritsugu of Toronto, and Mr. Frank Penn of the Ottawa *Citizen*, who suggest that I had no business condemning the C.B.C. For two days I tried to contact Mr. Penn to have a talk with him, but I was unable to locate him. These people are difficult to find, and I suspect they hide in their ivory towers writing articles about members of parliament.

The general public feels quite differently toward the extravagance of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I think this feeling has been expressed in an editorial which appeared in the Edmonton *Journal* in September, 1964. This editorial states in part as follows:

Members of parliament will be derelict in their duty if they do not ask why it was necessary to spend $6,160,000 of the taxpayers' money merely for a site for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's new headquarters in Montreal.

I suggest that is typical of the way the C.B.C. is wasting the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Bushnell, a former top executive of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, when speaking in Toronto, charged that the C.B.C. has become extravagant. In 1963-64 the C.B.C. spent $115 million, of which $78 million came from public funds. This year this publicly owned corporation is going to spend more than $100 million of the taxpayers' money. It is time that we as members of parliament sat as members of a parliamentary committee to inquire into the extravagance of the C.B.C. I suggested as early as March, 1964, that a committee to perform this function be established. At that time we were assured by the Prime Minister that this committee would be set up.

Mr. Chairman, we are now being asked to donate over $100 million of the taxpayers' money to the C.B.C. in order that that corporation may spend that money wastefully in the construction of new buildings. At the present time there are buildings owned by the C.B.C. in Ottawa of an aggregate value of $3 million. I think we should look at the situation today, bearing in mind that many individuals are unemployed in this country and living in poverty. I suggest there are many programs carried by the C.B.C. which are not fit to be seen by television viewers.

Some people have stated that we should not criticize the producers and script writers of C.B.C. programs. Perhaps those individuals should take a trip to Toronto and visit the C.B.C. club there to see the kind of people who write these scripts. I had the opportunity of making such a visit.

I still maintain that the time has come for us to take a very close look at the operations of the C.B.C. It is time a committee was set up in this house to scrutinize the spending of this crown corporation. As a last resort I ask the Secretary of State, who is not in his place, or the Prime Minister, to give us some assurance that a parliamentary committee will be established to look into the affairs of this corporation so that we may at least attempt to save the taxpayers some money and stop the C.B.C. from exposing its viewers to programs which, in my opinion, are completely unfit.

This government is asking us to vote this money so that the government may carry on with its business. The government has been

in power for over a year and has brought in no useful legislation. It has been hiding it in the cupboard. It has been playing with the flag, it has been playing with the pension plan, and all this time farm prices have been going down. What are they doing about it? Absolutely nothing. We see that today the price of cattle is as low as 15 cents a pound, a reduction of 10 cents from last year. Yet the Minister of Agriculture is not even around the house. This is a do-nothing government. They are just playing for time and engaging in tricks. They have even got magicians in the government who take something out of a hat one day and put it back the next day. This has been going on for nearly two years. It is about time we had some action from the government. Otherwise I think we should be tempted not to give them any more money to fiddle with.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, I want to put a few remarks on the record at this time when the committee is discussing the whole matter of revision of our constitution.

Mr. Grégoire: Carried.

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, would you ask the hon. member for Lapointe to come to order so I can do my thinking and speaking in some kind of orderly manner?

An hon. Member: Can you not think otherwise?

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, in answer to that question, whether I cannot think otherwise, may I say I am not used to thinking in the midst of noise, chattering and jabbering.

Mr. Grégoire: Are you stating you are not used to thinking?

An hon. Member: He is only going to read his speech anyway.

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, once again I say that I intend to continue my speech. If these members on the Liberal back benches wish to make speeches I am sure you will recognize them, Mr. Chairman, if they will stand up and be identified.

The whole question of the revision of the constitution poses rather special problems for 50,000 of our northern people who happen to live in the Yukon and Northwest Territories because neither the Yukon nor the Northwest Territories is in confederation yet. As hon. members are probably aware, when the responsibilities and tax fields that were to be divided were defined in the British North America Act only two spheres were envisaged, the federal sphere and the provincial sphere. The transitional stage of being a territory was meant to be precisely that, transitional, and I think it is most important that at this time when we are talking about repatriating the constitution the situation in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories should be reviewed rather carefully. It is even more important at this time, because neither of these territories was represented at the conference of attorneys general held recently to consider these matters.

I have listened attentively and quietly, Mr. Chairman, all afternoon to the remarks made by other members in the course of this debate and I would recommend to the hon. member for Lapointe that he should do the same. I too am concerned about the piecemeal dismemberment of this country at the hands of the Prime Minister and I do not hesitate to say that he must take full responsibility. He is supposed to be the leader of the government, although whether or not he is is something for him to worry about. But certainly we have seen the federal authority purposely weakened by his actions at a time when more than anything else we need a strong central government.

I know that the background of the Prime Minister is certainly an interesting and distinguished one in terms of his work at the United Nations. No one would question that the present Prime Minister was a great United Nations man, but although he may have been a great UN man he is certainly unable or unwilling to provide the kind of federal leadership that is required at the present time. This is the worst possible time for Canada to have a windsock prime minister. I am sure those of you who do any flying know what I mean when I refer to a windsock administration that turns in response to whichever way the breeze is blowing. This kind of approach to our problems is a source of real concern to me as the member for the Northwest Territories and to my colleague, the hon. member for Yukon, because if the Prime Minister insists on calling conference after conference at which the whole federal pie is put up for grabs, then those people who live in areas that are weaker in terms of their representation, either provincially or territorially, are going to be left with little more than crumbs.

There is another reason why I feel the situation within the two territories is serious. Right now neither the Yukon nor the North-

west Territories has full representation in parliament. If you will recall, Mr. Chairman, that parliament consists not only of the House of Commons but of the Queen and also the Senate, you will understand what I am driving at. At the present time neither the Yukon nor the Northwest Territories is represented in the Senate. There are no senators from either of these territories.

Some may automatically ask why we do not have such representation, or why we should have, in view of the sparse population of these areas. I am aware of the historical reasons for Prince Edward Island having four senators but I think it is fair to point out that at the present time more than 40,000 people live in the two northern territories. In my own constituency of the Northwest Territories we have over 26,000 people. Prince Edward Island, with a population of approximately 107,000, has four senators. As I say, I am aware of the historical reasons for this but I draw this matter to the attention of the committee, because in justice I think the two northern territories can insist on having representation in the Senate.

The previous administration made tremendous strides in opening up the Canadian north and embarked upon a program that concerned not only physical resource development, involving such things as airports, roads and railroads but which also gave the federal franchise to all residents of the Northwest Territories through the medium of the Nielsen bill, named after the hon. member for Yukon. This was part of a program to speed up the political development of Canada's far north, so that the logical step after the people were given elected representation in the House of Commons was to strengthen the local government and also to provide for the representation of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories in the other place.

The advantage of this sort of thing is surely obvious to anyone who will do a little thinking. It distresses me to see the Prime Minister deal away federal responsibilities in reaction to the slightest bit of pressure exerted upon him, but it is of particular concern because it tells those of us who live in the Canadian north that we may never get representation in the Senate.

The charge was made last week in Edmonton by the hon. member for Yukon and myself that for the past 18 months at any rate there has been a complete neglect of the affairs of the two northern territories, perhaps in retaliation for the northland having dared to send other than Liberal members to this house or perhaps because of the traditional approach of the Liberal party which has been to neglect, to deride and overlook the needs of the rural areas of this country, whether they be in the west, the maritimes or the Canadian northland. In the past 18 months, there has not been a single new project initiated by the federal government in either of the two northern territories. The Minister of Trade and Commerce was in Edmonton and he talked about the wonderful railway that was now pushing the frontier up to latitude 62. He described this railway as the greatest single development in the Canadian northwest, and said it would be of even greater importance in the years ahead as the tremendous Pine Point lead and zinc deposits were exploited.

Fortunately, the Leader of the Opposition arrived in Edmonton on the same evening. He was quick to point out, and this was not lost to westerners, that every Liberal member in the House of Commons voted against the Pine Point railway at the time the bill was up for second reading. Now they are taking credit for this railway and saying what a wonderful thing it is. I mention these things, Mr. Chairman, not to thresh old straw, if you will, but because it is more crucial than ever for these two territories to rather quickly get representation in the Senate. This is a time when the creation of two positions in the other place for people from the north would be of great help. It is a time, perhaps because our territories are evolving very slowly, when the Senate, which is less involved in the day to day speculation about a general election and certainly does not need to be alarmed by partisanship in any of its strange forms, would be able to provide the sort of advice and study so necessary on behalf of the two northern territories. Now, in all the hundreds of thousands of words that have been spoken in this House of Commons in the last year in relation to solving problems, I have not heard a single member of the government refer to the fact that no provision was made to provide the Yukon and Northwest Territories with Senate representation.

The question I want answered is why this has happened? Surely, at a time when we are sitting down talking about making essential revisions, overdue revisions of the British North America Act, this is the logical time to plan an article in the constitution whereby the northern 50 per cent of this country can be brought under the British North America Act in a more meaningful way, and given full

representation in parliament. In late 1962 the hon. member for the Yukon was attempting to have this matter brought forward. At that time delay occurred because the development of political institutions in the Northwest Territories was proceeding apace. I do not believe anyone will quarrel with me seriously when I say it is more important for a resident of the northland to at least have the right to vote in federal elections, and it does not hurt to remind hon. members of this house that it was only in 1962 that every Canadian citizen over 21 years of age had the right to vote in federal elections. Prior to that time thousands of Canadians who were living in many parts of Canada's northland, whether they were Indian or Eskimo, were deprived of their vote. There was nothing in the election act that prevented them from voting, but they did not belong in any constituency. When the writs were issued and the lists were put up of the voters, tnere was nowhere they could vote.

There used to be a saying, when I was first knocking around the Northwest Territories, to the effect that if you wanted to lose your right to vote in Canada, all you had to do was to go to prison, go insane or go north. This situation was corrected. Not only were residents of the north given the federal franchise for the first time in June, 1962, but so were the Indian people. Prior to that time they did not have a franchise, because of their racial origin. When the accomplishments of the previous prime minister were being ridiculed and derided by the great exponent of political integrity, the Minister of Transport, to the jeers and catcalls of his loyal backbenchers, it was distressing to me to note that no one gave credit for this sort of thing. Yet, prior to the passage of the Canadian Bill of Rights and the implications that this had on the franchise in northern Canada, it was true that Canada had no right to hold up her head in the councils of the United Nations, at a time when many of her citizens were being deprived of the basic right to vote, solely because of their racial origin. I am speaking now of the Indian and Eskimo people. No one in this house knows what a tremendous step that was. If for nothing else, the previous prime minister deserves the commendation of Canadians and a place in history as the prime minister who, after 22 years of Liberal government, was the first to see that every Canadian citizen had the right to vote.

May I call it five o'clock?

Progress reported.

[Mr. Rhéaume.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock the house will proceed to private members' business, namely, public bills and private bills.

Mr. Knowles: Since it is generally known what order we will be proceeding with, could we not arrive at it by unanimous consent rather than calling 20 or 22 items and having each one stand?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall all the items but one be allowed to stand?

Mr. Churchill: I raise the suggestion that I raised before, that after bills have been called on two or three occasions they should drop to the bottom of the list. Then you would not have to go through this procedure of calling bills day after day that have been on the order paper and retained their position for months.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that one particular item will be called, item No. 23?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING SENATE REPRESENTATION FROM QUEBEC

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-76, to amend the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1960, with respect to representation of the provinces in the Senate and qualifications of senators.

He said:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, as all hon. members know, the object of this bill is to bring the Senate abreast with the times we live in. There is no question of abolishing the Senate but to bring it to proportions more appropriate to our times.

Bill No. C-76 reads as follows:

An act to amend the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1960, with respect to representation of the provinces in the Senate and qualifications of senators.

Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

1. Section 22 of the British North America Act, 1867, is amended by deleting the last paragraph thereto which at present reads as follows:

"In the case of Quebec, each of the twenty four senators representing that province shall be appointed for one of the twenty four electoral divisions of Lower Canada specified in schedule A to chapter one of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada."

Explanatory Note: "This paragraph, together with paragraph 6 of section 23, which it is also proposed

to delete, was inserted at the time of confederation to protect the English Protestant minority which was then located mainly in the eastern townships of the province of Quebec. Needless to say that no such provision has been inserted in the constitution to safeguard the French and Roman Catholic minorities of the other provinces.

However, as the population of the eastern townships is now mostly French Canadian, there is no need to perpetuate in the British North America Act such an obsolete provision.

Why should we keep in the statutes of the British North America Act a provision dating back to 1867, at a time when confederation comprised Upper and Lower Canada, while today our country includes ten provinces?

There is no such provision in any other Canadian province, except in the province of Quebec.

It seems to me that the federal parliament should remove that section which is altogether obsolete and outmoded.

Clause 2 of Bill C-76 reads as follows:

2. Clause 23 of the said act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"23. 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.

It seems to me that we have come to maturity and that we should repeal what is incorporated in clause 23 of the British North America Act, namely:

The qualifications of a senator shall be as follows:

(1) He shall be at the full age of thirty years;

That qualification does not change.

(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;

Since this is the parliament of Canada after the union, after confederation, it seems to me that we should revert to more equitable requirements, that is to be Canadian citizens, which implies the whole thing in itself and proves that we are masters of our destiny and that we can decide for ourselves.

The third paragraph of that clause 23 reads as follows:

(3) He shall be legally or equitably seized as freehold for his own use and benefit—

In simple terms, he must be the owner of property worth $4,000 over and above all his debts, mortgages, liabilities, etc.

(4) His real and personal property shall be together worth four thousand dollars over and above his debts and liabilities:

(5) He shall be resident in the province for which he is appointed.

Now, I come to the sixth paragraph and that is the one we want to eliminate. It reads as follows:

In the case of Quebec he shall have his real property qualification in the electoral division for which he is appointed, or shall be resident in that division."

Here is the explanatory note on that matter:

The main reason for the proposed change is that now that Canada is no longer a colony, only a Canadian should be qualified to be a senator. It is further suggested that if it is true that 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 in the Kingdom of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the abrogation of clause 23(6) is proposed for reasons indicated in clause 1 of the bill. We are also suggesting that clauses 26, 27 and 28 of the said act be repealed and section 4 states:

That this act may be cited as the British North America Act, 1964, and the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1960 and this act may be cited together as the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1964.

Clauses 26, 27 and 28 which at the present time read as follows:

26. If at any time on the recommendation of the Governor General the Queen thinks fit to direct that three or six members be added to the Senate, the Governor General may by summons to three or six qualified persons (as the case may be), representing equally the three divisions of Canada, add to the Senate accordingly.

Clause 27 reads as follows:

27. In the case of such addition being at any time made, the Governor General shall not summon any person to the Senate, except upon a further like direction by the Queen on the like recommendation, to represent one of the three divisions until such division is represented by twenty four Senators and no more.

Clause 28 reads:

28. The number of senators shall not at any time exceed seventy eight.

Since we never had to apply those clauses, why not repeal them? In fact, those clauses have never been used and we, nevertheless, tolerate them as it is provided that the number of senators should never exceed 78. At present, we have more than 78, we have 104. Therefore, clause 28 is outmoded and obsolete.

Mr. Choquette: We have 102, but we are entitled to 104.

Mr. Caouette: I thank the hon. member for Lotbinière for giving me this information.

I think that the attention of the house should be drawn especially to clause 23 where it is stated that a senator shall have the following qualifications:

(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.

This means also that, in order to be called to the Senate, the qualification of Canadian citizen does not imply that one must be a partisan of the party in power, or of the opposition party, or a political organizer of any party. The qualification of Canadian citizen means that any Canadian citizen is eligible for appointment to the Senate.

Quite often, appointments were made on a purely political basis. Of course there were exceptions, and I will mention them.

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: When?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: For instance, Senator J. Hackett, a Conservative member of parliament for many years, was appointed to the Senate by the then prime minister, Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent. Mr. Hackett was a Conservative. We also had appointments—

Mr. Choquette: Mr. François Pouliot.

Mr. Caouette: —which were not entirely of a political nature. I am thinking of businessmen like Senator Molson who was neither a known Liberal or Conservative, but whose appointment is a contribution to the Senate. We also have Senator McCutcheon, who somewhat entertains independent political views, though he is considered as a Tory.

My hon. friend from Lotbinière referred to Senator Pouliot. I do not think that, strictly speaking, Senator Pouliot's appointment was a political one. As as matter of fact, I knew him personally from 1946 to 1949, when he sat as a Liberal member, and whenever he wanted to let the government in office have a piece of his mind, the senator did not hesitate. They called him the enfant terrible of the house, precisely because he did not always agree with the government of the day, that of Right Hon. Mackenzie King, and also because, in those days, he severely criticized the then minister of national defence, Mr. Ralston. If Senator Pouliot had been willing to accept the Liberal party's discipline, he would have been appointed to a cabinet post long before that, for he was a very brilliant member, and this I admit, despite the fact that he was a Liberal member. For instance, when it was necessary to take a stand on the 1942 plebiscite, Senator Pouliot was one of those who crossed over to the other side of the House of Commons to protest against the fact that the Liberal government of the time was betraying the province of Quebec. This is all to his credit and we commend him for it. That is why I say that he was not appointed strictly as a Liberal member nor as a very influential member of the Liberal party.

On the other hand, others were appointed to the Senate after being defeated in an election and who were and still are active political organizers. Under the rules of the house, we have no right to attack a senator, but I know that in the case of Senators Bourget and Flynn, who were defeated in their ridings and appointed to the Senate soon after, those appointments were solely and strictly political and reflect no credit on democracy. When the electorate turns down somebody, why should the government go counter to the popular will, so clearly expressed?

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the house, take exception to some of the Senate's activities and we object to bills coming from this august house called the Canadian Senate.

Mr. Speaker, there are four bills on today's order paper, on page 21, that is Bills S-32, S-6, S-13 and S-27 designated as follows:

1. Bill S-32, an act to incorporate World Mortgage Corporation.
2. Bill S-6, an act to incorporate Bank of Western Canada.
3. Bill S-13, an act to incorporate Laurentide Bank of Canada.
4. Bill S-27, an act respecting The Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

We object to the passing of these bills and we have reasons for it. We are not blackmailing the Senate, but there is now before the Senate an application for another bank, the bank of British Columbia; it has been there for months, but the Senate does not pass this bill nor send it to this house.

We think that this is a flagrant piece of injustice as far as the Laurentide bank of Canada or the bank of western Canada are concerned because this bank has rights and is entitled to request this charter.

Mr. Lachance: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have found most interesting the speech made by the hon. member for Villeneuve on the bill he introduced today, but I

do not believe that we should discuss, at this stage, various bills concerning banks or any other bill but the one before us at present.

I think the members might like to say a few words on this most interesting bill, and I do not believe we are ready to discuss all those other bills this evening.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I duly note the remarks of the hon. member who has just interrupted me. On the other hand, I should like to tell him that we are not discussing Bills Nos. S-32, S-6, S-13 and S-27.

I am talking about the Senate whose members must be of the full age of 30 years and be Canadian citizens, resident in the province for which they are appointed. I am also referring to the role the Senate can play when its members possess those qualifications. In fact, I hope that some day the hon. member attains those qualifications, not as a politician, but as a Canadian, in order to reach what is called the heaven of Canadian politics.

Mr. Speaker, we object to those bills because we believe that it is unfair to delay the passage in the house of certain bills or certain requests, while the same privilege is granted to other measures. That is the only reason. This is no blackmail, and we do not want to practise blackmail; however, we would like that the most elementary justice be meted to everyone.

And I am wondering why the upper house objects to sending here, in the House of Commons, the bill that has been submitted by the province of British Columbia.

[*Text*]

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Caouette: Yes.

Mr. Basford: Is the hon. member aware that at the third last meeting of the committee on banking and commerce of the other place, on the bill to which he is referring, the attorney general of British Columbia asked that the committee not proceed with the bill at that time and that they adjourn their hearings?

Mr. Caouette: I am aware of that but my hon. friend's statement is not right. He knows very well that the attorney general of British Columbia never asked that that bill be deferred to a later date. He wanted the bill to be accepted and passed right away, but somebody else objected to the passing of the bill on that occasion.

Mr. Basford: Then on a question of privilege—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I should point out to the house that the bill before the house at the moment deals with the representation of the provinces in the Senate, and the qualifications of senators. I am just trying to bring the house to order before the discussion goes too far afield. I would point out to the house that this does not give hon. members leeway to discuss the operations of the other chamber, and I would ask them to stay within the confines of the bill now before the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I shall follow your suggestion with pleasure, and point out that the principle of the bill, as I have just mentioned, does not change anything much in the B.N.A. Act or acts. I simply suggest that the situation with regard to the appointment of senators be up-dated, in the provinces and throughout Canada.

Such clauses as have no longer any value must be deleted. In short, what does the bill mean? That the qualifications of a senator shall be as follows:

1. He shall be of the full age of 30 years.

2. He shall be a Canadian citizen, without a long string of qualifications or epithets after his name, and no matter where he comes from.

3. He shall be resident in the province for which he is appointed.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that hon. members, regardless of party affiliation, will not object to these three qualifications of a senator. We will thus have amended the B.N.A. Act or acts, in accordance with the spirit of 1964 and not of 1867.

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of interest that I read the bill introduced by the hon. member who just returned to his seat. I also listened to his comments with no less interest. In my opinion, there are provisions in the proposed measure which deserve serious consideration. But I do not feel that, were they to be accepted, the amendments brought forward would entail any real change. What is being asked for, at the present time, is a major and substantial reform of the Senate.

Mr. Grégoire: Its abolition.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, as for its abolition, if the hon. member will bear with

me, I shall deal with the matter later on. I agree with those who say that our constitution contains provisions which are obsolete and archaic. That is why, throughout the country, we hear about a reform in depth, if not a brand new constitution.

Last July I introduced a bill for the sole purpose of removing the obsolete provisions which are still in our constitution, that is clauses 55, 56 and 57, which provide that bills may be reserved to be given royal assent by the Queen of England personally; that has not been done for a great number of years now and dominion conferences had indeed suggested they should be dropped, since they serve no practical purpose.

I will now argue from analogy to deal with the provisions of the bill under consideration. In fact, the provisions which the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) would like to see removed are surely antiquated, as can be seen from the following subsection:

> In the case of Quebec each of the 24 senators representing that province shall be appointed for one of the 24 electoral divisions of Lower Canada specified in schedule A to chapter 1 of the consolidated Statutes of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I will now deal with that provision for a moment. We must of course define territorial constituencies if we want to appoint senators to represent those constituencies.

If, in the eastern townships for instance, senators were appointed to represent constituencies of that area I would not object, especially since, in the explanatory notes of the bill introduced by the hon. member, we find this:

> However, as the eastern townships are now predominantly French Canadian—

Mr. Speaker, since the population of the eastern townships is now mostly French Canadian, I see no objection to the appointment of senators from that area, because they would represent the French Canadian nation in the Canadian Senate. That is why I fail to see the point of lingering over the study of the proposed amendments.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, would the member permit a question?

Mr. Choquette: With pleasure, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member aware of the fact that the act provides for 24 electoral divisions or senatorial districts in the province of Quebec and that it is the only place in Canada where those divisions exist? A similar situation cannot be found elsewhere. When such provisions were enacted for the province of Quebec, they were intended to protect or to help the English minorities which were then living in the eastern townships of the province of Quebec. Since a similar situation cannot be found in any other province of Canada, we ask that the qualifications of a senator in our province be exactly the same as in all other provinces.

Mr. Choquette: This seems to be correct, Mr. Speaker, and, for all practical purposes, those who are called upon to represent the senatorial constituencies, whether their limits be marked or not, their number remains the same.

If the hon. member's purpose is to standardize the legislation in this field, I believe such purpose deserves consideration.

But, if I am not overly enthusiastic because the proposed amendments will not involve major consequences, this is because I would personally suggest—and I would not want to hurt the beliefs and the feelings of the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska (Mr. Pepin), who has perhaps not a particularly high opinion of this reality that the Senate represents—that the Senate should be precisely the image of the Canadian reality and institution designed to protect and promote the bicultural and bilingual character of Canada.

Mr. Grégoire: This is utopia.

Mr. Choquette: That place should precisely be the one where the binational character of our country should be asserted.

That is why I believe that should we reach such a reform, that is a thorough reform of the Senate, which appears to be a utopia, I would advocate a binational composition of the Senate, since the upper house exists precisely in order to protect minorities.

That clause which it is proposed to have repealed was aimed at protecting an English speaking minority living in a district of the province of Quebec.

Let us keep the spirit which existed in 1867, let us preserve the spirit which has prevailed and let us see to it that in the Senate reform which is proposed and which will be implemented some day—it must be ardently hoped —the bicultural character of our country is present in the Senate, since the Senate is designed to protect minorities.

A moment ago, the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) asked me if I was in favour of the abolition of the Senate. I am not in favour of abolition under the present circumstances, and I think that is the policy

of those who sit on this side of the house. We seek to reform the Senate, not to do away with it.

If the abolition of the upper house is being considered nowadays, it is because the Senate is not performing adequately.

Mr. Grégoire: Quite true.

Mr. Choquette: In this day and age, Canada needs modern institutions. If public service is being increasingly sneered at, it is our duty to restore its dignity and to give it proper efficiency.

People are asking themselves whether the House of Commons and the Senate truly hold any power. If they have doubts about that, it is precisely because neither house has any real influence. We sometimes have the feeling that we are administered by a ghost government, and this has been going on for years, Mr. Speaker.

The best way to remove this unpleasant feeling would be to improve fully our institutions. If the Senate continues to languish as at present, if it continues to sleep, there is no doubt that a strong movement will advocate more efficiently than the hon. members opposite the abolishment of the Senate, and this is not advisable under the circumstances.

The hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska has made his comments on the sad state of the Senate. His comments were quite interesting, Mr. Speaker, but he is pessimistic about the reform of the Senate.

His pessimism may be justified—

Mr. Grégoire: Yes.

Mr. Choquette: The only way to amend the constitution of the Senate is to include in a political platform, as one of its essential items, the reform of the Senate.

What is being proposed on the order paper? It is suggested to impose a compulsory retirement to the senators—nobody dares to go any further—but if such a reform can be effected, that would be fine.

This proposal has not yet been carried out, but it is merely suggested at present to set at 75 years the retirement age for senators.

Mr. Grégoire: That is too old.

Mr. Choquette: I feel that we should put forward more clearly and specifically to the voters the matter of the Senate reform, and any political party likely to come into power, and I automatically rule out our friends of the Ralliement Créditiste.

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lotbinière is violating the most basic rights of democracy where the choice of governments should be left to the people and not solely to the hon. member for Lotbinière.

I shall ask him to withdraw and to be more democratic by putting an end to his dictatorial manner in the House of Commons.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I would not want to cause you any trouble with this point of order. I do not want to deprive the people of the right to wipe off the Ralliement Créditiste from the electoral map in the next election. I speak for the future wish—

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. A few moments ago you called me to order because I was getting away from the subject of Bill No. C-76.

At this time the hon. member for Lotbinière is trying to brag as regards the Ralliement Créditiste, which he will not bother at all in the province of Quebec; on the contrary, we will replace him in his constituency at the next election.

I would ask that you call him back to order so that he may confine himself to the subject of Bill No. C-76.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The point of order raised by the hon. member for Villeneuve I think is well taken. The hon. member for Lotbinière has strayed away from the subject matter of the bill now before us. Perhaps I should point out to him that there is no mention in this bill of the retirement of the members of the other house. All that is mentioned in Bill C-76 is the qualifications of members of the other house, and their representation of different provinces. Perhaps the hon. member will confine himself to the bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: I abide by your ruling, Mr. Speaker. In trying to be witty I got away from the principle of the bill. Please forgive me.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, I very well understand the feeling of my good friends opposite, because in referring to the cordial words of the hon. member for Villeneuve, I have the impression that if we go by the provisions of this bill and by the spirit of his remarks, it is not impossible that one day the hon. member for Villeneuve might be called to the Senate. I would not object, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Caouette: Order.

Mr. Choquette: He spoke a while ago—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The bill we are discussing right now makes no mention of the appointment of the hon. member for Villeneuve to the Senate but simply of the qualifications required to be appointed a senator.

You have already called to order several times the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette). He is again wandering from the principle of the bill and I believe you will have to call him to order. If he fails to comply, I suggest that you should order him to leave the house.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, the standing orders of the house are for everybody, for me and for any other member, and I shall willingly comply with your ruling. However, may I be allowed to state that obviously some Créditistes would like to gain admission to the Senate, since they are precisely proposing the removal of the basic qualification of $4,000 provided in that section—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

Mr. Choquette: —and it is clear that the reason why that party wants the removal of the property qualifications required to become a senator is that the members of their party aim at being appointed to the Senate—

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: Why not send them both to the Senate?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order, please. I am having some difficulty listening to two members at the same time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member for Lotbinière, even though you called him to order, is departing from your ruling. I think that it would be your duty to call him to order again more strongly than the first time.

Mr. Choquette: These points of order, Mr. Speaker, have taken a lot of my time.

In any event, I want to say this: Clause 2 of the bill under consideration lists three qualifications which a senator must have in order to be appointed under the new provisions.

In our modern times, if we really wanted to democratize the Senate, why would we not have people under 30 years appointed, that is if we actually intended to rejuvenate the Senate? I ask this question without expressing any opinion on its merits.

If one wants to democratize and rejuvenate the Senate, it might be possible to delete that provision and amend it so that people under 30 years of age could be appointed.

He shall be a Canadian citizen. With that I agree. To be a Canadian citizen is important.

Mr. Grégoire: For Canadians.

Mr. Choquette: There is, in the citizenship act, and this should be pointed out to the hon. member for Villeneuve, a provision under which we are Canadian citizens and British subjects. Long live England. Long live the British people. I love them, I respect them, I admire them.

Today we have reached such a point of development and maturity that Canadian citizens, anyone of us from sea to sea, do not need to remain subject to another country, no matter how great, how noble or how powerful it may be. I say that honestly. I think that by Canadianizing all our institutions to the full, we are not offending the feelings of national unity which, I am sure, are shared by the majority of Canadian citizens.

Let us be truly and essentially Canadians everywhere, as regards facts and symbols.

Mr. Speaker, you saw how we respected the symbol of the British crown as represented by Her Majesty the Queen when she came to Canada. In the province of Quebec unfortunate incidents may have occurred, but such incidents were in no way a true reflection of the thinking in Quebec.

We respect the heads of state of all friendly countries. We particularly respect those of members of the commonwealth. But some day our constitutional evolution will be brought to completion, and to promote Canadianism is surely not to be against national unity. On the contrary, to see that this constitutional evolution reaches its ultimate goal shows a desire to do away with all ties of bondage or subjection to another country and thereby achieve true Canadianism. Such is the ideal of a young Canadian, and that is why I am happy about the new provision contained in my hon. friend's bill.

Let us be true Canadians, let us remain in the commonwealth with countries friendly to us, agreed. On the other hand, a minister is called honourable due to the fact that he is a member of the Canadian government but, in order to have the title of right honourable, a foreign government must confer it upon him, and this shows a certain subjection.

I say that it is in our interest to promote a Canadian ideal to the point where we shall no longer accept any sort of bondage.

One is not anti-British or anti-English because one hopes for such a thing. That is being pro Canadian. That is why I am happy about the provisions of Bill No. C-76. I am pro Canadian. I want us to fight for this ideal of Canadian unity and strength, which is the only dynamic means of discouraging any extremist movement at work in our country.

At times ideas like that may seem revolutionary to some people whose minds are receptive to such thoughts, but I feel that they do not reflect the true opinion of our young people who seek to assert themselves and who want the Senate to be truly Canadian. I am happy about that.

The Senate must be really Canadian; it must be reformed and it must protect our minorities. By transforming it into a binational institution, we will strengthen Canadian solidarity. I am not in favour of appointing senators according to their political affiliation. The hon. member for Villeneuve mentioned certain names and he was right. Right Hon. Mr. St. Laurent wanted to appoint Rev. Georges Henri Lévesque to the Senate, but the bishops were against it. Nevertheless, I am in favour of having clergymen appointed to the Senate.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order.

Mr. Ian Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all members of the house are prepared to commend the purpose of the bill, which is to remove certain anomalies relating to the appointment of senators. The explanatory notes accompanying Bill No. C-76 set forth that a system of 24 electoral divisions, together with a property qualification of $4,000 worth of real estate in the electoral district for which the senator is appointed, was established for the province of Quebec and was designed to protect the English Protestant minority located for the most part in the eastern townships.

Although in 1867 the English Protestant minority was in the majority in 12 of the counties mentioned in schedule 2 of the British North America Act, I believe that by 1900 they retained a majority in only four of the counties. In practice, over the last 60 years the provisions which the bill seeks to eliminate have not been followed. In the province of Quebec senators have tended to be appointed from the districts of Montreal and Quebec, with little regard to the original intention of section 22, which was to assure appointment from each of the 24 divisions mentioned in schedule A of chapter 1 of the consolidated statutes of Canada.

Although this act providing for the protection of English Protestant privileges in the province of Quebec has in fact passed into our folklore, there are certain other Quebec English Protestant positions which have remained inflexible and stagnant, to the disadvantage of all Quebeckers and Canada as a whole. I refer specifically to one of our better known organizations in the province of Quebec, the Quebec Protestant board of education. Every society has its sacred cows and the English Protestants of Quebec certainly have theirs. Foremost among them is the Protestant board of education and its French teaching division.

The Quebec education act provides that the lieutenant governor in council may appoint by proclamation a Roman Catholic central board of examiners and a Protestant central board of examiners for the examination of candidates of each of the two religious beliefs for teachers' diplomas. This means in effect that each of the teaching professions in the Roman Catholic and Protestant systems is restricted to people of that particular faith, with the result that in the province of Quebec people who are called upon to teach the French language in English Protestant schools are for the most part English speaking and are all Protestant.

This has resulted, Mr. Speaker, in what I believe is one of the saddest situations that we face today in the province of Quebec, which is found in the fact that a considerable percentage of our English speaking population in the province of Quebec is not able to converse in French. All of these people who have been raised in the province of Quebec have studied French from grade 3 for five days a week in most cases. Yet by the time they finish high school 90 per cent of them at least are unable to converse in the French language. I submit this is the fault of the Protestant board of education and their inability to adjust to changing circumstances, and to make progress in the face of what has become a closed shop so far as the teachers are concerned.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order; I hope the hon. member is going to indicate some relationship between his remarks and Bill No. C-76.

Mr. Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie): I will do this. The reason I have made these remarks is that the explanation

the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) gave for his bill was related to the English Protestant minority in the province of Quebec. I do not believe my remarks are completely irrelevant when I refer to certain English Protestant positions. The explanatory notes to the bill indicate that one of its purposes is to remove this anachronistic Protestant privilege which seems to have been created by sections 22 and 23 of the British North America Act. I thought it was fitting that I should refer to certain English Protestant sacred cows.

I have one further point I should like to mention, Mr. Speaker, if you will bear with me for a moment. The Montreal Protestant school board recently was absolved, with no excuse, by a royal commission of the province of Quebec, of any ill doing—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order; I feel that I am unable to see the relationship between the remarks which the hon. gentleman is making and Bill No. C-76. It may be true that there is a very dim relationship here, but I would advise the hon. member to recall that the bill before us deals with representation in the Senate from the different provinces, and the qualifications of senators.

Mr. Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie): We all agree that the Senate as a whole, and its framework, needs a complete re-examination. I feel the approach of the hon. member for Villeneuve is piecemeal. I am quite prepared to admit that perhaps his ideas are excellent and his objectives are excellent, but perhaps if we are going to consider the Senate we should consider not only these particular sections but all the sections of the British North America Act relative to the Senate.

Mr. Grégoire: Let us start with something.

Mr. Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie): I feel that these clauses 22 and 23, together with several other clauses of the British North America Act, were established because they reflected the demographic make-up of Canada in 1867. I think that today, when we are talking about changes in our constitution, changes in our approach to our national life, we should look clearly at the changes in our demography since 1867. We now have well over a million French Canadians living outside the province of Quebec, and yet our constitution is based on the demographic set-up of French Canadians living in the province of Quebec. I feel that this is something all Canadians are going to have to consider and to which they will have to pay a lot more attention in the future, especially in the months ahead when we are considering the report of the commission on biculturalism and bilingualism.

Earlier I saw fit to mention the English Protestant sacred cows in the province of Quebec because the hon. member for Villeneuve refers to the English Protestant position in his explanatory note. I just want to close by making one final point, that the Quebec royal commission's failure to criticize the Montreal Protestant school board—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order.

Mr. Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie): —is one of the most disgraceful whitewashes a royal commission has ever given the activities of that body.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order; will the hon. gentleman resume his seat, please? I have asked the hon. gentleman to remain within the confines of the bill before us. I would hope he would continue to do so.

Mr. Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie): I thank you for your patience, Mr. Speaker, and I will conclude my remarks.

Mr. J. E. Lloyd (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, in the three or four minutes that remain I should like to express my appreciation to the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) for bringing to the attention of the house some of the anachronisms that exist under our constitution. I think I can best do so by referring to the contribution a distinguished Haligonian has recently made to the literature of Canada on the subject of a new constitution for a great country. His name, by the way, is J. H. Ahearn, and he is writing on peace, order and good government. He says that it is time this battered hulk of the British North America Act and its amendments were replaced by a clear constitution made in Canada. In other words, the fundamentals should be sought out and propounded in a document accessible to all, including the youth of the nation; it should be a comprehensible document expressed in dignified and understandable language, so that the people will have a charter that they can know, understand and cherish.

I wish to thank the hon. member for Villeneuve for drawing attention to this anachronism in this legal work, in its application to our time and place. He has done a service to the house. I agree however with my colleague who has stated that this is but a very

[Mr. Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie).]

flimsy start. What we should do is address ourselves to an examination of what shall eventually be the reconfederation of Canada, to give Canadians a charter which is clear in its direction.

An hon. Member: Six o'clock.

Mr. Lloyd: I say, Mr. Speaker, that if in doing so the qualifications of senators need to be examined, if by subtracting that out of the anachronisms, we leave a residue of inadequacies, then it may be necessary to set some further qualifications for representation in this body, this sort of slow-down body, and on what might be accomplished.

May I call it six o'clock?

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: I had hoped that the new government house leader would be present now, so that I could offer him a kindly welcome to a position that is so dangerous, that of government house leader. He is the third government house leader in a year and a half, which establishes some sort of a precedent. May I ask the acting house leader what is the forecast of business for next week?

Mr. MacNaught: On Monday we will continue with the discussion of interim supply, and should it be secured on Monday, we will take up redistribution.

Mr. Knowles: I realize that everything that needs to be said was said this morning, but I wonder if we could not arrange, those of us who are here, for the last entry in today's *Hansard* to be a round of applause for Mr. Montgomery?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, November 2, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. CHOQUETTE—REPORTED SPEECH BY MEMBER FOR PORT ARTHUR

[*Translation*]

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, as a result of a speech delivered in Toronto by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher), in which he said that the province of Quebec was the greatest obstacle to a comprehensive vision and a common effort in federal politics. He said:

> The Quebec members of parliament tend to stand aloof from their colleagues speaking the other language and to consider their provincial capital as the real seat of power in Canada.

Such statements, Mr. Speaker, are unfair and unfortunate and cannot but deeply annoy the Quebec members in this house.

The main political concern of every Canadian citizen should be the greatness and prestige of Canada.

Quebec members are Canadians and are prompted by that national political ideal. Of course, they refuse to be assimilated because they are prompted by a true national ideal, which is based on their will to spread the influence of the French fact throughout Canada.

We categorically reject the statements made by the hon. member for Port Arthur and we declare that, contrary to the ideology preached by the Liberal federation of Quebec and its officers, the main political expression of French Canada is the Quebec members sitting in the House of Commons who wish to contribute to the greatness of their country, of which they are proud.

[*Text*]

TRADE

WHEAT—ANNOUNCEMENT OF SALE TO HUNGARY

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, today the Canadian wheat board announced in Winnipeg that it has negotiated a contract for the sale of approximately 100,000 long tons of wheat to Hungary. This sale, totalling about 3.7 million bushels, is for shipment during the period December through March, 1965, from Canadian east coast ports. This is the first sale made to Hungary under the provisions of the long term agreement signed on June 11, 1964, whereby Hungary had agreed to purchase 250,000 long tons of wheat during the three years of the agreement.

Payment for the wheat is to be made on the basis of ten per cent at time of shipment with the remaining balance to be paid in equal instalments, plus interest, at two, two and a half and three years respectively. These credit arrangements were authorized by the government of Canada under the provisions of the Export Credits Insurance Act. The buyer has the right to divert the wheat to any other eastern European socialist country.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

TABLING OF PRESS RELEASE ON CONCLUSION OF CONFERENCE

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table French and English copies of a release which was handed out last Friday after the two-day conference on Indian affairs. This release outlines the general opinion of those who took part in this conference, as representatives of the parties concerned.

[*Text*]

SPORTS

DESIGNATION OF LACROSSE AS CANADA'S NATIONAL GAME

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-134, respecting the national game of Canada (lacrosse).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Prittie: Mr. Speaker, if I read the preamble to the bill and the explanatory notes, both of which are very brief, I think this will explain the purpose of the bill. The preamble reads:

Questions

Whereas lacrosse has been played in Canada from time immemorial; whereas it has long been assumed that lacrosse is the national game of Canada; and whereas there is an attempt to have a lesser game adopted as the national game of Canada—

The explanatory notes read:

Lacrosse has been played in Canada for an unknown period of time, having been played by the original native Indian people. It is uniquely Canadian and was not imported to this country as all other games have been.

The purpose of this bill is to rectify what was probably an oversight on the part of the Fathers of Confederation who were so preoccupied with drafting sections 91 and 92 of the B.N.A. Act that the question of declaring a national game escaped their attention.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for New Westminster has seconded this bill not simply because he is my seatmate, but he represents the home city of the Salmonbellies, which team has won the Canadian senior lacrosse championship more times than any other team.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PROGRESS REPORT ON P.E.I. CAUSEWAY

Question No. 1,916—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. In the light of the public statement recently made by Mr. A. D. Margison and Associates Ltd. in reference to the building of the Prince Edward Island causeway, when does the government of Canada intend to issue a progress report on the project?

2. Have any other private companies expressed an interest in undertaking the construction of the causeway and, if so, what has been the government's reply?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. The government of Canada is considering a progress report on the Northumberland strait crossing project received from Northumberland Consultants Limited.

2. No other proposal has been received though an approach has been made from one company other than A. D. Margison and Associates Ltd.

P.E.I. CAUSEWAY—CONSTRUCTION WITH OR WITHOUT RAILS

Question No. 2,045—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Are any officials or agencies of the government of Canada making a study of the effects on freight movements to and from Prince Edward Island which might result from the construction of a causeway on which no railway tracks would be laid and, if so, when is such a study expected to be concluded?

2. What is now the estimated cost of constructing such a causeway between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick (a) without rails (b) with rails?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes, and expected to be concluded about January, 1965.

2. There is as yet no firm estimate.

FREIGHT CARS USING DETROIT AND TOLEDO SHORE LINE RAILWAY

Question No. 2,104—**Mr. Marcoux:**

1. Do Canadian National Railways freight cars to, or through, Toledo, Columbus, Cincinnati and Cleveland, Ohio, exclusively use the Detroit and Toledo Shore Line Railroad Company as far as, or from Detroit, Michigan, via the Grand Trunk Western Railroad and, if not, for what reason?

2. Do the freight cars of American companies destined for Toronto, Montreal, or Quebec city, from, or through, Toledo, Columbus, Cincinnati or Cleveland, Ohio, exclusively use the Detroit and Toledo Shore Line Railroad Company as far as, or from Detroit, Michigan, via the Grand Trunk Western Railroad and, if not, for what reason?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows:

1. Canadian National cars moving to or through the points mentioned do not move exclusively via the Detroit and Toledo Shore Line Railroad. There are competitive routes to all of these locations and the routing of freight traffic is governed by the shipper and/or consignee. However, where traffic originating on Canadian National lines is not specifically routed and where there is no difference in rates, the railway applies routing via the Detroit and Toledo Shore Line.

2. The answer is the same as in No. 1 above, except where routing is not specified by the shipper or consignee, it may be applied by the railway on which the traffic originates.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN STUDENTS VISITING CUBA

Question No. 2,117—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. What are the names, dates and places of birth of the 46 Canadian students, male and female, who recently left on a study trip to Cuba?

2. When did they leave?

3. When are they expected back?

4. Who is paying for the travelling and stay of these students abroad?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Canada has no regulations restricting the travel of Canadians to

Cuba. Canadian citizens are not required to inform the Department of External Affairs of their plans to visit that country or to supply to the department any personal particulars in connection with such plans.

2. The Cuban press reported the arrival in Cuba of the Canadian students on July 6, 1964.

3. Newspapers in both Cuba and Canada reported that they returned to Canada around the end of August, 1964.

4. Information published in Canada by the organizers of the tour indicated that the Cuban government would provide transportation and accommodation for the students.

[*Text*]

*TRANSPORTATION FOR PROVINCIAL PREMIERS TO QUEEN'S DEPARTURE

Question No. 2,122—**Mr. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke):**

1. Was official transportation made available to the provincial premiers on Tuesday, October 13, 1964, to take them to R.C.A.F. station, Uplands, to attend the departure of Her Majesty the Queen and, if not, for what reason?

2. Were one or more requests for official transportation made on behalf of the premiers and was this courtesy refused and, if so, for what reasons?

3. When the provincial premiers arrive in Ottawa to attend dominion-provincial conferences are they met by an official of the Department of Secretary of State to assure that all arrangements have been satisfactorily made for their convenience; on such occasions is official transportation made available to them at their place of arrival or is any official transportation provided for them during the course of the conferences; if not, for what reasons?

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the answer to part 1 of this question is no. It is not customary to provide official transportation for guests invited to departure ceremonies at R.C.A.F. station Uplands. In answer to part 2 of the question, no such requests were made. In answer to part 3 of the question, it has not been the practice to meet provincial premiers or to provide them with transportation upon their arrival in Ottawa to attend federal-provincial conferences. However, transportation is normally provided in connection with official functions during the conferences.

DETROIT AND TOLEDO SHORE LINE RAILWAY

Question No. 2,123—**Mr. Marcoux:**

Is the Detroit and Toledo Shore Line Railroad Company owned in part by the Grand Trunk Western Railroad Company, a subsidiary of Canadian National Railways, and, if so, what person or organization jointly and severally guaranteed the capital, the interest and the payments to the depreciation fund in connection with the first mortgage bonds of the Detroit and Toledo Shore Line Railroad Company, series A, 3¼ per cent, 30 year, to the amount of $2,708,000, due December 1, 1982?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows:

Yes, and the Grand Trunk Western and the New York, Chicago and St. Louis Railroad Company are jointly and severally liable as guarantors of the principal, interest and sinking fund payments with respect to $2,708,000 first mortgage 3¼ per cent 30 year series "A" bonds due December 1, 1982.

[*Text*]

COMMITTEE ON OCCURRENCE OF CONGENITAL ABNORMALITIES

Question No. 2,128—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. What are the specific terms of reference for the committee on occurrence of congenital abnormalities, of the dominion council of health?

2. What funds will be made available to this committee annually?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. The terms of reference for the committee on occurrence of congenital abnormalities, as set out in the minutes of the meeting of the dominion council of health in April 1963, are as follows:—

"The purpose of the committee shall be to advise the Department of National Health and Welfare, through the dominion council of health, on measures which when implemented will improve the quantity, quality and availability of information on the occurrence of congenital anomalies in Canada.

This information shall be pertinent to etiology, prevention, diagnosis and ultimately the treatment and rehabilitation of individuals so affected.

This information shall be of such a nature as to be of value for epidemiological studies, assessment of health service needs, as well as more fundamental research in the field of etiology.

The committee shall examine currently available information from various sources and shall determine its adequacy for the above purposes.

The committee may establish subcommittees to study particular aspects of the problem and may add to its membership, if necessary, for this purpose."

2. The transportation and living expenses of members in attending meetings of the committee are paid by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Questions

ST. CATHARINES CITY COUNCIL REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING MEDICAL CARE

Question No. 2,131—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Has the government received representations from the St. Catharines city council deploring the increase in P.S.I. insurance rates, and recommending the early implementation of a national medical health plan and, if so, what has been their reply?

Mr. Jack Davis (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): The Prime Minister has been notified by the deputy city clerk of the city of St. Catharines of a resolution passed by the city council on this matter, and the city authorities have been advised that their representations have been noted.

MOTEL DEVELOPMENT, BANFF TOWNSITE

Question No. 2,165—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. What was the content of the telegram received by the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources on July 10, 1964, from the Banff advisory council?

2. Has the Banff advisory council agreed that the motel to be located on the Bow river site might be located on another more suitable site in Banff to avoid commercialization of an area described in the Oberlander report as one of the most beautiful in the park?

3. What were the reasons advanced by the Banff townsite interim development committee in rejecting the proposal for a motel development on this site particularly lots 22A and 23A?

4. Is it possible to reconcile a commercial motel development with the boardwalk viewing bays and displays of water plants contemplated by the Oberlander report and, if so, in what manner?

5. Does the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources intend to establish a buffer zone to avoid commercial encroachment destructive to the presentation of the natural beauty of the park?

6. Are any other lots adjacent to the Bow View lodge site under lease to a private operator and, if so, is it the intention of the minister to permit further commercial development on these lots?

7. Is the land zoning policy in national parks contemplated by the minister in his statement of September 18, 1964, the same as that announced by the former government in January, 1963 and, if not, what changes have been made?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. The telegram of July 10, 1964 from the president of the Banff advisory council asked me to review the proposed construction of the Bow View motor lodge after considering their reasons for opposing the development.

2. At a meeting I recently attended, the Banff advisory council suggested that the developers be offered another site in exchange. However, the Bow river site was designated in the Oberlander report for tourist accommodation.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

3. The Banff townsite interim development committee initially opposed the proposal for a motel development on the basis of land use.

4. Yes, by the closing of Bow avenue to vehicular traffic as recommended by the Oberlander report.

5. Such buffer zone has already been provided by virtue of a 100 foot reservation along the shore of the river for use by the public as contained in the national parks general regulations.

6. Yes. Decisions concerning future commercial development will be made if and when applications are received.

7. There are no available records which would indicate that an official statement concerning the land zoning policy in national parks was made by the former government in January, 1963. If such announcement was made at that time it was not made in the House of Commons.

USE OF RECREATION HALL, P.E.I. NATIONAL PARK

Question No. 2,169—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. During the season 1964, what use was made of the recreation hall at the Cavendish section of the Prince Edward Island national park?

2. What employees carried out their duties in this building?

3. Was a register of visitors to the building maintained and, if so, what was the total number of visitors for the season 1964?

4. Who held the post of director of recreation during the 1964 season?

5. What recreational programs were carried on under the direction of the park personnel at the beach in Cavendish?

6. In 1964, were representations received from groups or individuals requesting the use of the recreational hall for directed group programs?

7. What was the nature of the replies given to such representations?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. The recreational building was used as a park information bureau.

2. An information bureau attendant was the only employee of the park who utilized the recreation hall in 1964.

3. Yes, during the period of July and August the information bureau attendant served 1,494 visitor groups.

4. No such position was on the establishment of this park during the 1964 season.

5. The park naturalist undertook evening programs at the Cavendish campground three evenings each week and the lifeguards at Cavendish main beach and campground beach provided swimming instructions for those visitors who were interested.

6. Yes, requests were made on three occasions for the use of this building.

7. In one instance, a theatre group performing at the new centennial theatre in Charlottetown and accommodated in the area, utilized the building for rehearsal purposes in order to avoid transportation difficulties to Charlottetown. In the other two instances, the Cavendish Beach development association used the building to serve refreshments to the R.C.A.F. Summerside band and the R.C.A. band, following band concerts in the park. These requests were all made by telephone and they were granted in view of the fact that they were made by responsible groups for a specific use.

UNIFORM FOOD GRADING SYSTEM

Question No. 2,192—**Mr. Mather:**

Is consideration being given to establishing a uniform food grading system throughout the country, such as Canada No. 1, No. 2, No. 3?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Yes. This matter is being studied to determine if it would be feasible and practicable to establish a uniform grading system. Uniform food grading is no doubt desirable, but the grades of many food products, which have been established for many years, are understood and recognized in international trading, thus they do not lend themselves readily to change.

STUDENT LOANS

Question No. 2,196—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. As of September 30, 1964, how many students in each province and territory have been granted Canada student loans?

2. In each province and territory, what was the total of loans granted as of September 30, 1964?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1. This information is not yet available.

2. This information is not yet available.

* SITE FOR QUEEN ELIZABETH OBSERVATORY

Question No. 2,198—**Mr. Basford:**

Has a site been selected for construction of the Queen Elizabeth II observatory and, if so, what is the site?

Hon. W. M. Benidickson (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard as to whether a site has been selected for construction of the Queen Elizabeth II observatory and, if so, what is the site, I should like to state that public announcement of the site was made on October 28, 1964. It will be located on Mount Kobau in the southern Okanagan valley in the province of British Columbia.

WIDENING OF TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY, WINNIPEG

Question No. 2,234—**Mr. Enns:**

1. Has the Minister of Transport been approached by Manitoba's minister of public works in connection with widening the trans-Canada highway to four lanes west from Winnipeg to the junction of No. 4 highway?

2. Is the unused Cabot line of the C.N.R. required for this project and will the Minister of Transport urge the board of transport commissioners to consider Manitoba's request to have the C.N.R.'s application to abandon this line, heard before the end of the year so that the said track can be lifted during the winter to allow an early start on the expressway next spring?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): 1. Yes, informally.

2. It has been indicated to the minister of public works of Manitoba that, if he makes a proposal in the name of the Manitoba government that the hearing on the abandonment of the Cabot line be proceeded with, the Minister of Transport would pass that request on to the board of transport commissioners with the suggestion that this particular application for abandonment be removed from the freeze.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

CLOSED CIVIL SERVICE COMPETITIONS

Question No. 2,082—**Mr. Francis:**

For each department, for each of the past three years (a) how many closed competitions were held (b) how many of these competitions were subject to appeal (c) in how many competitions was an appeal sustained (d) in how many appeals was the final result the promotion of a different candidate than originally recommended?

Return tabled.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

METHOD OF CONSULTATION RESPECTING CHANGES IN RELATIONSHIP

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 Citizenship and Immigration in reference to the press announcement about Indian affairs. Will the minister indicate what procedure the government has in mind, and his department in particular, to assure that each Indian band, reserve and tribe in this country will have a right to vote on whether they want a change in their relationship with the federal

government or its control over them, and when will the vote take place? In general, what is going to be done or what is envisaged to assure that the Indians will not be pushed around as chattels?

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked me this question which will allow me, after the federal-provincial conference which was held here Thursday and Friday last and which was quite successful, to give clarifying explanations concerning the consulting procedure which was agreed upon at that conference.

The first point upon which the participants to that conference agreed upon was the necessity of consulting the Indians concerning any program which might affect them in the future.

This consulting procedure will operate at two levels.

First, in every province of Canada there shall be held a conference to which all Indians will be invited so they can express their wishes and their suggestions on the very principle of extending provincial services to the Indians in every province. After this consultation and provided the Indians agree that such provincial services would be desirable, there shall be a second method consultation: the bands will be consulted. Every band in Canada or in every province will be consulted—that is, the councils of those bands will be consulted in order to ascertain if they wish to take advantage of a program to be established in a province, and every band which does not wish to take advantage of provincial services will be free to reject such services and, under those circumstances, the federal services will remain in force.

This double consultation will make the federal and provincial governments aware of the feelings and wishes of the Indian population concerning the provision of services by the provinces.

Third, it was decided at the conference to set up, in each province, a standing Indian affairs committee which will be consulted on any administrative question concerning the Indians. As can be seen, at the very first official meeting the federal government and the provinces have been able to agree on machinery which will ensure adequate consultations with the Indians in the future.

For the first time the Indians will feel that they will be the first to benefit from the steps taken by the government and that far from seeking to impose its decisions upon them, the latter wishes to approve steps which they themselves would consider advantageous.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: The minister has dealt at great length with the question of consultation. He stated that the band chief and the council of each band or reserve would be consulted. I want to ask him particularly whether there will be a vote held for each band as well as for each reserve, so the desires of the individual Indians will be ascertained?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, a vote will be taken by each band to determine whether its members wish to participate in any proposed program.

[*Text*]

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What is the view of the Canadian government with respect to the proposal put forward at the weekend conference that Indian reserves be incorporated into various school districts in order that a land tax may be imposed upon them for school purposes?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, we have had a lengthy discussion on the problem of incorporation of Indian reserves in any province where there are schools. No decision was arrived at on the matter. These discussions will be re-opened with each province and, of course, the Indians will be consulted in this regard; however, no decision has been reached concerning new taxes on Indian reserves, although many views were expressed on that subject.

[*Text*]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister say whether the government intends to seek parliamentary approval for any such changes as he contemplates, or does he consider that the governor in council now has the authority to deal with the matter?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we have to amend the existing legislation to conclude agreements with the provinces in connection with certain provincial services, because this is a situation which

has been prevailing for a number of years in several provinces and no new principle is involved in this matter.

[*Text*]

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell the house how the permanent Indian advisory committees he mentioned are to be set up? Who is going to take the initiative to establish them?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, we shall take the initiative, in co-operation with the provinces, of establishing these provincial advisory councils which might prove very valuable for the federal government and any provincial government planning to extend these services to the Indians.

[*Text*]

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In addition to these provincial consultative committees is the minister giving any thought to the setting up of a federal consultative committee with some idea of having a co-ordinated program? Second, will the minister specify what are the particular provincial services which he is going to suggest to these meetings might be made available to them?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, we shall discuss with each province in particular what services it would be advisable to extend to the Indians. These can vary and include social welfare, education, health services as well as community development.

There is no precise program for the country as a whole and it is only following negotiations with the provinces that we shall be in a position to establish the categories of services some provinces are ready to offer immediately to the Indians; the other services may be extended at a later date.

In reply to the question asked by the hon. member with regard to Indian committees, I must say that these provincial committees will be under a general Indian committee and there will be joint advisory committees within the provinces to complete the matter.

[*Text*]

Mr. Howard: My question is really a reiteration of the first supplementary I asked, which I think the minister did not fully understand or, if he did, did not answer. I asked what was the position of the Canadian government with respect to the proposal that Indian reservations or reserves be incorporated into the various school districts in order that they may be taxed for school purposes. What is the position of the government with respect to that proposal, which emanated at least from the province of Quebec?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows as well as everybody else that Indian property on reserves is, under the act itself and under the powers granted by the B.N.A. Act, exempt of any possibility of taxation at the provincial level as well as at the municipal level. Therefore, I do not want to change this undeniable right of the Indians to enjoy tax exemptions on all property they own on their reserves.

On the other hand, we know that certain Indian property outside the reserve, is subject to certain provincial taxes, but the right to tax exemption on property within the reserve is something sacred, protected by the constitution itself.

[*Text*]

Mr. Howard: No, it isn't.

[*Later:*]

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, for clarification purposes. Did I understand him to say that this vote that will be held on individual Indian reservations will be a vote of all the rank and file, and not just a vote of the band?

Mr. Pickersgill: What is the difference?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is the proper place to give the detailed technique of each Indian council for the consultation method.

However, the principle is established that it will be a consultation of each band, and the council and the members will decide the methods of those consultations. The essential thing is that the council and the band be consulted with relation to the extension of services.

[*Text*]

Mr. Hamilton: I still have not the clarification for which I asked, Mr. Speaker. When I mentioned bands, I assume there is a council of each band. Is the vote going to be held just among the band council, or is it the rank and file who are going to have a chance to vote?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I know that each band possesses a structure whereby they determine their own problems. I do not think this is the place or the time for the minister to determine the way this consultation will take place. The essential thing is that the band is consulted. It is up to the Indians to decide whether this consultation should take place by means of the council or whether the council should seek the advice of the members themselves, and to do so in a democratic way.

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question.

Will the minister require a 95 to 98 per cent majority before accepting the decisions?

[*Text*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

DELAY IN APPROVAL OF WINTER WORKS PROGRAMS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Labour. This might be a question for the order paper, but in view of the fact that winter works projects start today, and that several municipalities have yet to receive the required authorization to proceed with their plans, I would like to ask the minister to give us an answer tomorrow.

If there is delay, will the minister take the necessary steps to allow these municipal winter works to be undertaken this week, where they have been accepted by the provinces? Moreover, will the department's approval be retroactive and, is the number of projects that had been approved on November 1, 1964 the same as on November 1 of last year?

[*Text*]

PRESS RELEASES ON WINTER WORKS IN ENGLISH ONLY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Labour.

Following complaints received by several weeklies of the province of Quebec to the effect that the press releases from the Department of Labour on winter works and other matters are received only in English, and after finding that those releases come to my office both in English and in French—for which I thank the minister—will the minister investigate in his department to determine why the newspapers of the province of Quebec receive those press releases only in English?

Moreover, will he correct that mistake?

[*Text*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to make inquiries.

REQUEST THAT PENDING LEGISLATION BE CONSIDERED BY HOUSE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Since further and numerous recommendations made over the week end indicate that the trucking industry is far from assured about Bill No. C-126, I wonder whether the minister has given further consideration to referring the legislation so the industry can make their representations before an all party committee of the house, rather than considering the bill in committee of the whole house? Has the minister given further consideration to this?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): We are giving no further consideration to this point, which I dealt with last week.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether he would give consideration to the point raised by the hon. member for Regina City. The truckers in general want to be given an opportunity of placing their views—and they seem to be thoughtful views—before the members of the house. Would the minister in replying also say whether the wheat pools in western Canada have made representations as to the changes which they believe should be made in the legislation as presently formulated, to the end that their industry will not suffer in consequence?

Mr. MacEachen: Of course, Mr. Speaker, the industries which have been mentioned have already made representations and are continuing to make representations, and I am sure that each of us individually would be glad to hear their views with respect to this important bill. I have already given consideration to the question of sending the bill to a committee, but taking into account all the circumstances I did not feel that it

was necessary. However, if this is a matter which requires further consideration I will be glad to give it such further consideration.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PARTICIPATION BY CANADIAN STUDENTS IN U.S. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Could he tell the house whether government authorities have been informed of the action taken by 15 students from McGill University, in Montreal, who will go tomorrow to the state of Vermont in order to work for the democrat candidate, Mr. L. B. Johnson?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of this.

INDIA—POSSIBLE USE OF CANADIAN BUILT REACTOR TO PRODUCE NUCLEAR BOMB

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. There have been some recent statements in the press as to the possibility of India using the reactor, which was contributed by Canada through the Colombo plan, for the production of a nuclear bomb, perhaps in response to the explosion of a nuclear bomb by the Chinese communists. Can the minister tell the house whether there is anything in these reports?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. friend for giving me notice of this question. My attention has been drawn to these press reports. As regards the policy of the Indian government in this matter, I think the record is clear. Prior to the Chinese explosion, and subsequently in the face of this event, the prime minister of India stated that India is maintaining its policy of not manufacturing atomic weapons. I regard this declaration as a positive contribution to world peace.

In so far as the Canada-India reactor is concerned, under an agreement concluded with India in April, 1956 and tabled in this house on May 9, 1956, the government of India gave an unconditional undertaking to use it for peaceful purposes only. The relevant article of the agreement reads as follows:

> The government of India will ensure that the reactor and any products resulting from its use will be employed for peaceful purposes only.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON MEETING OF PARTY LEADERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Léon Balcer (Three Rivers): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister in a position to report on this morning's meeting with the various party leaders, and could he tell us of the proposals and the progress that have been made?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we had an interesting and I think useful exchange of views on the procedure that might be followed during the remainder of the autumn, as a result of which, Mr. Speaker, we agreed to meet again later in the week.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Jean-Pierre Côté (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister say whether there was a certain agreement made this morning, at the meeting of the leaders of the parties, that they could not disclose to their seatmates the results of the meeting?

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO INCLUDE COOPERAGE TRADE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I should also like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that local coopers or barrel makers in Nova Scotia have been threatened with the necessity of repaying unemployment insurance benefits received during periods of unemployment since 1959, will the minister take the necessary steps to classify the cooperage trade as insurable under the Unemployment Insurance Act?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): I will be glad to take this question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

PENSIONS

CANADA PLAN—REQUEST FOR EARLY CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as government house leader. Pending the making of an arrangement among the party leaders regarding the question of the flag, may I ask the government house leader whether the commitment that the Canada pension plan is next in priority to interim supply still stands. Can he also say whether a decision has been made to give one day this week to the resolution preceding the Canada pension plan, so that we can get the bill?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I believe the commitment was as to the resolution stage of the pension plan, and it still stands exactly as made.

Mr. Knowles: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the terms in which that commitment was made, can the minister say whether we will have that one day this week?

Mr. McIlraith: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give that answer. The answer I gave when the question was asked originally made it clear, I think, that interim supply would have to take priority. The hon. member's remarks during the last part of the sitting that day contained an implication that the interim supply debate would terminate on a certain date in any event, and invited the government to take one day out of the interim supply discussion for the resolution stage of the pension plan. I said that the government would give that consideration; but I also made it clear that I did not necessarily accept the implication contained in the argument put forward. That is still the position; there has been no further decision taken on the matter.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

PINE POINT RAILWAY—COMPLETION OF TRACK LAYING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Could the minister advise the house whether it is correct that the C.N.R. has completed the laying of track on the Great Slave lake railway from Peace River to Pine Point and Hay River, and that the date of completion is approximately 12 months ahead of schedule?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was good enough to give me notice, through my office, of this question. As this is the first time a railway has ever gone into the territory I do not think we should regard it as a local matter; therefore I am very happy to answer the question by saying that the management of the C.N.R. advise that at the present time it is anticipated that track laying will be completed about 12 months ahead of schedule. This has been possible, I am informed, because working conditions turned out to be exceptionally favourable. I am also very happy to be able to add that the work, by being expedited, will enable the mining company to bring in heavy equipment to open the mine.

Mr. Baldwin: I have a supplementary question for the minister, Mr. Speaker. If this is the case, would the government give consideration to making use of the time and money, I hope, so saved—mainly by adopting the proper route for building the railroad—in building further extensions of the railway for northern development?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman is in a bit of a hurry.

TRANSPORT

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—USE OF ICEBREAKERS TO CLEAR CHANNEL

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer two questions that were put to me on Friday, which I took as notice. One was asked by the hon. member for Longueuil, as follows:

> Inasmuch as the breakwater now being built near Champlain bridge will not be completed before the next spring break-up, is the Minister of Transport considering the possibility of using icebreakers to keep the St. Lawrence river ice free this coming winter, so the islands where the world fair is to be located may be protected?

The best answer I am able to give to this technical question—the hon. member will appreciate that I am not an engineer—is that to avoid endangering the world fair works, especially because of the narrowing of the river downstream by the temporary cofferdams protecting the construction of the Boucherville tunnel and bridge, and to protect

these cofferdams themselves, an extra icebreaker was assigned last year to flood prevention duties as required. No change in the amount or nature of icebreaker operations is required or contemplated for the coming winter.

I think that might also be regarded as a short answer to the question asked by my hon. friend from Halifax, but there were certain implications in my hon. friend's question which I think would make a long answer out of order, sir. Therefore I would ask my hon. friend from Halifax whether he would agree that we discuss this matter further when my estimates come up again.

Mr. Regan: It will be a pleasure.

IMMIGRATION

STATEMENT ON REPORTED PRESENCE IN CANADA OF U.S. NAZI LEADER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in response to a question by the hon. member for Skeena on Friday, October 30 the Prime Minister indicated that inquiries would be made concerning the alleged presence in Canada last week of George Lincoln Rockwell. These inquiries have been completed. It would be well to first explain that the television program involving this individual did not originate in Canada but rather was filmed in the United States some little time ago.

As to the possibility that Rockwell was in Vancouver for other purposes within the last week or so, a check has been made of all ports of entry in the vicinity and there is no indication of Rockwell having been allowed entry. I can assure the house that all immigration officers are fully aware of this man's personal particulars. Furthermore, a check was made at the Georgia hotel in Vancouver where Rockwell was alleged to have been staying, and there is no record of his having been registered there. Also, employees of the hotel were unable to identify Rockwell as a person whom they had seen in the hotel.

As a result of all these inquiries I am satisfied that it is highly unlikely that this man entered Canada as alleged.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether it is the fact that Mr. Rockwell is barred from entry into Canada?

Mr. Tremblay: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

SUGGESTED HONOUR FOR LATE SUPERINTENDENT LARSEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister relating to the news last week that Superintendent Larsen of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police had passed away in Vancouver. I should like to know whether the government would give consideration to honouring Superintendent Larsen by perhaps naming one of the coastguard ships or perhaps an Arctic location after him. I do not know whether that has been done in the past, but this man made a very great contribution to the geography of this country, and I think this question should be given consideration.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I will be very glad to give consideration to this interesting suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO EXPANSION OF MEDICAL TRAINING FACILITIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he is now in a position to answer the question I asked him last Friday, which was:

> Do the government plan to contribute financially to the recently announced expansion of medical, dental and nursing training facilities in Ontario, and in particular will they consider contributing the 50 per cent recommended by the Hall commission report?

Mr. Speaker: Unless the Prime Minister wishes to answer, this is certainly a question for the order paper.

FINANCE

INTEREST RATE ON LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

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

Regarding the investigation being conducted by the GATT committee—

Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Finance should also be asked whether he paid the electricity bill.

I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether, following the investigation conducted by the GATT committee about the necessity

for Great Britain to charge an additional 15 per cent duty on imports, the Bank of Canada should not divulge to that committee the amount of the loan granted to Great Britain and the rate of interest charged?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): In reply to the first question, Mr. Speaker, I think if interim supply were passed in reasonable time we could see that the electricity bills are paid. Even if we cannot "see" they are, we would take steps to undertake that they are paid on time. With regard to the second question, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the two matters are quite unrelated.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance. Following the announcement to the effect that the Bank of Canada had granted a loan to Great Britain at a low rate of interest, did some Canadian provinces apply to the Bank of Canada for similar loans?

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: I wish to correct the preamble to that question, Mr. Speaker. I said nothing about a small rate of interest. I said I was not prepared to disclose the rate of interest but that it approximated the market rates. The answer to my hon. friend's question is no.

SUPPLY

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

INTERIM SUPPLY

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $740,710,974.77, being the aggregate of

(a) two twelfths of that total of all of the items to be voted in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965, as reduced, except finance item 15, mines and technical surveys item 25, national research council item 10, and transport items 15 and 25 for which the proportion is one twelfth and atomic energy item 5, external affairs item 20, forestry item 25 and legislation item 20 for which no proportion is being released, $651,829,576.84;

(b) an additional two twelfths of the amount of public works item 70 (schedule A), of the said main estimates, $666,666.67;

(c) an additional one twelfth of the amount of fisheries items 5 and 10, legislation item 5, mines and technical surveys item 70, post office item 1 and public works item 40 (schedule B), of the said main estimates, $20,263,800.00;

(d) two twelfths of all of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (A), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, except national defence item 56a, and loans, investments and advances items L12a, L17a and L37a for which no proportion is being released, $20,612,522.50;

(e) an additional two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103a (schedule C), of the said supplementary estimates (A), $872,966.67;

(f) nine twelfths of the total of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (B), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, $46,215,108.75;

(g) two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103b (schedule D), of the said supplementary estimates (B), $250,333.34;

be granted to Her Majesty on account of the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965.

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, at five o'clock on Friday I was briefly pointing out to the committee the undesirable situation in which the Yukon and Northwest Territories find themselves at present by not having full representation in parliament. I had made the point that although for the first time since 1962 the Canadian northland had members of parliament, the situation had not yet been corrected in terms of representation in the other place. I had made the point that at the present time there are in excess of 40,000 Canadian citizens living north of the 60th parallel, yet neither the Yukon nor the Northwest Territories had been allowed representation in the other place. I believe I made the point that even though there may be historical reasons, a province such as Prince Edward Island with a population of 107,000 had four senatorial representatives in parliament. It seems to me that the political development of our northern areas warrants this move.

One need only think back to last year, when we had legislation in this chamber intended to divide the Northwest Territories into two separate parts. Presumably that was going to be a step in the political evolution of that area. As another example of just how unsure of itself this government is, I point out that that proposed legislation was sent to a committee, and we have heard nothing about it since. Nor has the government reintroduced that measure.

Mr. Chairman, I mention these facts because I intend to give notice that at the time the formula for repatriating the constitution is brought before the house I will expect the government to have some sort of plan ready along the lines I have mentioned. It seems to me this would be the logical course of development, not only in terms of the political evolution of the Northwest Territories but also to ensure that all Canada is fully represented in parliament. This can

only be done if the Yukon and Northwest Territories are allowed representation in the other place.

I do not know what answer the government can give at the present time for overlooking this matter during the last 18 months, nor am I particularly interested in that answer. I hope all hon. members of this house will support me when I say that in a few months' time it will be completely unacceptable to us as Canadians to have the government bring in a formula for amending the constitution without first having taken the steps necessary to give the Yukon and Northwest Territories full representation in parliament.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a constitutional lawyer, but I did listen very carefully to the debate on Friday, and it seems to me that at the present time the federal government has the authority to create a province or provinces in the Canadian northland. If the proposed formula is adopted then it will require two thirds of the provinces, including either Quebec or Ontario, before the federal authority can create a new province. Speaking as the member for the Northwest Territories I can assure this committee that for several reasons the implications of such a formula are frightening. They are frightening because the present federal government has never shown any interest in the north country. Certainly that has caused a great deal of distrust and will remain the source of distrust as long as the present Minister of Finance holds that portfolio. One need only think back a few years, when that individual headed a royal commission on Canadian economic prospects, and stated in effect that if people living in the maritimes could not make a go of it they should move to Toronto. In other words his solution to the problems facing people who live in depressed areas is for those people to move out. He certainly wrote off that 60 per cent of Canada which lies north of the 55th parallel, as having any real future as far as our economy is concerned.

If the Northwest Territories and the Yukon territory are to be dependent upon the whim of one province, let us say Quebec, for example, before they are allowed full economic and political status, they will find themselves in an impossible position. If one thinks back a few months he will realize that the present government made great political capital everywhere in the southern part of this country by accusing the previous administration of throwing away thousands of dollars in the northland. There is no doubt in my mind that the Liberal government won hundreds of thousands of votes in the southern area of Canada by writing off the Yukon and Northwest Territories. That is a frightening situation. My colleague the hon. member for Yukon is unavoidably absent today, but I can assure this committee that he also is alarmed by this situation.

In the last two days we have seen examples of what can happen to us if we become dependent upon the good graces of the other provinces in Canada. For example, one can easily imagine the difficulties we might encounter if we had to obtain the approval of the province of Quebec before provinces could be created out of either the Yukon or Northwest Territories; and that would be the situation should the suggested formula be adopted. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that the province of Quebec has expressed a great deal of interest in the offshore islands which lie immediately adjacent to the coast of that province. One can easily envisage the sort of blackmail position in which we could find ourselves in the Northwest Territories if we were seeking full political status as a province, having to obtain concurrence of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Chairman, I am not discussing the merits of the suggestion that the offshore islands should belong to Quebec.

The Chairman: Order, please. Perhaps I will be allowed to bring to the attention of hon. members that there are many conversations being carried on in this chamber, and that it is very difficult to follow the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. Rhéaume: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the benefit of those who did not hear what I said because of a preoccupation with a little caucus across the way, I suggested that the offshore islands off the coast of Quebec, which at the present time are considered a part of the Northwest Territories, might well for administrative purposes, or for all purposes, belong to the province of Quebec.

Mr. Grégoire: Hear, hear.

Mr. Rhéaume: Indeed, I personally support such a suggestion, because I think it would make geographic sense. As hon. members may realize, the problem exists because when the boundaries of the Northwest Territories were being determined they were not determined in terms of co-ordinates or metes and bounds, but in terms of high water marks. When one considers the straits which

separate Baffin land from Quebec and realizes that at times and in places the tide there is in excess of 60 feet, he can see what happens when the tide goes out. All the land that is exposed belongs to the Northwest Territories. This is an illogical situation and should be corrected. I know my hon. friend from Lapointe has pressed for this before, but I am merely using this as an example of the sort of problem that would occur should it be necessary for the federal government to obtain the consent of two thirds of the provinces, including either Quebec or Ontario, in order to create a new province in the northland.

There is one other current problem worthy of mention in this context. Only a few weeks ago the premier of British Columbia expressed a new found interest in annexing the Yukon territory and part of Mackenzie territory. That was not a laughing matter, or considered as a joke. Nor was it a display of the bad manners of the newly rich by Mr. Bennett.

It was not just an attempt on his part to become prime minister by buying up Canada even though we know he already has $100 million worth of Quebec in his pocket. It was a serious move on his part to take over a large section of Canada. He too recognizes the policy and planning vacuum that has existed in the Northwest Territories since the change of government. He knows that nothing new has been initiated by the Liberal government in the last two years. He knows that the people of the Yukon and Mackenzie districts are discontented because of the neglect they have experienced once again at the hands of a Liberal government.

If the premier of British Columbia had said two years ago that he wanted to take over the Yukon and part of the Northwest Territories he would have been laughed at throughout the country, and to the people who live in the territories it would have been unthinkable. However, today in both the Yukon and the Mackenzie districts there are people who are seriously pondering the offer made by Premier Bennett. They are doing so because they have come to the conclusion that the present federal government has no interest in developing the area and has not retained the impetus initiated by the previous administration, and therefore they had better give serious consideration to the offer made by the premier of British Columbia.

The people who live in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories do not intend to be pawns in federal-provincial conferences in the future. Why should our status from the point of view of being provinces be dependent upon the acquisitiveness of various provincial premiers who recognize that in Ottawa at the present time there is a weak federal leader and that this is an appropriate time for them to swoop in because they know that all their demands will be met? We in the territories are most alarmed over the policy followed by the present government of yielding to whatever pressures are exerted. We are alarmed because we are totally dependant on the federal authority for the time being, and if at the bargaining table the only thing the federal government is going to consider is political strength you can imagine how we in the north feel with only one lonesome member from the Yukon and another from the Northwest Territories. Only two federal seats are at stake, and if the government intends to follow a policy of responding only to political pressure related to the distribution of seats you can imagine our alarm and concern with regard to the situation.

The Chairman: Order. I have to interrupt the hon. member to bring to his attention that his time has expired, unless he has the committee's permission to continue.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

An hon. Member: No.

The Chairman: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Winkler: Who said no?

The Chairman: Order, please. Shall the resolution carry? The hon. member for Edmonton West.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, it is always instructive to listen to hon. members across the floor, who as long as they are speaking think the house should pay the closest attention to their words, but when members in other parts of the house dare to get up to speak there is the clucking of hens—

Mr. Winkler: The quacking of ducks.

Mr. Lambert: —or there are shouts of "filibuster" or what have you. It seems that, as in the past, divine right is again vested in the Liberal party, and they believe they are the only people with any knowledge or intelligence. They seem to subscribe to the doctrine of infallibility. I do not know whether that would apply to them in all respects, but certainly in matters political they believe they are infallible.

The subject we are discussing this afternoon and which was discussed on Friday is one that was raised by members on this side at the first opportunity because of certain events that occurred in mid October. I make no apology at all for participating in the debate on the question of the amendment of the constitution. I make no pretence whatsoever of being a constitutional expert, but in the light of the comments that are being made with greater and greater frequency throughout the country I must say it is incumbent upon us to raise questions about these highly important events which took place in mid October.

We all know that Her Majesty was here prior to the 15th of October, and that on that particular day a communiqué was issued by the federal government and the provincial premiers dealing with the matter of the amendment and patriation of the constitution. Stripped of its aura of self satisfaction the communiqué was more than ever unenlightening. Therefore we must ask questions in regard to this matter.

There was an attempt the other day by the Minister of Transport to say that we were wrong in raising these questions. He said that the hon. member for Bow River, the hon. member for Peace River and the hon. member for Queens were wrong in posing questions about this matter because the formula, he claimed, was the self-same formula as in 1961, with no changes. This I question. I have very great reservations with regard to the equality of positions as between 1961 and now. Even if there is a similarity with 1961 in certain respects, and there is, it must be remembered that the proposals were made within a conference and that while certain details of the negotiations did get out, no document was deposited in the house to indicate any agreement. Actually we are being presented with a *fait accompli.*

In that regard I would refer to a story under the byline of Anthony Westell which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of October 22. I disagree entirely with Mr. Westell's conclusion in his last paragraph. He is expressing his opinion and I disagree with it, but I will say he is factually correct when he says that within the last two years there has arisen what might be called a form of superparliament, if one can really use the word "parliament" with regard to dominion-provincial conferences. A fourth level of government has crept into the picture, because there have been any number of dominion-provincial conferences at which major agreements were made which were then presented to the house as something already binding upon the house because the government was bound.

We have yet to discuss the implications, in regard to the pension plan, of the step taken last April. It was a very quiet, under the table, cloak and dagger sort of proposition. Ministers at Quebec were going in the back door while other ministers were going out the front door, neither knowing that the others were present. Provinces were not being consulted beforehand and were being presented with agreements to such an extent that Premier Robarts has now said we must bring a halt to this type of procedure.

In so far as this parliament is concerned, we are now being presented with an agreement, and gracious only knows what would be the implications if this parliament were not to accept this agreement between the federal government and the provinces or were to amend it in some major particular. I must say that I believe it is all right to consult on matters of this kind, but the hands of this parliament must not be bound. I think it is high time hon. members raised this question. Quoting one paragraph from the article by Mr. Westell:

> Federal-provincial conferences are becoming the real seats of power—the places at which national policies are set in private to guide 11 governments. But there is no legislature or equivalent authority and prestige to check and balance this exercise of executive power.

Then there is this paragraph with which I disagree entirely:

> There may have been a time when the federal parliament could have filled this role. But not the present parliament, which is low in public esteem and in which most members seem to have little concept of their changed position.

I disagree with that because I think hon. members, at least in the opposition, are exercised as I know other hon. members like the hon. member for Greenwood are exercised. I am sure there are many hon. members on the government side, if we hear correctly about some of their discussions in caucus, who are also very concerned about this. Now that this agreement of October 15 will be coming before us, it is fundamentally important that we must raise questions which cannot be discussed and analysed on short notice. We need the advice of constitutional experts who will examine all the implications of this proposed agreement. In due course—I do not know when the Prime Minister stated this

proposal would come before us for discussion—we must be fully prepared to analyse the problem.

In his remarks on Friday afternoon the hon. member for Bow River—I have not got the page of *Hansard* immediately before me —made some reference to Canada being the first nation in the whole British commonwealth to enjoy full religious liberty. I was astounded to see that usual symbol in *Hansard*, "Some hon. members, oh, oh.", being an indication that a number of members did not believe him. Obviously this exclamation came from across the floor.

I would point out to hon. gentlemen, and this is a very brief run through of history, that if we look back to pre-1763, the inhabitants of Canada, whether they were Roman Catholic or Huguenot, enjoyed the same rights of freedom of worship and security of properties. With the treaty of Paris in 1763 these same rights were guaranteed to Roman Catholics. They were confirmed by the Quebec Act in 1791, and they were extended to the new province of Upper Canada with the act of union just a few years later.

In the year following, with the passage of the Roman Catholic emancipation bill, all disabilities for Roman Catholics were removed in the remaining portions of Canada, that is the maritime provinces. This is a recognized fact that is all too frequently forgotten. Under the aegis of Westminster we have enjoyed in this country full religious liberty without the disabilities that applied for so many years even in Britain. I hope, therefore, that hon. members will correct their estimation of the remarks made by the hon. member for Bow River in the early part of his speech on Friday afternoon.

Let us look at the proposed amendment to the constitution. Briefly, if we look at the categories under the formula we find there is, first of all, the 100 per cent consent of the provinces for the federal parliament to amend provisions of the constitution relating to (a) the powers of the legislature of a province to make laws; (b) the rights or privileges guaranteed or secured by the constitution of Canada to the legislature or government of a province; (c) the assets or properties of a province; (d) the use of the English or French language and, further, the senatorial floor or representation of a province in the House of Commons. Almost in the same category is the right of a province to deal with education, except that Newfoundland is in a class by itself. This province cannot have anything to say about education generally, and no other provinces can have anything to say about education in the province of Newfoundland. This is a result of the confederation act of 1949.

There is another category in which the amendment would affect one or more but not all the provinces, and in this case only those affected would have to give their consent. Almost all the remaining amendments must be concurred in by legislatures of at least two thirds of the provinces representing at least 50 per cent of the population of Canada according to the latest general census. We know that there are entrenched areas and that they are of long standing. It is agreed also that if you have amendments that affect only certain provinces, then those provinces should consent. This has been accepted. What I am concerned about is this two thirds of the provinces representing 50 per cent of the population.

It was indicated the other day that this was not the essence of the formula of 1961. In 1961 there was no proposal to do away with section 91(1) which had been passed in 1949. Yet if we examine the proposal I put it to hon. members that it goes much further, because the first numbered paragraph of the proposed constitution of Canada amendment act reads as follows:

> Subject to this part, the parliament of Canada may make laws repealing, amending or re-enacting any provision of the constitution of Canada.

In other words that is the paragraph granting the maximum of power. Then all the exceptions follow, and they are legion. Under paragraph 2 we have seen that the four points, the entrenched clauses, are included in section 2, and section 3 deals with the case of "less than all of the provinces," and with the case where the affected provinces must all give their consent. Section 4 deals with education, but section 5 says this:

> No law made under the authority of this part,

The language is clear and unequivocal.

> —affecting any provision of the constitution of Canada not coming within sections 2, 3 or 4—

Which I have already dealt with.

> —of this act shall come into force unless it is concurred in by the legislatures of at least two thirds of the provinces representing at least 50 per cent of the population of Canada according to the latest general census.

In other words no amendments, unless covered by those categories enunciated in sections 2, 3 and 4, may come into force unless there is the concurrence of at least two thirds of the provinces in number representing 50 per cent of the population.

Then paragraph 6 says:

Notwithstanding anything in the constitution of Canada the parliament of Canada may exclusively make laws from time to time amending the constitution of Canada in relation to the executive government of Canada and the Senate and the House of Commons—

In case anyone has any illusions as to how much this means, he has only to turn to the British North America Act where it will be found that the executive government of Canada is covered by sections 9 to 16 of that act, and even there some seven—no, eight—limitations have been introduced to this exclusive right of jurisdiction, and they are in part those that were included previously in section 91(1).

I suppose this is the *quid pro quo*, but frankly we in the parliament of Canada under these proposals are ceding to the provinces far more extensive rights than they previously had. As I pointed out the other night in the debate on the redistribution bill this house had a right to determine its composition, but now we will have to seek the approval of the provinces if we are to change the proportionate representation of any province in this house. In other words, if it were necessary to cushion the effects of redistribution in any particular province, or if it were necessary to grant a province more seats than it would be entitled to under the application of the mathematical formula contained in section 51 of the B.N.A. Act, we would have to obtain the consent of two thirds of the provinces to do this.

If this is to be the case, then I can assure hon. members there will be a great deal of jockeying and horse trading at any dominion-provincial conference at which the question of the representation of a province in the House of Commons comes up for discussion and settlement. In many ways this may make mockery of the principles of redistribution if one is to follow the logic and principle of the act which is now before us.

Next we come to the delegation of legislative authority under the proposed section, 94(A). One would have thought there would have been a free exchange in this regard, but this is not the case; because the federal government will be able to legislate in four sectors of provincial jurisdiction, those covered in subsections 6, 10, 13 and 16 of section 92; subsection 6 covering the establishment and maintenance of public and reformatory prisons in and for the provinces, subsection 10 having to do with local works and undertakings, subsection 13 with property and civil rights, and subsection 16 with generally all matters of a merely local or private nature in a province.

This right of the federal government to legislate in provincial sectors will come about only if the government of Canada has consulted with all provinces—

—and the enactment of the statute is of concern to fewer than four of the provinces and the provinces so declared by the parliament of Canada to be concerned have under the authority of their legislatures consented to the enactment of such a statute.

In addition to that, in other cases we must have the consent of at least four of the provinces to the operation of such a statute. Then we get the reverse side of the coin, and the provinces will now be able to legislate—

—in relation to any matter coming within the legislative jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada.

However, there is a provision that:

Prior to the enactment thereof the parliament of Canada has consented to the enactment of such a statute by the legislature of that province, and

A similar statute has under the authority of subsection (3) of this section been enacted by the legislatures of at least three other provinces.

In other words the consent of four provinces and of the federal government will entitle those four provinces to legislate in a federal field. As has been questioned by certain editorial writers, what stand would the federal government take if, say, the four most populous and wealthiest provinces decided they wanted to invade the fields of trade and commerce or customs or immigration? We have had attempts by some of the provinces in the past to do this. But if Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia and Alberta decided among themselves that they would make a certain demand on the federal government and wished to enter into the field of immigration, for example, how could the federal government resist this pressure? Up to the present time it has been clear that any such attempt could be resisted either across a bargaining table or in the courts, in that it is unconstitutional; but if these amendments go through, this argument goes by the board. Only then could the political strength of the federal government withstand such concerted pressure from four provinces.

I am pointing this out as one of the prices that we may be asked to pay. This house is going to be asked to accept this constitutional amendment; the people of Canada are going to be asked to accept it. But what is the price? Is the achievement to be merely the one that no longer will we have to go to Westminster to amend our constitution; that

we can take pride in the fact that we are now grown up and can amend our constitution by ourselves? After all, there has never been any opposition from Westminster. That would certainly be a step in constitutional evolution; but what is the price we are going to be asked to pay for it? These are the questions I want to ask. It is too bad that the Minister of Justice is not here, and I trust he will note these questions. What price has been exacted by the provinces in order to get their unanimous consent? Why did the provinces of Saskatchewan and Quebec withdraw their previous objections? After all, these sessions were in camera and we do not know what bargaining went on. Have any of the provinces indicated already that they would like to proceed under section 94A; that they want to get into certain fields? Do they want to get into banking? After all, Alberta has taken certain steps in that regard. It may be that British Columbia will want to do so. Every one of the provinces, I think, may have some reason for wanting to come into the federal field. We would like to know the answers to these questions.

There is another point I would like to make in this regard. Not all the provinces will view these changes with equanimity. We know some of the provinces want to have as much power as they can get, or want more power for themselves, and that they would reduce the authority of the central government to a few limited spheres. Shall we say these are the extreme provincial rights people. On the other hand there are those who would have the government of Canada much stronger in order to give them opportunities for balancing out the economy. I think it is fair to say that probably the maritime provinces do not want to see a greatly weakened federal government. In any event, Mr. Chairman, may I conclude my remarks this afternoon with this quotation from an editorial which appeared in the Toronto *Star* of October 20:

> It may be nothing short of a national disaster if parliament rubber-stamps the agreement reached last week between the federal and provincial premiers regarding the amendment of Canada's constitution.

Then further on the editorial says:

> The agreement as it stands, in fact, represents a triumph for the extreme "provincial rights" faction which wishes to exalt the role of the provinces and reduce that of the federal government to a minimum. It could be a milestone in the breakup of confederation.

I cite this editorial as an example of the division of opinion that exists on this question. There are other citations I could put before the committee. I have a goodly number of them. I have some from the Winnipeg *Free Press*. These two newspapers are not unfriendly to the present administration. That is why I believe we must ask these questions. Therefore I agree with this editorial when it says:

> For this reason, it is essential that this agreement should not be hastily approved by parliament as so many dominion-provincial agreements have been. It needs to be given a very close, careful and critical examination by a qualified committee of the House of Commons, which should invite testimony by constitutional and other experts.

It is merely because this matter is so important that I make this plea that we get as much information as possible and that a very careful study be made of the agreement when it comes up for ultimate decision.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, it is not often in the house that we are considering an action of the government which offers an appropriate stepping-stone for us all to take a look at the general trend of government action over the last while, to see whether there is any pattern emerging out of government action, to note the behaviour of the government and the provinces, what its present effect is on Canada and whether it gives any indication as to where similar action is likely to lead us in the future.

I certainly think that when the government has announced that it has reached an agreement with the provinces on a method of amending the constitution, all of us who take seriously our responsibilities as members of the Canadian House of Commons should discuss this question in a very broad terms and try the best we can to see whether there is any trend as to where we are going, with the piecemeal legislation that now and then comes up. I am sure we are all aware that now and then the government takes a step, or a measure is passed, which seems to nibble away at a freedom, which seems to limit the economic activity of certain people; and many times we shrug it off and say, "Well, it is necessary for the greatest good at this time that some slight inconvenience be experienced". But such nibbling away does add up to a general erosion of freedom; it can mean the weakening of the country as a whole, and certainly a gradual limitation of the power of the federal government to effect the economic welfare of the people of Canada generally can lead to the impotence of the government.

While this measure is not before us directly, I think now is a good time to take

a look at the various factors which I believe are important, to get us in the state of mind in which we can properly consider the importance of the change in the constitution. Certainly many members have already indicated that they feel this agreement with the provinces amounts to a further reduction in the power of the federal government. I suggest that all of us should look seriously right now at how much power the federal government has and how much power it has to have. I get the feeling sometimes that because we have had so much pressure from the provinces we have been altogether too preoccupied with the growing responsibilities of the provinces and their inability to cope with these responsibilities out of limited resources. Also they have not seriously enough considered the fact that federal responsibility is growing, while federal capacity for action and influence on all these factors has been eroded away, and not just by giving in to the provinces.

When confederation started I am sure most of us would have agreed that the Fathers of Confederation laid great emphasis on the necessity for having a strong central government. They did not give to the provinces those fields which had the greatest influence on Canada's economic status or which gave the provincial governments the power to have a great influence on Canada's economic status. At that time it was the internal problems of the provinces—the problems of vast distance, the immaturity of the nation, etc.—which made them see clearly why the federal government, if it were to bind together such a loose confederation of provinces, had to have the main power in its hands. I suggest that if we are to approach the problem today it behooves us to look and see whether those factors have been changed so much that the same thinking does not still apply.

It is true that today we are in a much different world from the world of a hundred years ago, but I suggest that each other nation in the world today is in a different position too. Let us look at some of the outside factors which show that power has been taken away from the federal government, its capacity to manage, to conduct and influence the economic welfare of the people in the country. Trade situations have changed. We are now more than ever depending on international trade, balance of payments, tariff agreements and such general agreements as GATT. Each one of those limits the capacity of the federal government to be able freely to influence the destiny of our own people. Every time the federal government binds itself to a new agreement to limit tariffs it must of necessity limit its own capacity to influence the opportunities for our own industrialists now more than ever dependant on international markets and resist the impact of potential importers into this country.

I suggest that we consider what has happened in Europe, where nations with much longer established governments, with in many cases much larger populations, governments without our problems of vast distances, transportation and difference of climate to contend with, nations with vast pools of skilled labour to call upon, much experience in industrialized machinery, in all of which we are just acquiring experience, have themselves found it was not within the legislative competence of their own governments to influence enough their own economic chances for survival, let alone spreading it down through the subdivisions or sections of the country. The federal governments of such countries have not had the power, acting alone, to be of sufficient use to private entrepreneurs within their own countries, so as to keep up with the cry for a rising standard of living, but have found it necessary to give some of their own economic independence to an economic union. In light of this I suggest we must look very carefully when we see in this country a strong move in the other direction.

Certainly Canada as a country has as many problems as any of these nations to which I have referred. We are blessed with perhaps a certain greater natural wealth in this country. But we do not have the wealth of manpower. We do not have the skills of some of them, and we do have the disadvantage of great distance.

I suggest that any thinking person who considers that other nations of the world have become more and more preoccupied with economic union, are spending more and more time trying to negotiate satisfactory trade agreements, have tried to bolster the purchasing power underdeveloped countries and tried to work out a lessening of tariff barriers, etc., so that the federal governments in those countries may give some assistance to their industrialists, will come to the conclusion that we would be very shortsighted indeed not to take every opportunity we have to give our federal government the chance to be of influence in that type of work.

I think that one of our major difficulties has always been the increasing demand for social justice, each of the provinces finding itself beset with new and increasing demands

for more and more money and becoming more and more aware of the limitation of its own action or its own ability to act, owing to constitutional difficulties. The provinces were given only certain powers. They can act only in certain ways, can influence industry only to a certain extent and can raise only so much money. When a bewildered provincial treasurer or provincial premier tries to find ways and means of satisfying the cry for new services he must find it very frustrating indeed to discover his hands are tied because the federal government has so much power, power which he might himself find useful.

I am not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that there is anything wrong with any of the provincial premiers who are striving to get for their provinces a little more power if they feel, and honestly feel, they can use that power to better the lot of the peoples in their provinces. But I do think we should be aware that that problem is not unique to any one province or to any one government which might be in power. I think we should examine the demands made by a province and remember that generally the demands made by a province represent the viewpoint of the government of that day. We must remember that when the government of the day says that there is only one solution to a certain problem, part of that cry may be a political one and part an actual one. But certainly we do know that there are different political governments in the provinces, and we have heard enough, from some of the premiers at least, to know that there are many and various approaches to economic affairs which these different governments reflect.

I should like to single out the government of the province of Quebec for a moment, just as an example of what has been going on. I suggest that the pressure put on by the government of the province of Quebec is explained, in part at least, by political pressure rather than just economic pressure. We are aware that there has been a resurgence of interest in government and government status and in the role of government in that province. There has become an awareness—and a voice to express that awareness as seldom heard before—that there are many depressed areas in the province. There is an awareness that the agricultural industry, for instance, is not faring as well as the agricultural industries in other parts of the country. Certainly when this awareness is coupled with a very high pressured political campaign to convince the country that that province has the best government it can get and that it is working the hardest, we can understand why the ordinary citizen in that province and perhaps throughout the country as well—and sometimes those in the government itself—fail to appreciate that a lot of this pressure is political propaganda. It is to the welfare politically of the Liberal government in the province of Quebec to convince the rest of the country that there is only one solution to Quebec's economic difficulties, to say that there is no help other than by giving more power to provincial governments so that they will be able to solve those difficulties for themselves. We have observed some of that type of thing in Mr. Bennett's approach to this problem in British Columbia.

Since we in this house are politicians, we are not blind to the advantages to be reaped by provincial premiers who can convince the rest of the country that the only thing wrong with their governments is that they do not have sufficient power to do those things which they in their wisdom think are necessary, and that the big bad government in Ottawa will not let them have those powers. The present government has been politically disappointing along this line. Certainly we are all aware of the Liberal government's ability to sell itself as the government of this country which can handle all the difficulties. In considering the supposed generosity of the Liberal party, I have never been able to comprehend why it farmed out this area to the provincial Liberal government of Quebec. I should think that the first people to seize on this gradual erosion of federal power to excuse their own incompetence as a government would be the Liberal politicians sitting opposite.

Certainly if we are going to consider taking away any further power from the federal government we must also consider the problems the federal government will have to meet, and whether those powers are sufficient to meet those problems. We must consider the difficulties facing the people of Canada and the necessity for increasing the standard of living and services available. How shall those problems be met across Canada. I for one believe that most people in this country are Canadians first. While they are proud of their own provinces they readily agree that the standard of living available to all Canadians in all provinces should be considered in the best interests of Canada as a whole.

We must be wary of giving economic powers to the provinces, because we should

attack these problems first as a nation. We must consider the capacity of the provinces to raise their standards of living if we are to divest the federal government of some of its authority in order that provincial governments can take care of the provincial economic situation.

Earlier I referred to the necessity in Europe of creating economic unions. Those of us who have considered some of the problems of increasing Canadian exports are very much aware of nations such as Japan which have larger populations, and have greater productive capacity as a result of using devices such as state trading cartels, and prohibiting private manufacturers from competing with each other on the world's markets. We are aware that communist nations use the governments themselves as trading agencies. If we are going to give some of the economic authority in Canada to the provincial governments in order that the provinces may take a purely regional and local approach to the economic situation we are going to be very shortsighted.

The economic problems in Canada are such that all the assistance and help the federal government has been able to give private enterprise in the past has proved in many cases to be inadequate. Should we complicate the matter by giving extra legislative competence to provincial governments which will move in the direction of assisting only those industries within the province? I am sure such a situation would result in industries within the borders of one province having a great advantage over competing industries in another province. In contrasting the conditions of government within one province with those within another we can at this time find situations where concessions given by provincial governments are almost tantamount to tariff barriers. Certainly there is no difference between imposing a tariff between the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario and the effect of one of those provinces lowering the tax on an industry within its border by 5 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, we are already beset by problems of this type. How far is it fair for a province to go in attracting industry to its area? When do the concessions given by provinces amount to penalties imposed upon the manufacturers in other provinces? If we are going to increase the power of the provincial governments to the point where they can influence the economy of the provinces to the extent I have suggested, then certainly we are going to increase the provincial potential for making these unfair adjustments. We know that it is unconstitutional for provinces to impose tariffs between provinces. Unless we get our thinking straight and realize that in today's economic world every nation is concentrating on obtaining a fair trade situation, we will find ourselves in difficulty. I suggest that every bit of power possible should be left with the federal government so that our economic and trade problems can be handled on a nation-wide basis.

The feeling of some provinces that there will be an immediate advantage to the provinces as a result of this transfer of authority is understandable. However, I suggest the provincial governments are thinking only in terms of the immediate advantage. I do not blame premiers for coming to Ottawa, suggesting they want the power to do certain things, and I suppose they have the right to point out to their voters that this would remedy certain situations. However, we as members of the federal parliament are duty bound to consider these problems on a nation-wide scale. We are especially duty bound to consider the powers of the provincial governments and those powers which they are new seeking. No matter how inadequate we feel at times we must look at Canada and its position in the world. We must consider the economic factors which effect the economy of this country and, above all, remember that the responsibilities of the federal government are growing even as provincial responsibilities are growing.

This government has given some indication of its own in ability to cope with the increasing demand for funds. Certainly those of us who supported the previous government are not likely to forget quickly the derision and condemnation of the deficits the Conservative government had to face. The present government came into office partly at least because it was able to picture the problems Canada faced as needing only the assistance of the Liberal experts for their solution, but one would think that after the length of time they have been in office, during which period they have run up bigger deficits than ever and have yielded constantly to pressures from the provinces, they would begin to realize that they do have a problem. It is not just a matter of getting the masterminds in and the dopes out, as they used to say, and I do not pretend that that prescription even applies today. We need to do more than just get the dopes out. We need to take a look at the pressures and try to wipe out some of the politics in deal-

ing with these matters. We need to try to understand how far politics will carry us and how far a little sound planning will go.

There should be no more piecemeal consideration of whether the country can afford a pension plan. The pension plan has to be viewed in the light of its effects on industry and what it will do for the provinces and their ability to finance the carrying out of their obligations. I suggest that many members of the house have not bothered to look at the whole picture and try to piece things together. I am sure that many, like myself are just a little afraid to look at the whole general picture, say that it is a bit beyond them and ask where the experts are. I think the only experts we can rely upon in approaching a problem of this sort are the members of parliament who are elected to represent the people of the country.

In approaching many of these problems the government has emphasized its desire to cooperate with the provinces, but in my opinion it has really been neglecting its duty. To the federal government co-operative federalism means: Give up all responsibility to a conference of provincial premiers and let them handle these matters. I have seen such an erosion of federal powers that I sometimes feel that the powers left to the federal government have been reduced to a level comparable to the capabilities of the present government to deal with these matters. This is a disgraceful situation, and I hope that when we are considering amendments to the constitution our attitude will be that we will not give even a fraction of an inch. Things have gone so far under the present government that every day we must look to see what power we can get back into federal hands which has been so unnecessarily thrown away.

If the present members of the cabinet feel they want to divest themselves of as much power as they can so that the job of governing the country may be reduced to their level of competence, it is up to us as members of the house not to let them do it. If they want to give away their responsibilities I submit they should divest themselves of those responsibilities immediately by resigning, so that competent individuals can take over the government.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I will be brief, but due to the fact that the Conservatives intend to monopolize the entire time of this house to talk about every matter possible on the occasion of interim supply, I would like to say a few words this afternoon con-

[Mr. Nugent.]

cerning certain persons from Montreal who are visiting Toronto, and I would like to make some comments respecting a news story which appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star* of October 30. Here are the title and the text of that item:

[*Text*]

Baptist: Catholics Support Separatism.

A French speaking Baptist minister from Montreal said here yesterday that the Roman Catholic church in Quebec supports the separatist movement. Rev. W. H. Frey, pastor of Montreal's French Evangelical Baptist church, was a delegate to the annual convention of the Canadian Evangelical Baptist fellowship which met this week in High Park Baptist church. The fellowship represents 100,000 adherents and nearly 250 churches, 20 of them in Quebec.

"If the Roman Catholic church were against separatism she would not have failed to thunder against it, as she has against everything else she opposes," Mr. Frey said in an interview. The "strange silence" of the Catholic hierarchy in Quebec about separatism could only be interpreted as tacit approval, Mr. Frey said.

He said that although there has been a "thaw" in Catholic-Protestant relations in Quebec since Pope John XXIII started the ecumenical movement, Quebec is still a "church-dominated society."

"Converts to our Baptist faith from Catholicism have told me that they had only learned to love English speaking Canadians after the conversion," Mr. Frey said.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, it is statements such as those which undermine the good understanding between the various groups which make up the Canadian nation.

When Pastor Frey states that the Roman Catholic church approves of separatism, he knows he is lying shamelessly to those he is addressing.

When he maintains that it is only when Roman Catholics are converted to the Baptist church that they learn to love their English speaking fellow citizens, again Mr. Frey is lying shamelessly to his audience.

We find in Quebec, especially because we live in Quebec, that cordial relations do exist between the elements—

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Villeneuve will please allow me to interrupt him for a moment to remind him that the committee is now dealing with interim supply and any contribution to this debate should refer to the matter at hand, at least in some way.

At present we are discussing questions relating to public administration.

I do not see how what the hon. member is discussing at the present time is connected in any way with the administration of the state or government business.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, we are studying interim supply amounting to $740 million. I am convinced that a part of this amount will be apportioned to the department of national health. Now, if it covers expenditures by this department, I submit that the case of mental health I am referring to could be dealt with under appropriations of this department.

The Chairman: I believe there is a far-fetched relation between the hon. member's contribution to the debate and the resolution now under consideration. I would therefore ask him to limit his remarks to the resolution now before us.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, may I very humbly suggest that all the members who speak of the constitution, for instance, do not relate their remarks too much to the appropriations of $740 million now under consideration. The speeches of those who for some ten days have dealt with the relations between the various ethnic groups in this country do not either have a direct connection with the expenditures of $740 million for which the government seeks approval.

I would ask you to be as patient with me as you have been with the Conservative members, who have said nothing for ten days but who have nevertheless spoken and dealt with subjects of much less importance than that about which I am speaking at the present time. I wish I had approval in order that I may resume my remarks.

The Chairman: I would ask the hon. member, for the sake of this discussion, to relate his comments to the resolution before us.

The hon. member is referring to certain comments which were made about the constitution during this debate. He will admit that to a certain extent the constitution falls under public administration and certainly under the Minister of Justice.

On the other hand, the government can in no way be responsible for the statements made by the person referred to by the hon. member.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, once more I humbly submit that this matter falls under the Department of National Health and Welfare. I do not wish to make many comments on this item, but I would point out that some people deserve our attention, even with respect to the very large estimates now before us.

What I wish to point out is that the question of national unity, the understanding between Canadians, does fall under the government. It has responsibilities in this respect.

Even if the constitution may fall under the Minister of Justice, in my opinion the government has responsibilities as regards persons who try by all possible means to sow hatred and discord in this country; it should denounce those who endeavour to divide the people of Canada instead of uniting them.

And here, as a French Canadian from the province of Quebec—

Mr. Prud'homme: Would the hon. member allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. Caouette: Certainly.

Mr. Prud'homme: Does the hon. member feel that the speech delivered by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) during the last week end was a contribution toward national unity?

Mr. Caouette: I have not yet had the opportunity to read the speech made by the hon. member for Port Arthur, although I have heard comments about it, and as far as his speech is concerned I was told that he spoke as an irresponsible man.

An hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Caouette: The hon. member for Port Arthur might deny it; however, I will certainly read the speech he made in Toronto over the week end and I will report in due time to the hon. member who asked me a question.

Before being interrupted, I was saying that it is as a French Canadian and as a practising Roman Catholic that I object to such statements, stupid statements aimed only at pitting people against one another.

The Roman Catholic clergy in the province of Quebec has never taken a stand for or against separatism. It is not within its purview and the priests will tell you so just as they will tell you that the Roman Catholic church stands behind no party, be it Liberal, Conservative or Social Credit; it is not its role. The Roman Catholic church in our province, as elsewhere, has a part to play which has to do with the salvation of the soul; as for the salvation of the body, this is our role and the Roman Catholic church leaves it to us.

I am sorry to see publicity given to reports such as this one in a city such as Toronto and even Montreal. They are untrue and accomplish no purpose in terms of the national good. We are here as federal representatives to serve this nation, and I think

that we have a moral obligation to denounce those, wherever they come from, who try, in such odious ways, to divide the people in the various parts of Canada.

These are the few remarks I wanted to make today on these estimates amounting to $740 million which we are now discussing with the rather full co-operation of the Conservatives who are looking forward to the Christmas holidays.

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Chairman, while we are dealing with the interim supply, I wish, like some other colleagues, to express certain views regarding a problem of capital importance, that of Canadian unity.

I take this occasion to comment on some statements made by certain of my colleagues. I hasten to add that these are colleagues whom, I admit, are competent and of good faith and whose opinions I respect also. I hope that they also will respect my views and that they will let me express them as clearly as possible.

Three very interesting questions have been raised in regard to the constitution during this debate.

It has been said, if I am not mistaken, that confederation act was not an agreement and, in short, that it was an ordinary piece of legislation just like any other. It was added, however, that when the British North America Act was passed by the British parliament, as it was wont to do, it was necessary to remove any suggestion of an agreement.

I am against the concept that the British North America Act would only be a mere piece of legislation. I maintain that it was an agreement binding the provinces in a union based on the good faith of the two main ethnic groups then constituting the Canadian people.

The B.N.A. Act is, in the tradition of British public law, on the same footing as the great pieces of British legislation which are the very basis of the personal freedoms and even of our western civilization.

I have in mind for instance, the Magna Carta, the 1689 Bill of Rights, the petition of rights and all the others. In order to convince oneself that in the minds of all the participants who united the North American colonies in 1867 an agreement was really being entered into, only one has to read the discussions held in the British House of Commons at that time. One can read, for instance, the words of the sponsor of this legislation in the British parliament, Lord Carnarvon, who stated:

To those resolutions—

He was referring to the Quebec and Charlottetown resolutions, which have resulted in the adoption of the act itself.

To those resolutions, the British provinces of North America gave their consent, and the measures based upon those resolutions must be accepted as a union treaty.

Then it was said that this was an essential pact. And, if we look at it closely, we realize that such was the case, because if it had been merely a piece of legislation of the British parliament, why would the consent of the participating provinces have been required previously? Why would not all the British provinces have been united, even those which had not given their consent?

It is therefore obvious that the constituting act of our constitutional existence is a pact and was considered as such by the Canadian participants themselves, the Fathers of Conferation, and by the British legislators. In addition, the main judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada and, especially, of the judicial committee of the privy council all confirm the theory of a pact between the provinces but mostly between the two ethnical groups. In fact, for nearly a century no French Canadian living in Quebec or elsewhere has ever thought that it was anything but a freely accepted union of all to form a new entity, Canada. Under the circumstances, there could have been no question of either direct or indirect coercion or domination.

Mr. Chairman, some astounding things have been said. It has been claimed that some plot had been contrived and reference was even made to an assassination, for words of exceptional violence have been uttered in the course of this debate on the constitution, one which surely should be marked by level-headedness and complete objectivity. It was said that the present government had contrived a sinister plot to abdicate its responsibilities in order to decentralize constitutional and administrative authority in this country and, as a result, achieve the dissolution and disintegration of confederation itself.

I have made my share of speeches in this house and never to speak on behalf or uphold the cause of the present federal government. If any charge could be laid against this government, I would rather accuse it of being a centralizing government striving under the guise of that co-operative federalism formula, to deprive the provinces of much of their powers. Therefore, I say that there

does not seem to exist any immediate or remote conspiracy to take away from the central government any of its legitimate powers. On the other hand, decentralization in itself is not by any means a bad thing, on the contrary.

By the way, may I say very frankly and very openly at this stage of my remarks that I am in favour of a united Canada, that I have confidence and hope in the future of confederation. And, in my capacity as the authorized spokesman for the Quebec caucus of our party, I add that like the provincial leader of the Conservative party, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer), we on this side of the house do not consider that we have been given a mandate to take away from the present federal power its legitimate rights.

If we acted any differently, we would not then truly understand where our duty lies. Still, I must say we are aware that, if confederation is to continue and progress, if it is to rally the support of the majority in Canada and more especially in the province of Quebec we must face present realities, and especially that which implies recognition of the French fact, of the legitimate aspirations of the French group as an essential partner in confederation. As such, we must endorse and support as much as possible, and with all the constitutional means of which we can avail ourselves, the autonomist attitude adopted by almost all the governments of the province of Quebec, whether Liberal, Conservative, Union Nationale or other.

Mr. Chairman, were it not for such an autonomist attitude, confederation could not survive. This is not a Quebec problem only; it is a national problem, because Canada is not only composed of two main ethnic groups coming from two founding races, it comprises also many other ethnic groups. There is, in this vast geographical territory called Canada, many different economic and geographical areas which, in order to survive, must have powers which, within their jurisdiction, are completely autonomist, independent and free from any interference by the central power.

Mr. Chairman, there is another argument to support the claims of the partisans of provincial autonomy: the transformation within confederation and throughout the country in the last few years, especially since the last world war.

Everyone knows that under cover of the war and of the economic needs resulting therefrom, the central government monopolized as never before nearly all the powers and the economic sinews in the country. On the other hand, since the war the wind of decentralization started blowing and the provinces, having under the constitution sovereign powers in their own field, acquired responsibilities which they never had before and were faced with all sorts of needs. Now, to carry out their responsibilities in these fields, the provinces had to have fiscal means which, largely under cover of the war and also for other but less obvious reasons, were monopolized by the central power; the provinces have been claiming these fiscal resources since the end of the war. I am thinking, for instance, about their responsibility in the fields of public education, communications within the provinces, municipal services, social welfare and particularly about the development of national resources of all provinces. Those are concrete tasks, tremendous responsibilities the provinces must assume and that is why there was a whole series of federal-provincial conferences during which all premiers spoke with one voice in order to give back to the appropriate jurisdiction the means to legitimately carry out the obligations incumbent to them under the constitution. And I think that such a trend will certainly continue.

There was much more. Since the end of the war—it is proper to say so—there has been a new awakening in the province of Quebec, and especially among French Canadians. Quebec is now conscious of its power and of its human as well as material resources. I think it is accurate to say that the great majority of its population, having such resources, want to use them for legitimate purposes and to promote its development in all fields, so that it can be strong, more powerful and more united to share in this great Canadian achievement.

I think that such is the true voice and desire of the moderate elements in the province of Quebec. I leave out of consideration all those who, because of past disappointments, have lost their illusions, and no longer believe in the possibility of the existence of a confederation where their rights would be fully recognized.

Mr. Chairman, I think that while desiring national unity, we must demand from our government leaders, from all those who have responsibilities, to pursue a genuine Canadian policy and I cannot see the pursuit of such a policy without the implementation of a great many reforms, the need of which is getting more pressing day by day.

I am thinking in particular of the necessity for our country to approve a truly distinctive

flag. I am for this distinctive flag, Mr. Chairman. I, for one, am quite satisfied that a committee looked into this matter for nearly two months and held a great many meetings at the end of which it finally made its choice. I recognize that this choice has been freely accepted by the majority of the members on this committee, and I feel that to delay the approval of the committee's report, at this stage, would certainly not help the cause of national unity.

I also believe that legislation concerning the repatriation of the constitution should be passed quickly. I have examined the two formulae: the one brought forth in 1961 and the 1964 version. I am unable to see any essential difference between the two, or at least, no difference in respect of the federal government powers. Even if this formula is examined carefully with a magnifying glass, nowhere will there be found a lessening of federal powers. Therefore, it seems that when one is speaking of a plot, in this repatriation formula, in order to get rid of certain powers of the federal government, this assertion cannot be proved by the text that was submitted.

Certainly, there are differences. Sections 6, 7, 8, and part 3 of the press release or legislative project are different from the Fulton formula of 1961. But nowhere is there any lessening of the powers of the central government, except in section 6 which contains a definition of what constitutes federal jurisdiction, and also certain powers under which the federal government could not unilaterally make any amendment.

This is why, Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is advisable to adopt quickly and without acrimony the necessary address in order to bring home the constitution in accord with the wishes of most Canadians and of the British authorities themselves.

I also believe that once we have brought home the constitution, we should also think of revising and modernizing it. It is not difficult to realize that the British North America Act and some other statutes that are part of our constitution are antiquated, rigid, and do not meet the realities of today.

It is only normal that after 100 years there should be this anxiety to modernize an instrument which certainly served us well in the past but is no longer adequate in the light of today's needs. And when I say today's needs, I do not mean only the legitimate claims and aspirations of only a section of the population, namely the French Canadian people, but I mean also all social, economic and cultural problems which are not mentioned in the constitution and for which a solution does not seem to be provided.

[Mr. Martineau.]

In my opinion, those are facts about which we, the members of the Canadian parliament, must think seriously.

We live in a changing world, and Mr. Chairman, the very basis of the British genius is to accept changes when they become necessary. Where would the British commonwealth of nations be today if the British genius had not changed with the times, accepted changes, and created a large association of free nations which are an important factor in the peace and prosperity of the world?

Mr. Chairman, the world we live in is an independent world, and it is certain that no matter under which system we live we will still be subject to that interdependence between all the nations of the world and will have to accept it.

In my opinion, to refuse changes when their necessity has become absolutely obvious and clear is to show a lack of flexibility, a lack of political realism.

One of the greatest virtues which made the western civilization great is tolerance, and I believe that we, the members of parliament, while considering today and in the following days our very future, will have to show much tolerance. If we consider the problems I mentioned in that spirit we will find a solution and Canada will become a greater nation.

[*Text*]

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, I was not able to be in the house last week but I have been checking the *Hansard* record to see what subjects were under discussion at that time. I was interested to discover that most of the complaints which were presented in the committee with respect to government action, or lack of action, related to a problem that I was exposed to directly last week during my absence from the house. It was my privilege to attend the opening of parliament in another commonwealth country, the island of Bermuda. I was interested to note the different functions of parliament as they exist here compared with those in a parliamentary body which has not yet completed the transition from representative parliamentary democracy to responsible parliamentary democracy.

It was also interesting to note that the Bermuda parliament had some of the problems with which we are faced in this country. As a matter of fact the newly formed oppo-

sition in that country decided to demonstrate its protest against the policies of the administration by boycotting the opening ceremonies of parliament. As I have been listening to the groans and moans emanating from the government benches this afternoon as opposition members have risen to their feet to take part in this important discussion on interim supply I have come to the conclusion that some of my hon. friends across the way might hope that the opposition in the Canadian House of Commons would demonstrate its protest by being absent from the sittings of the committee.

Mr. Knowles: Most of them are right now.

Mr. Dinsdale: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre says that most of them are absent at the moment from the sittings of parliament. I am always surprised when a member of his broad experience in parliament makes a comment of that kind, because he has been in the house long enough to know that members of parliament have other responsibilities than those which bring them to the House of Commons.

Mr. Knowles: Oh, that line.

Mr. Dinsdale: I know my hon. friend is always aware that this will get him a headline and I suppose that is why he makes these frequent interjections into our parliamentary discussions here.

Before I was interrupted by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre I was pointing out, Mr. Chairman, that judging from the reaction of members opposite they might wish that the members of the opposition would discharge their responsibilities by being absent from this chamber. It seems to me that that would demonstrate the attitude I saw in the Bermuda parliament, which has not yet completed the transition from representative democracy to responsible democracy.

In this regard I should like to make some comments on the discussion which took place last week on the subject of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

An hon. Member: Again?

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, hon. members keep interjecting from across the way. Unfortunately I cannot hear their mumblings so therefore am unable to reply. However, I make this comment just in case the *Hansard* reporter has been able to catch their mumblings, instead of their rising to their feet and discussing intelligently these important subjects.

I think that by failing to recognize that we do have responsible democracy in Canada the government brings trouble upon its own head. As I read the discussion which took place about the C.B.C., member after member made the point that it would be in the best interests of our parliamentary process if the subject of the C.B.C. were brought before a parliamentary committee. This house of course is the highest court of public opinion in the land. Whenever the government is questioned on the functions of the C.B.C. it always replies that that important public corporation is responsible to the parliament of Canada. If that is so, Mr. Chairman, how can parliament discharge its responsibility better than by having an opportunity to hear from representatives of the C.B.C. before a parliamentary committee? In addition, we as members would have an opportunity to make comments and suggestions to the officials of the corporation in the process of discussion in a parliamentary committee.

This was the practice when I first came into parliament back in the early 1950's. There was a parliamentary committee on broadcasting almost every second year and it led to some of the useful reforms brought about in this house in 1958. But this government, in its stubborn refusal to refer such a difficult and complex subject to a parliamentary committee on broadcasting, brings trouble down upon its own head. This seems to be typical of the actions of the present government in handling the affairs of the nation, and certainly in handling the affairs of parliament: its failure to present business in an orderly fashion, and its introducing divisive subjects in an arbitrary manner.

In this connection I make merely a passing reference to the flag, which has so disrupted and confused the deliberations of this body during the current session of parliament. They knew by introducing a divisive subject of this kind that this would be the inevitable result. In its failure to allow representatives from the C.B.C. to come before a parliamentary committee the government is creating difficulty as well for that body.

There is bound to be criticism of a crown corporation charged with the responsibility of carrying on a comprehensive national broadcasting service. Questions are being asked on orders of the day, cluttering up the preliminary procedures of this house. It is inevitable that on a motion for interim supply, which provides an opportunity for discussing these matters, we have an extended

debate on the subject. The parliamentary committee system has been extolled as a time saving device by parliamentary reformers from all sides of this house. Yet the government has resorted to a cover-up procedure by appointing an advisory committee which will in due course report to parliament, and in this arbitrary way has by-passed the basic principle of parliament and the responsibilities of the elected representatives.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. member permit a question at this point?

Mr. Dinsdale: Certainly.

Mr. McIlraith: When the hon. member mentions the C.B.C. and the reference to the advisory committee, does he not think it would be fair to comment on what was said about a parliamentary committee at the time of the announcement? He will recall that at that point there was reference made to a parliamentary committee, and that reference can be found in *Hansard*.

Mr. Dinsdale: The point I am making is that instead of setting up a parliamentary committee the government has decided to set up an advisory committee which will in due course report to parliament. If we are going to adhere to the principles of responsible democracy, it is essential that the elected representatives of the people have an opportunity of reviewing from time to time the functions of this important body.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the hon. member understood my point. In the announcement regarding the advisory committee there was a commitment made, as I recall it, that a parliamentary committee would be set up to study the recommendations of that advisory committee.

Mr. Dinsdale: This is precisely what I am saying. The government is introducing an intermediary body. In other words the government is setting up another court of public opinion in this country to give consideration to the problems of broadcasting, and is stating that that secondary court of public opinion must report before the primary court of public opinion can take action. No democratic country can afford more than one high court of public opinion. This is our complaint and protest.

If the government had even a simple knowledge and understanding of the functions of the C.B.C. it should have been able to avoid this error. If the government had an understanding of responsible parliamentary democracy it would be aware that in order to satisfy the interests of the members of parliament in the functions of this tremendously powerful public opinion and educational service, it would have to make it possible for direct contact between the members of parliament and the officials of this organization. That has been the practice in the past but, as I have already intimated, but for some inexplicable reason, the present government has not resorted to the established practice.

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member has made reference to an action taken by the government as announced on May 25, 1964, and which appears at page 3520 of *Hansard*. However, in referring to that announcement he has omitted to refer to a statement therein about a parliamentary committee and a time limit within which it would be set up. I am asking him whether he thinks that is a fair way of presenting his case.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that an advisory committee is to be set up.

Mr. McIlraith: A parliamentary committee is to be set up also.

Mr. Dinsdale: A parliamentary committee is to be set up following the recommendations of the advisory committee. The reason I have difficulty in understanding the government's devious device in this regard is because the government itself reiterates that the C.B.C. is not responsible to the government, but is responsible to parliament. What better way could it demonstrate that responsibility than by giving members of parliament an opportunity from time to time of making its wishes, comments and criticisms known with respect to the operations of this huge public corporation?

Mr. Chairman, the minister suggests that I am ignoring a statement which appears in *Hansard*. I am not ignoring that statement, but I am criticizing the government because a parliamentary committee is going to be by-passed in the first instance by an advisory committee which has no responsibility, or a lower level of responsibility, to the elected representatives in the House of Commons.

Various commentators have pointed out that it is unfair for members of parliament constantly to raise questions on orders of the day concerning the operations of the C.B.C. This is the only possible opportunity hon. members have to ask these questions, if the procedure which used to be followed, having the affairs of the C.B.C. submitted for review by a parliamentary committee on a regular basis, is not to be followed. Cer-

tainly discussions about an item of expenditure of some $100 million is in order during the debate on interim supply because, by the very actions of the government, we have a prime example of taxation without representation.

The government for some reason has tried to make a sacrosanct organization of the C.B.C. by removing it from the arena of public discussion. As I have already indicated, this is not only embarrassing to the government but is a source of embarrassment to the C.B.C. I think we should consider again the fundamental points which the C.B.C. reiterates in the midst of the current and continuing controversy. The C.B.C. admits that the air waves do not belong to any corporation, either private or public, but that they are a trust to be administered in the interests of the people. The air waves belong to the people. The officials of the C.B.C. also indicate that they are charged with the responsibility of carrying out broad national objectives. In this parliament we have the representatives of the people. This is the court of opinion where these broad national objectives are debated, and where we are trying to achieve a national consensus.

If we consider the early organizational period of the C.B.C. we will find that it was patterned after the British Broadcasting Corporation. The policies and techniques that had already been developed in the B.B.C. were adhered to very closely in the initial setting up of the C.B.C., and it has been pointed out over and over again in the house that the British parliament discharges its responsibility through regular referral of B.B.C. matters to a parliamentary committee at Westminster.

What are some of the main broad national objectives which make it important for parliament to have an opportunity to make its wishes known to the officials of the C.B.C.? First of all, Canadianization is the major function and role of the C.B.C. as defined in the Broadcasting Act, to encourage the development of Canadian talent, and to counter the influence of the powerful broadcasting media south of the border. We should have an opportunity to see how the C.B.C. is discharging this most important of all functions. Second, there is the question of national unity and the efforts of the C.B.C. to assist in the achieving of national unity. If we are to learn any lesson from the discussions that have been going on in the house and throughout the country in recent months, I think we will readily come to the conclusion there is something wrong with the national consensus and national unity in the Canadian body politic at the present time. Therefore it would be most advisable for members of parliament to have an opportunity to see just how the C.B.C. is assisting the cause of national unity at this time through its radio and television facilities.

I have heard comments outside the house by responsible ministers of the Quebec government, for example, to the effect that the programming of the C.B.C. in recent months has tended to have a detrimental effect, rather than encouraging national unity. I refer in particular to the statement of Hon. Bona Arsenault just the other day when speaking on this subject. Mr. Arsenault is no stranger to the House of Commons. He sat in the house for many years. In his remarks the other day he was not speaking from a provincial or regional point of reference but as one who was a federal member of parliament for many years and who, if I recall correctly, took a special interest in the operations of the C.B.C. through the parliamentary committee that used to meet.

Then of course there is recurring criticism by members representing various parts of the country that there is a tendency for the national broadcasting system to have a regional bias. When we think of the development of Canadian talent we find that most of such talent is developed in the more populous areas of Canada and we sometimes hear protests raised from the less populous regions of Canada, the maritimes or the western part of the country, that the same opportunities for program origination and cultural development are not provided in the non-metropolitan areas and regions. This of course is because the large metropolitan communities tend to dominate the national life of Canada as they dominate the life of any nation.

I should like to refer to a third important function which is often cited as basic to the operations of the C.B.C. I have in mind the educational and cultural function. It is recognized that a broadcasting organization with the facilities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation bears very important responsibility for educational and cultural development. This is reflected in the $100 million annually which is made available for its operations by the parliament of Canada.

It must also be recalled that when the C.B.C. was first organized as a federally operated institution Ottawa was very sensitive about invading the field of educational responsibility because of the jurisdictional prob-

lem with which we are all too familiar and which has been a part of the discussion today on the subject of dominion-provincial relations. But back in the 1930's the government at Ottawa moved into the broadcasting field because it felt this was a most important medium for cementing Canada together and developing a sense of national unity largely through educational and cultural programming.

We in this parliament have moved quite a distance from our attitude toward educational priorities in those days. I need only refer to the grants to Canadian universities, to the amount of over $400 million that has been poured into the development of the excellent system of technical and vocational schools now available to the young people of Canada. Yet even though parliament has expanded its educational activities in other fields the fiscal demands of the C.B.C. continue to mount in an almost astronomical way. University leaders of Canada constantly remind parliament that they are being hard pressed to meet the challenge of education in the modern world because of the tremendous influx of the post-war generation of Canadians, the population explosion resulting from the war baby generation now reaching university age. It is high time that parliament gave some consideration to priorities in regard to assistance in meeting the educational problems of the nation. We grant $100 million to the C.B.C. I do not know what the figure is for federal grants to universities but obviously it has not increased in equal proportion.

As I have intimated, it was the practice to have the broadcasting committees up until the change of government in 1963. The Conservative government established a parliamentary committee to deal with broadcasting matters and the preceding Liberal government set up several parliamentary committees for this purpose. Arising out of the deliberations of the parliamentary committee in 1957 and 1958 there came very important policy recommendations which resulted in changes in broadcasting procedures that had a beneficial effect in regard to the functions of broadcasting in this nation. The B.B.G., for example, was established and it is high time an opportunity was given for an examination of that body such as is made possible through the device of a parliamentary committee. We must remember also that there has been a continuing shift from radio to television. I do not have the relative expenditures at my fingertips, but I would imagine that a large part of the $100 million made available for the C.B.C. is designated for the telecasting function rather than the radio function.

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

I neglected to mention in the earlier assessment of the functions of public broadcasting in Canada that it was always emphasized that it was desirous to have adequate broadcasting services without resort to commercialization. I think we are all aware that more and more, in both the telecasting and radio fields, the C.B.C. is resorting to revenues from advertising in order to assist in financing. Here is another aspect that could be examined by a suitable parliamentary committee.

Then, we now have alternative broadcasting services available. The private stations, both radio and television, have broadened their services to the Canadian public within recent years. During the past hearings of the parliamentary committee, it has been possible for members of parliament to hear representations from the representatives of the private broadcasters. I wonder if this advisory committee the government has set up is even going to give the private broadcasters an opportunity to make their difficulties and problems known.

Then, another major item that will confront the C.B.C. and the private broadcasters, and because of parliament's function in scrutinizing the operations of the C.B.C. it will concern all members of this house, is the fact we are about to face the decision of whether or not Canada should go into the colour telecasting field. I recall that back in 1952, I believe, the parliamentary committee of that year gave attention to the question of whether or not the C.B.C. should go into the telecasting field. As a result of the discussion in the committee, the C.B.C. was able to come to a decision that was in tune with prevailing public opinion of the day. I can recall, too, we even had a discussion in that committee of whether or not it was desirable to have an FM broadcasting network that would supplement the AM broadcasting facilities at that time. Well, the recommendation came strongly from the parliamentary committee that the C.B.C. should move into FM broadcasting, and as a direct result of the deliberations of that committee the Canadian Broadcasting facilities were considerably improved.

During this debate I do not want to go into the question of programming on the C.B.C.

The Chairman: I have to interrupt the hon. member to inform him that his time has expired, unless he has unanimous consent to continue.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Dinsdale: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman; I will not trespass for very many minutes on the patience of the committee because, as I have intimated already, I do not want to discuss, either in a positive or negative way, the programming of the C.B.C. I do not believe that this committee of the whole is the place in which this subject can be dealt with adequately. It is easy to criticize a particular program, as happens from time to time in this house. Then we hear the minister, speaking from his exalted level of non-partisanism and non-political interference, say that he would be very happy to bring the comments of the hon. members to the officials of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. How much more useful and effective it would be if hon. members could sit across the table and make their comments about these programs and get answers directly from the C.B.C. officials. I am sure the C.B.C. officials would be pleased to explain the motivation behind some of these programs that give rise to discussion and comment not only in this house but in many parts of Canada.

It is not only a public information media such as the C.B.C. that comes under criticism. The press is always under criticism. Of course, we have more direct access to the press through the printed page, and the press is also a private information service. Unfortunately the C.B.C., as a public information body, has to consider the delicate relationships between politicians and the corporation. This makes it a very much more sensitive and difficult area in which to operate. It is not only the press that is criticized. I can recall year after year in this house discussions going forward about the problem of salacious and indecent literature, in much the same terms as the pornography on the C.B.C. comes under discussion here. It was the former member for Kamloops who kept this subject alive over a number of years in such a way that finally this parliament was persuaded to take some legislative action. I am certainly not at all in favour of censorship, but I am absolutely in favour of an expression of public opinion from this responsible parliamentary body that can make the wishes of the people of Canada known to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

I have one final word on this subject, and that is to underscore the importance of a mass media of communication in the world in which we live. We know that the printed word and the earlier means of communication have had an important role to play in shaping the destinies not only of nations but of whole civilizations. I remember, for example, that well known economist, Dr. Innes, at the University of Toronto, giving a series of lectures on the subject of civilization and communication. His thesis was simply this, that the values of the civilization achieved by man in any particular period of time are strongly determined by the means of communication which are available.

He went back to the days of the Egyptian civilization, pointing out that the great leap forward was made possible by the invention of even a simple improvement in communications such as papyrus as opposed to the cuneiform writing which had been the only means of written communication up to that time. But how much more important is this thesis in the kind of world in which we live today, which has mass media able to engage in all sorts of subtle propaganda which can brainwash people without their even knowing they are being brainwashed. I refer to the hidden persuasion which is made possible by the subliminal advertising available in television, whereby one can flash a message on a screen, a message the viewer is not even aware of but which seeps into his subconscious and thus determines his behaviour and motivation.

We hear many criticisms from responsible groups that the avante garde has taken over in certain areas of the C.B.C. and are using this important mass medium to put forward their views, views which obviously are motivating many people, if we are to judge by a generation of angry young men and women making its protests heard in many national areas. All of this has been brought home to us in a forceful manner in recent weeks.

That is all I have time to say at the moment, Mr. Chairman. We have not even begun to exhaust the comments that could be made on broadcasting. I have endeavoured to put forward a case for the referral of C.B.C. and broadcasting matters to a parliamentary committee rather than resorting to the devious device of an advisory committee, such as the government has done. This is a dereliction of duty on the part of the government, because in our form of parliamentary democracy the government and the agencies operating under its aegis must always be responsible to the elected representatives of the people.

Mr. Ormiston: In the few minutes left before six o'clock I should like to remind the committee that when I led off the debate on

interim supply on Friday, October 23, a serious problem confronted us with regard to transport. Those of us who participated in the debate were certainly gratified to note that on the following Monday certain action was taken which we hoped would make it possible for a commission to investigate the situation, but even though some work has been done, to date the situation has not been resolved.

I understand there is difficulty finding someone to head an investigative commission, and we have no guarantee on how long the railway employees will keep their contract to run and operate the trains if no positive action is taken. If, because of the inability of the government or the Minister of Transport to find someone suitable for this job, services were again disrupted, this would be most unfortunate. I sincerely hope that in the very near future a commissioner will be named to investigate the situation, and that an arrangement will be reached satisfactory to both management and the unions involved. The President of the Privy Council was good enough to say we can expect some action in this respect in the near future, but I believe such an announcement should come from the Minister of Transport who holds direct responsibility.

This evening I wish to pursue the topic discussed this afternoon by the hon. member for Edmonton West. We have received some legal interpretations of the constitutional problem, but it is the layman and the public in general who will be affected by the great changes envisaged.

It is only normal that as a country develops and its provinces flex their muscles and become prosperous, they wish to expand in many ways, and in looking for the means with which to expand undoubtedly they look toward the political aspect of a question. This is not only true of Canada but of developing nations all over the world. We have heard much about the winds of change. They do not blow just in one direction or in one country; they blow in many places. As confederation develops we must accept the necessity for change, but every care must be taken and every preparation made before changes are effected and accepted.

As I say, changes have been taking place in many parts of the world. With their experience of the parliamentary system we expect the British to be the most adult nation politically, but just a short time ago we found there are nationalists in Scotland who believe they should be given some recognition. Some of them want a form of parliament for their own country and they go to considerable lengths to make their views known not only to the people of Britain but to people in other parts of the world. They do not, of course, resort to the more callous means of bringing their case to the attention of the public, but it will be recalled that a few years ago, in the dark of night, they stole the stone of Scone which had been sitting in Westminster for hundreds of years, and took it back with them to Scotland. This was their way of showing that the parliamentary representation they were getting was not adequate, and though there was a great hue and cry months went by before the stone was taken back.

There has been little said about separatism since then, these people being very rational, as are all Scottish people, and deeming they had made their point. Mr. Chairman, may I call it six o'clock?

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Ormiston: Mr. Chairman, before the supper hour I was trying, with limited success, to point out that the winds of constitutional change are blowing everywhere in the world, even in the British Isles, where the Scottish nationalists used some unorthodox methods of bringing their views before the public. However, having done it in a rather polite manner, they were not ostracized, as is shown by the fact that the people of Great Britain had two Scottish prime ministers prior to the recent election. While the stone of Scone, or the stone of destiny, as I mentioned, was resident in Westminster, I am one of those who feel that we are not inconvenienced to too great an extent by the residence of the constitution in Westminster; but I did feel that the repatriation of the constitution would begin a war of attrition on that constitution.

We see this because of several situations which have taken place in the last few months. We see that the premier of British Columbia is trying to extend the boundaries of his province into the Yukon and Northwest Territories. We see that the minister of revenue in the province of Quebec has said there are several departments in which there is too much overlapping and that as far as the federal field is concerned they could be done away with. We see the premier of Saskatchewan, after attending the meeting of the federal and provincial representatives,

certainly taking exception to the ideas which were voiced at that meeting. The premier of Saskatchewan was so incensed, evidently, by what took place that he felt that any change in the constitution, if Quebec was affected, would require the province of Saskatchewan to join up with the United States.

This of course is a most unusual approach. Those of us who know something of the economy of Saskatchewan and of the great potential there realize that in the years ahead the economic power of Saskatchewan will probably equal that of the province of Quebec. There are those tremendous deposits of potash which underlie so much of the area of Saskatchewan. The great potential in the province of Saskatchewan is not equalled anywhere else in Canada. Those minerals in the province which will be transported in ever increasing quantity to the underdeveloped and undernourished countries of the world will create an economy for Saskatchewan which will not be equalled. That is why I am wondering why the premier of a province such as Saskatchewan feels so concerned that after a federal-provincial conference he says that if certain other situations are prevalent Saskatchewan will also have to take some steps to dissociate itself from confederation. I am wondering just what did transpire in so far as the change in the constitution was concerned.

There are many people in all parts of Canada who have that same view, and I think it is only pertinent that we should at this time make some inquiry into and expect some explanations as to what the analysis of this whole situation can be. I am particularly concerned because I have heard in other quarters of people in public life who are concerned, and really concerned, about the attitude that was prevalent at that meeting.

One of those individuals is a constitutional lawyer of some note; in fact he is the former lieutenant governor of the province of Saskatchewan, Hon. Frank Bastedo. For the benefit of the committee I should like to put on *Hansard* tonight some of his opinions in this regard, because Hon. Frank Bastedo is recognized in most quarters as an eminent lawyer and one quite well fitted to analyse the situation as it prevails today. Mr. Bastedo was one of those who was a witness when the commission on biculturalism and bilingualism held its meetings in the city of Regina in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Bastedo was very concerned and some of his remarks illustrate his concern to some extent. He told those who were present that the terms of reference of the commission on biculturalism and bilingualism was in effect the first draft of a new constitution for Canada. This is a very strong statement, Mr. Chairman, but he felt this was a constitution that would divide us into an alliance of regions, a partnership of what he called two preferred "founding races" with a silent partnership for those of us who are what he called the "foundling" races.

In the British North America Act there is no talk of races and there is no talk of Quebec or Ontario agreeing to enter into confederation either. The preamble to the British North America Act begins:

> Whereas the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one dominion—

Section 3 provides for the formation of the provinces of Canada, of Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick into one dominion. Then section 5 declares—and hear this carefully:

> Canada—

That is, the new dominion:

> —shall be divided into four provinces, named Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick.

In other words, with the exception of those two provinces which temporarily stayed out of the union in 1867, all of British North America was lumped together to form one nation and then, for the purposes of local government only, it was divided up again. The province of Canada was divided into the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario. These provinces were born, as was our nation of Canada, with the British North America Act. One third of the act sets up constitutions for these provinces. Reading the plain English of the B.N.A. Act—as we must, because there is no official French language text, not even of that part which is the constitution of the province of Quebec—how can there then be talk of an alliance of two founding races, of the parts being greater than the whole?

The Fathers of Confederation deliberately conceived our constitution as a union of parts into one nation, not as an alliance of states. They knew that the United States of America had begun to fall apart within ten years of its founding as an alliance of states. They had read the words of the American statesman James Madison, who was later president, when he successfully fought for a union and repudiated an alliance of states in these words, which I will now put on *Hansard*:

> In time, the world would have seen, for the first time, a system of government founded on an inversion of the fundamental principles of all govern-

ment; it would have seen the authority of the whole society everywhere surbordinate to the authority of the parts; it would have seen a monster, in which the head was under the direction of the members.

Madison and his fellow statesmen succeeded in strengthening the bonds of union, but they were not so successful as to prevent the war between the states which was burning fiercely at the very time our Fathers of Confederation were planning our union. It was because of the experience of those Americans that Sir John A. Macdonald analysed the situation as it then was across the border and also made some pointed remarks. Having seen the situation which existed across the border he said this:

We can now take advantage of the last 78 years, during which the constitution—

He is referring to the American constitution.

—has existed, and I am strongly of the belief that we have, in a great measure, avoided in this system which we propose for the adoption of the people of Canada the defects which time and events have shown to exist in the American constitution... Ever since the union was formed the difficulty of what is called "state rights" has existed, and this had had much to do in bringing on the present unhappy war in the United States... They commence, in fact, at the wrong end. They declared by their constitution that each state was a sovereignty in itself, and that all the powers incident to a sovereignty belonged to each state, except those powers which by the constitution were conferred upon the general government and congress. Here we have adopted a different system. We have strengthened the general government... We thereby strengthen the central parliament, and make the confederation one people and one government, instead of five peoples and five governments, with merely a point of authority connecting us to a limited and insufficient extent.

This is certainly a point to analyse when we realize today that to some extent we are again trying to divide the powers of our governments.

When these statesmen such as Madison, the American, and Macdonald, the Canadian, have so spoken, why does the present government revive this type of proposition—this monster government which Madison repudiated and Macdonald slew; the monster of which the head is under the direction of the members; the monster of which the parts are greater than the whole; the monster that spawns that monstrosity of wars, civil war?

There was another American who was very conscious of the division of power between the state and the federal government, and I refer to George Washington. Washington, who led the armies of the colonies in revolution, who lived under the alliance of states and

[Mr. Ormiston.]

wrote that it seemed little more than a shadow without substance, who served two terms as first president of the strengthened union, knew the answer. In his farewell address to the people of the United States Washington said this—

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): We have enough problems over here without hearing about the United States.

Mr. Ormiston: This is quite relevant, if the hon. member will listen. He said:

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your tranquility at home, your peace abroad, of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But it is easy to foresee that from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union, to your collective and individual happiness...frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts...In contemplating the causes which may disturb our union, it occurs as a matter of serious concern that any group should have been furnished for characterising parties by geographical discriminations—northern and southern—Atlantic and western; whence designing men may endeavour to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence, within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts...

I may say now, Mr. Chairman, that the evil which Washington foresaw as a constant and active threat to the union of the United States has come upon us in Canada. There are designing men in all parts of the country, both on the provincial and the national level, who can easily raise the cry of discrimination in one quarter and favouritism in another. I think it is evident that those of us who analyse what was said by Macdonald, Madison and Washington feel that here is a lesson which we can take to heart. They foresaw the difficulties which would ensue where the country was divided, where the federal government was weakened, where the provincial or state government became too powerful. This is a lesson which we would do well to take to heart in the days ahead when we have to examine all of the propositions which have come forward from this federal and provincial conference.

Mr. Willoughby: Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the applause which I am getting from the other side of the house. I hope I will be worthy of the courtesy hon. members opposite are showing and that they will continue to be courteous during the few remarks I have to make. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the remarks which I have will be brief and they will be based on criticisms which I hope are justifiable. I feel they are. But in addition to being criticisms I hope they will also be criticisms of a constructive nature. It is not criticism, Mr. Chairman, of the intent; it is the criticism which I have in my mind of the methods being used in this house.

I feel I am wholly correct when I say that at the present time parliament is in disrepute. It is in disrepute not only in local circles here, but from talking to constituents and from correspondence I have received from all over Canada I feel this is the attitude of the general public toward this institution, and I think it is something which should be taken very seriously. The House of Commons cannot afford to continue in this manner.

Everything this parliament has done is not wrong, and I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys upon his recent announcement regarding the choice of site for the construction of a $10 million telescope, which I believe is of national importance, This telescopic complex represents a tremendous memorial to the 1967 centennial celebration. The location of this site was decided after careful consideration and study by the scientists involved in the project, and I congratulate the minister and his government in this regard.

My criticisms are not directed toward the things brought forward by this government, but toward the manner in which it has brought them forward. Far be it from me to profess expert knowledge in many of the fields of legislation which have been and will be covered during this session, but I do feel that we should receive more expert advice regarding the problems with which we are faced. The legislation brought forward during the past 18 months has been submitted to this parliament without due study and preparation. As a result we have witnessed one blunder after another. We were promised 60 days of decision but instead we have observed 16 months of indecision.

Mr. Chairman, are we to witness further decisions of the same type which will not stand up to scrutiny and criticism? Is the government creating more problems? Let us find the answers to these questions before it is too late. Let us take a lesson from what has happened during the last 16 months and thereby avoid making the same errors. During the present session of parliament many federal-provincial conferences have taken place. While I think the principle behind these conferences should be encouraged, I believe more have been held during this session than during any other session in history. Perhaps that is an indication of uncertainty or insecurity on the part of the government.

What is the trouble with Canada? This is a country with unlimited opportunity, and I am sure no one will deny that fact. Under present circumstances can we not be a happy family? Why are we so divided at this time? I think our problem is one of misdirection. Let us stop pussyfooting, locate the trouble and cure it. We should stop treating the provinces and each other like sick children. More candy never cured a sick child. This is an adult nation, so let us be adult in our thinking. Separatism is a word which we should banish from our vocabulary.

Mr. Chairman, I am not alone in my thinking, and as support for my argument I should like to quote the sentiments expressed very well by Mr. Westell in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of October 22. Mr. Westell was writing about the situation existing in Canada today and has stated:

> A whole new system of government appears to be emerging in Canada without conscious planning and with no one quite sure how it will end.

He then states:

> Prime Minister Lester Pearson calls the new system co-operative federalism—a phrase which has become a cliché and thus tends to conceal rather than reveal what is happening.
>
> The Canadian constitution provides in theory for a division of powers between the federal and provincial governments. But more and more, the two levels of authority are merging their fields of jurisdiction and making policy jointly.
>
> The extent to which this is happening is best seen in the extraordinary rapid development of federal-provincial consultation at the ministerial, or policy-making level.
>
> Mr. Pearson remarked in a casual aside recently that there were federal-provincial talks going on nearly every day. He was hardly exaggerating.
>
> Until his government took office last year, formal consultations between Ottawa and the provinces were rare. The prime minister and the premiers met about once every five years to renegotiate tax-sharing arrangements and there were occasional special conferences to deal with special problems, such as repatriating the constitution.

As I have said, this type of conference may be helpful and I do not think they should be discouraged, but let us be more adult in our thinking. Let us think at a higher and

more important level. What did the last conferences really accomplish, and I refer to the one which has just concluded? What is the meaning of the proposed amendment to the so-called Fulton formula?

Mr. Chairman, I am not an authority on the technicalities of these things but I do know we must accept the statements of the authorities in these fields. The Minister of Justice should know what he is talking about, and I should like to quote from something he said on the C.B.C. This quotation has been referred to already here in this debate, but I think it is worth repeating. The following question was asked:

> If, for example, at any given time four provinces, or indeed more than four provinces, decided to delegate important powers to the federal government in the coming year, and that the province of Quebec, for its own reasons which we all understand, decided to retain these powers, would we not arrive at a kind of associate-state status for these two ethnic groups, two nations?

The Minister of Justice in reply to that question made the following statement:

> Up to a certain point, that is possible. Because in at least four important areas as, for example, property and civil rights, which is considered as almost sacred by the province of Quebec, it will be possible to have a delegation of power by seven or eight or nine provinces and thus, of course, for this end, there could be a distinction between Quebec and the other provinces, which would be at least a distinction in fact, if not in real status, because it would be the same constitution.

What does this mean? Does it mean that the provinces may expect to have jurisdiction over immigration? Does it mean they can expect to have jurisdiction over Indian ffairs? Does it mean that the provinces will have jurisdiction to override the recent federal-provincial conference on Indian affairs, concluded just last week? During that conference it was suggested that the Indians should use their own judgment as to whether they should stay under federal jurisdiction or opt out and fall within provincial jurisdiction. These are things that should be left to the experts. I do not think the majority of members of the house are qualified to decide these points.

Mr. Winch: Then why are you discussing them?

Mr. Willoughby: What am I discussing? I am trying to discuss the idea of bringing some degree of reason into the House of Commons and I hope I am being successful.

Mr. Rhéaume: Any more questions down there?

[Mr. Willoughby.]

Mr. Winch: You said these matters should be left to the experts. Then why are you discussing them?

Mr. Willoughby: If you will hear me out I think you will come to the same conclusion, and after that I hope I will hear what you have to say. We have further evidence of this situation of uncertainty in our midst and I think I should quote from another article in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of October 15 last which has reference to the constitutional problem. It refers to the supreme court ruling some time ago with regard to the jurisdiction of the provinces and the federal government, in which these words are found:

> "The powers of parliament and of the provincial legislatures are strictly limited by the British North America Act and cannot be enlarged even with the joint consent of parliament and with the legislatures. Jurisdiction cannot be conferred by consent. None of these bodies can be vested directly or indirectly with powers which have been denied them by the British North America Act and which, therefore, are not within their constitutional jurisdiction."

That was the ruling of the court. The article goes on to say:

> With this road blocked, the present government at Ottawa attempted a new approach. The idea was that affected governments should simply turn a blind eye to the court. It should be possible to get around the constitution by a cosy agreement that it was not there. This was attempted in the Eskimo case although the matter was confused by an unconvincing and shabby pretence that administration could be transferred while jurisdiction remained untouched.
>
> We now have a third approach which has at least the merit of honesty. The constitution is to be changed to make possible what was not possible before.
>
> The power of delegation to be conferred on parliament by the draft amendment will be restricted in two ways. It will have authority to delegate provided that at least four of the provinces have, prior to the enactment of the statute, consented to its operation. But this is followed by a rather curious alternative.

The article goes on to show how the situation becomes more and more confused. I ask this question, Mr. Chairman: Are we at the present time facing a *fait accompli*? Are the provinces to be given powers that may not serve the best interests of our country? Everyone agrees with the principle of bringing home the constitution. We are mature enough, I hope, to handle it. We have not been handicapped particularly by the fact that it has been in Great Britain and that we have had to apply to Great Britain for necessary amendments to the constitution. We have at least received fair play there. But our national dignity and pride have been hurt and I believe

we all agree that the constitution should be brought back to our own country.

With regard to the question of the results of these alterations to the constitution, I think this is a matter that should be left entirely to the experts and certain questions must be answered before we proceed with the legislation about to be introduced into the house. As soon as it can possibly be done I believe the house should refer this matter to a committee for study. The finest experts in Canada should be brought before the committee to assure us that the constitutional amendments are in the best interests of everyone in this country, every province and the federal government.

I hope we will not let this matter go until it gets into the position where the Supreme Court of Canada has to hand down rulings with regard to whether the constitution is really valid. Now is the time for us to place this matter before a committee. We should not wait until the legislation is brought before the house because it will then be tossed around from party to party and from man to man. People like myself are not in any position to judge, and in my opinion we now have the opportunity to get away from the situation that arises when legislation is brought in, and then has to be taken out of the house and brought back in again in modified form before it is finally accepted. I think this is our opportunity to see that this most important piece of legislation is placed in the hands of a committee, where the finest experts in the country will be able to pass judgment on it. In my view this is in the interests of Canada's future, because I feel that the House of Commons must make provision for a most careful investigation.

This is not a partisan issue, Mr. Chairman. Our future depends on seeing to it that the alterations made are fair and safe. I say that now is the time to stop, look and listen and to see just what this legislation really means. Does the proposed transfer of powers really alter national control? Is the constitution in danger of being relegated to political expediency? These are things we want to find out. These are things we must know. Will parliament have the courage to refuse amendments when requested by certain provinces or will these matters have to be referred to the supreme court to find out whether or not the provinces are within their constitutional rights?

What does all this add up to? I would say it adds up to the fact that we should take steps immediately to bring about something that we know will be in the best interests of our country, something that will stand up to the criticism that is bound to come before these amendments to our constitution can be made. Let us have a committee study the matter as soon as it can possibly be arranged. If this is done I believe we will probably find that many of the criticisms we are hearing in regard to this matter may not be justified. I think we will probably find that what we are afraid of can be clarified without difficulty. In my opinion the original Fulton formula with these alterations will probably stand up in the House of Commons and we will find that it is satisfactory to all Canadians. If this course is followed I believe we can get the legislation through much more quickly, save a lot of the time of parliament and of the government and get ahead with what is best for our country.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Chairman, in today's debate considerable discussion has taken place regarding the constitution of Canada, commonly known as the British North America Act, and methods of repatriating and amending it. I want to take the opportunity for a few moments to discuss these points because in my province, indeed in the constituency I have the honour to represent, for the whole of this year we have as a community been celebrating the centennial of the first meeting of the Fathers of Confederation which took place in Charlottetown commencing on September 1, 1864. We in the maritime provinces are happy to celebrate the centennial of this occasion because we felt and still feel that the fondest dreams of the Fathers of Confederation who met in Charlottetown 100 years ago are within our grasp and that many of them indeed have already been achieved. After all, they met 100 years ago to weld together into a nation a few scattered colonies in what was then known as British North America. We can be proud of the success they achieved because if we consider the nations of the world as they existed at that time and especially the governments that dominated the face of Europe, we realize that most of them have changed their shape or have gone out of existence entirely during those one hundred years. Our dominion has survived and grown, and there is much of which Canadians can be proud in the achievements of the last 100 years.

The delegation that met originally in Charlottetown met for the purpose of considering the union of the maritime provinces

of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. However, they knew that their lieutenant governors had previously been asked by Lord Monck, who was then the governor general of the province of Canada, in a letter written earlier, if the province of Canada could send a delegation of observers to this conference. Those eight delegates arrived from what was then Canada, and their discussions were given priority in the Charlottetown meeting—that is, the discussion of the larger concept of the union of all the colonies of British North America. This was discussed for several days. There was agreement in principle as to the type of union that would be suitable. It was agreed that it should be a confederation, a federal state.

After these discussions had concluded, the conference that had met originally for the purpose of discussing maritime union, then turned to the first item on their agenda. In the light of the progress made in consideration of the wider suggestion, it was decided to postpone indefinitely any thought of union of the maritime provinces. Instead, the delegates from these three maritime provinces, plus the augmented delegation from Canada and two representatives of Newfoundland, met a little later at Quebec city and passed the Quebec resolutions, which became what we know as the British North America Act.

I believe, in retrospect, that the Fathers of Confederation made two unfortunate omissions from the things they agreed upon. In my judgment, one was that they neglected to devise a means of bringing the constitution to Canada, a repatriation of the British North America Act.

Mr. Lloyd: May I raise a point of order?

The Chairman: The hon. member for Halifax wishes to raise a point of order?

Mr. Lloyd: Earlier today in this debate on interim supply, Mr. Chairman, you cautioned the hon. member for Villeneuve to be mindful of the matter before the committee. You reminded him of the need to be relevant in the observations he was making. I suggest to you that the same general observations should apply to the speaker who is now addressing the committee.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I want to thank my good friend, the hon. member for Halifax, for bringing this to my attention, because if he follows my remarks he will find that shortly I will be relating what I said to the item before us, which is interim supply.

[Mr. MacLean (Queens).]

An hon. Member: This is 1964, not 1867.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): That is right; we are a country which came into being because of what took place in 1867, and in order to understand what we are I think it is only reasonable that we should review briefly what happened before.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. This afternoon you called me to order two or three times because my remarks did not bear directly upon the $740 million interim supply now before us.

Now, then, is the member who now has the floor speaking on the expenditures or the supply under study? He is speaking of 1867, while we are in the year 1964. If you remind him that we are now in 1964, I will agree with his remarks.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: It is certainly a good point that has been raised by the hon. member for Halifax and the hon. member for Villeneuve. From time to time during this debate the Chair has reminded hon. members who have participated in the debate that we have a specific resolution before us. The rules of the committee are that discussion in committee should be strictly relevant to the question at issue. What we are considering now is interim supply. Certainly hon. members cannot continue discussing theoretical questions. They have to relate their remarks specifically to government business. I assumed that the comments which have been made to this point by the member for Queens were perhaps laying a foundation for a future specific reference to the resolution before us. I would ask him to keep that in mind.

Mr. Byrne: I rise on the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am sure that unless Sir John A. Macdonald left some unpaid bills in Charlottetown 100 years ago, these remarks could not possibly be relevant.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): You are quite right, Mr. Chairman. I was saying, when I was interrupted, that I felt two areas in our constitution, as it now stands, have been of great concern to this session of parliament. We would not be in the state of disarray in which we are as a nation if these omissions had not been made. The first is, as I said, that no provision was made for bringing the constitution back to Canada. This is one of the things that is immediately concerning us. The second omission was the lack of a provision for national symbols in our constitu-

tion, so that changes therein could be made in a constitutional way.

In 1962, the ten provincial governments of Canada and the federal government, decided to create a memorial, which is still not paid for in its entirety, to these Fathers of Confederation. We should look for a minute, I think, at what the objectives of the day were as they apply to the present situation. I should like to quote briefly from one of the Fathers of Confederation:

> What we desire and wish is to defend the general interests of a great country and a powerful nation, by means of a central power.

This is a quotation from Hector Langevin. Then, I should like to quote from George Etienne Cartier:

> Shall we be content to maintain a mere provincial existence, when, by combining together, we could become a great nation?

As I have said previously, provision was made two years ago for this fine national memorial to the Fathers of Confederation, which happens to be located in my constituency as that is where they first met. At that meeting, and in subsequent meetings they laid down what should be the jurisdiction on the one hand of the federal government and on the other of the provincial governments. Now, before the memorial is completed, we find ourselves with a government which has the rather fatuous theory that you can have your cake and eat it, that every part can have its own way completely, independent of the whole.

We have a government that tries to create the impression that each province can go its own separate way and enjoy the narrow benefits which accrue from that course while at the same time enjoying all the benefits of unity. That these two things are possible is a fallacious theory. The two points are mutually exclusive. We need a fairly strong central government.

The repatriation of the British North America Act is something which has been desired by Canadians for many years. It is not a fact that our constitution has to be amended in Westminster because of a desire by the British government to hang on to some vestige of colonial power. Far from it; Britain would have been pleased to be rid of this anachronism years ago. The reason it was not repatriated was because the various segments which make up our great country did not always feel in concert that their interests would be safeguarded if a change were made, or at least they could not arrive at a formula which would guarantee them their own interests.

I for one welcome the repatriation of the British North America Act, but I would point out that at the recent federal-provincial conference other matters were introduced, and in the proposal we find not only the question of bringing the constitution to Canada but also the question of amendments which would provide a sort of floating jurisdiction between the federal government and the provincial governments. Changes in jurisdiction may be made without further amendment to the act, provided four provincial governments act in concert, and if they did I am sure they would not be resisted by a federal government as weak as this one, even though their action was not in the national interest. This concerns me deeply. For more than one reason we must have a strong federal government.

D. G. Creighton, the well known Canadian historian, speaking of the British North America Act and of the feelings of the Fathers of Confederation said:

> They had no desire whatever to break with Great Britain or to make any radical change in their own system of government. They firmly believed that constitutional monarchy, parliamentary institutions, and responsible government on the British model provided the best and freest political system in the world. All they had to do at Quebec was to recast these institutions in a federal form, but without giving too much power to the provinces and thus weakening the federation. They were convinced that it was "States' Rights" that had led to the American civil war. They must avoid the mistake of the Americans and make confederation a strong union with a predominant central government.

The federal government should also be strong in the area of its financial resources. When a number of colonies unite, the union is bound to be more beneficial to some than to others, and although on the whole it is beneficial to everyone the benefits that accrue to some will not be as great as accrue to others. Therefore there has to be a central government that can even things out a bit, and by subsidy guarantee a minimum standard of services in various things that are the responsibility of the provinces, so that a minimum is established which is the right of all people in the nation, in this case all the citizens of Canada, whether they live in Newfoundland, Quebec, Manitoba, B.C. or anywhere else. In my view it is essential that the financial resources of the central government be fairly strong, not only to fulfil the responsibilities which fall to it under the

constitution, but also to provide this evening-out effect between the provinces that make up the nation.

I am greatly concerned with the proposal which emanated from the recent federal-provincial conference in that any consortium of four provinces can set upon the federal government and piecemeal take away part of its powers, this without any reference to the legislatures of the provinces which are not in accord with the procedure. These other provinces would have no voice in what was taking place except through their members of parliament in the House of Commons.

I have a question in my mind with regard to residual powers. As hon. members will remember, 35 years ago when the case of broadcasting came up this matter had not been contemplated by an earlier age, and the question arose as to whose jurisdiction applied. Such a thing will occur in the future and I wonder whether jurisdiction will automatically lie with the central government in the first instance.

It is unfortunate that during the last two years there has been an accentuation of discord and disharmony in this country, which was conceived with such great prospects for the future. As a nation we find ourselves disenchanted with our government. We find ourselves dismayed by some of its tactics. We find ourselves disconcerted with the lack of progress parliament is making because of the manner in which matters are placed before it. We have a great responsibility and it behooves us all to realize that at best we are only very temporary custodians of the nation's interests.

That being the case, our greatest responsibility is to improve the potential of what future generations of Canadians may inherit. We are, after all, still nation building and I think it behooves the government to raise its sights above petty, shortsighted, myopic political considerations of the moment and realize that this is a great country, deserving the services of great men. They should raise their sights and look to the future, realizing that their greatest responsibility is to future generations of Canadians.

We should remember that our actions should not be governed by the short term view of what may keep a government in power for a few weeks longer, or anything of that sort. We have the future of a nation to consider. I think I can best express what I am trying to say by quoting very briefly from John Ruskin's "Seven Lamps of Architecture", in which he says:

> Therefore, when we build, let us think that we build for ever. Let it not be for present delight, nor for present use alone; let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for, and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time is to come when those stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say as they look upon the labour and wrought substance of them, "See! this our fathers did for us".

I am—I was going to say disenchanted but that is not a strong enough word, Mr. Chairman—disgusted on occasion with the attitude of this government, even in the normal life span of a government, that has been given by the Canadian people the responsibility of conducting their affairs for a short period of time. I hope that in the future this government will realize that it has not been elected to power to govern for its friends, or to govern only its friends; but its responsibility is to the whole nation and to every Canadian.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of speaking tonight in this debate, but like all other members I realize that the Conservative party apparently, intends to somewhat gag the parliament of this country. In fact, we have been discussing for ten days estimates to the amount of $740 million which are before us, and for the past eight days we have been told behind the scene, here in this house, and almost everywhere, that nothing will be passed because the Conservatives have so decided.

They have been talking about the constitution, the flag, assistance to farmers, immigration, Indian affairs, in short about everything, but the Conservatives are not at all interested in the appropriations which are before us, which are already spent and which we must pay. According to what we read in the newspapers, and according to what we can see in this house, they are interested in a general election. And yet, if a general election were held probably half the present Conservative members in this house would be defeated.

What I find strange—

[*Text*]

Mr. Rhéaume: What about you?

Mr. Caouette: Never mind about me. I will be back here much faster than you will.

Mr. Rhéaume: You hope.

Mr. Caouette: I do not hope; I am sure of it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who just interrupted me knows very well that he is in much greater danger of not coming back than the member for Villeneuve. He is quite aware

of the fact. He knows perfectly well, too, that the debate now going on is nothing else but what, in the King's English, is called a filibuster on the supply motion brought forward by the government.

[*Text*]

Mr. Rapp: Didn't you say the same thing in 1963?

Mr. Caouette: Yes. I said it in 1962 also. And in so far as your party continues to act the way it does, I will be fighting you; don't worry about that.

Mr. MacEwan: We are awfully scared of you.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: We on this side of the house are not interested in protecting or siding with either of the old line parties. However, I will remind the Conservatives that they were in office one year and a half ago; indeed, they were in office for six years. A moment ago I saw the former minister of agriculture preparing to rise when I stood up and you gave me the floor.

What are the Conservatives doing now? They blame the party in office in regard to agriculture, labour, public works, mines, in short, in regard to every field. They were in office for six years; why did they not act differently from the government they are now blaming? Let us be consistent and logical with ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, we often hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) repeat that he is the right hon. leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition. However, let us keep in mind that not so long ago he was not the leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, but the prime minister of the royal government of Canada.

The then prime minister was not very active in those days. When he was defeated by a majority vote in the House of Commons on February 4, 1963, it was through his own fault and not through that of others; everyone was asking him to take action and to present a budget, which he and his government had neglected to do for a couple of years. Today he sits on the opposition benches and he blames the government for failing to do what he neglected to do himself.

For the last eight or 10 days many matters, many questions have been discussed in this house, and no one seems to know exactly where we are heading. Some talk about immigration. A while ago, I heard a member, who has since left the chamber, talk about immigration and Indian affairs. Are we going to leave those matters to the provinces?

Others spoke about repatriating the constitution. They do not know what repatriating the constitution means; they do not know what we should do with the constitution.

As I said a week ago, all those who are attached to the British crown should have listened to the speech made in Quebec city by Her Majesty the Queen on the Saturday of her visit because she stated at the time that it is hardly surprising that a 100 year old constitution should be outdated.

Why always depreciate Canada as it now stands or as it could be?

A while ago I heard a Conservative—they are the only ones who speak but I manage to squeeze in a few words now and then—say that the province wants to control immigration. What is wrong with that? Would it not be normal for a province to keep track of the people who move into its territory and of those who move out and, if necessary, that it object to the admission of undesirable immigrants? If that were done by a province instead of by the federal government as at present, what would be wrong with that?

This does not mean that we will chase away from the provinces immigrants coming from any country whatsoever in the world. But if any Canadian province were forced to accept as an immigrant a man like Castro from Cuba, for instance, could you blame it for objecting?

First of all there is dissension among the Conservatives, that is as clear as day; they disagree amongst themselves. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer) was here a while ago, the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent) does not share his leader's views, nor has the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon) shared them for a long time now, and the same goes for the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Valade), the hon. member for Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière (Mr. Paul), the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) now occupying his seat in the house, and the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue (Mr. Martineau) who spoke intelligently this afternoon in favour of a Canada for Canadians, not a bound Canada, a trapped Canada, an enslaved Canada, but a Canada belonging to Canadians. That hon. member was logical when he spoke thus. He was justified in calling for the adoption of a distinctive national flag. Of course, if he only represented the southern part of his riding he would say: "Any flag but a distinctive national flag." It is because

Témiscamingue is in his constituency and some people there insist—

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Caouette: —that the hon. member should advocate a distinctive national flag.

Mr. Martineau: I feel flattered by the remarks of the hon. member for Villeneuve, but he is mistaken when he suggests that I would speak otherwise if I represented only one part of my riding. He is not in a position to make such an allegation and I am sure that, in all his usual fairness, he will not pursue that course.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I take due note of the explanation given by my very good friend, the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue. However, I know his riding, I would not say better than he does but at least as well because I once was the member for that riding. I know the difference between the northern and southern parts of that riding; I used to get a beating in the southern part and get elected in the northern part; the hon. member knows that.

However, should there be an election the hon. member is certainly interested in getting elected in the northern part of his riding without offending the southern part and, therefore, he is trying to run with the hare and to hunt with the hounds. That is his business, since I have nothing to do with that riding.

An hon. Member: A majority of one.

Mr. Caouette: Someone says that he was elected with a majority of one; it was not with the vote of the elector but the vote of the returning officer.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that I am straying far away from the subject matter of the debate at this time. The election of the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue has nothing to do with the $700 million expenditures which we are now considering.

I am also willing to record in *Hansard* that I have much admiration for the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue, that I respect him, and he knows that. We never exchanged cattish words. I would not wish tonight to start a battle which I am convinced he would lose in advance.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard all kinds of recriminations, all kinds of allegations, but what surprises me, I say it again, is seeing that the Conservatives seem to take a malicious pleasure, a pleasure that I should call sadistic, in forcing us to discuss for hours, for days on end, a supply motion for $740 million which nobody considers important.

Their objective is obvious; to prevent the legislation from being introduced and discussed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of each member of the Ralliement Créditistes, which I represent, I say: "We do not object to a debate on the legislation, but we strongly object to boycotting. If this boycotting was reasonable or had a commendable objective I would probably agree with the Conservatives at this time. But under the circumstances, everybody is tired. In hallways one meets Liberals and Conservatives who are tired and disgusted by the present attitude of certain members of the Conservative party. They are the ones who say: Introduce your legislation.

No opportunity is given to introduce legislation, but it is said: Introduce that legislation.

Mr. Chairman, people cannot be fooled like that forever. The flag question was mentioned. That matter will be discussed in due time. We had a meeting of the party leaders; we will have another one and the whole matter will probably be discussed at that time.

Why do Conservative members discuss the flag question again? We can discuss it, indeed. But what can we answer the people we meet on the streets in our ridings, in Toronto, Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Montreal, in short, everywhere in Canada, who ask us: When will you settle this flag issue, so that we do not hear any more about it? You should settle important problems for Canada instead of wasting your time on the flag issue. That is what we hear all over Canada, not only in one province.

Then, they try, as they did last week, to pit the English against the French Canadians and make people believe that the province of Quebec wants special treatment in Canada; the Quebec people do not ask for special treatment, but for fair treatment in Canada; they want to be recognized as real Canadians entitled to the same advantages and benefits as other Canadians, and ready to face the same obligations.

That is what we ask.

Why do the Conservatives make us waste our time here? They will try in the province of Quebec—Mr. Chairman, I see that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) probably finds my remarks humorous; I am ready to discuss those same matters

with him any time he may choose, in his own riding in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, we want justice to be done. But let us stop wasting tax money paid by the Canadian people. The Conservatives are the ones wasting the tax money paid in by Canadians who sweat and labour to make an honest and honourable living in Canada.

They do not want to stop, they go on with their filibuster. As far as I am concerned, I shall not indulge in filibuster any longer. Let them go on, let them talk, they are the only ones who want to take the floor.

I took the liberty of making these few remarks to indicate exactly who are those responsible for this intrigue work, this shameless parliamentary work which does honour to no Canadian, no matter his origin.

In the province of Quebec, we want action. In the other provinces, people also want action. It is not a policy of nuisance, aimed at preventing others from acting, that will give Canadians satisfaction.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the Conservatives and I ask them to be more honest towards the Canadian people, more honest towards the Canadian taxpayers, so that we can pass these estimates as soon as possible and go on to legislation which will at last give more security to every Canadian citizen.

[*Text*]

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you have listened with great interest to the Liberal member for Villeneuve who has just taken his seat.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hamilton: If ever we have heard a member preaching for a call, there it was.

The hon. member mentioned something about Quebec's wishes. I wonder whether he would do me the honour of recognizing that those who come from areas in other parts of Canada have just as many rights to their deep-felt traditions as do the people of Quebec. This involves a fundamental point. If we ever find in this country of minorities that a minority has its rights trampled upon, we expect every member in this House of Commons—on all sides of the house—to join in the defence of that minority. All that is happening in this parliament today is that a group of members of only one party are attempting to put before the Canadian people the fact that some feel the rights of a minority are being trampled upon.

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on this subject, but was provoked into doing so by the remarks of the hon. member for Villeneuve. I came here tonight to speak about the expenditure of $740 million. Each member of parliament has the right to refuse to vote supply to a government that is not meeting the wishes of parliament.

Mr. Lloyd: On the general estimates.

Mr. Hamilton: It is not only the right of an hon. member to do so—

An hon. Member: Go ahead and do it; let us vote.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Batten): Order, please. The Chair is having some difficulty hearing the hon. member.

Mr. Hamilton: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sure if I am out of order at any time the hon. member for Halifax will object. I have listened to that type of objection on previous occasions and I am sure he will do so now if he thinks I am transcending the rules.

Mr. Lloyd: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. It is my right to object, on a point of order, and I will exercise that privilege whenever in my considered judgment the situation calls for such an objection, and I do not need the hon. member to indicate when I should object. I have only risen on a point of order twice during the present session. He and his associates have taken up the best part of 72 days to obstruct, and to insist upon what he proposes should be put to the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Stand up and take a bow.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member's sensitivity speaks for itself.

Mr. Skoreyko: That is the first speech he has made in the house.

Mr. Hamilton: The reason I feel we should not vote supply in this house at the present time is that those who sit opposite are not the successors of the Fathers of Confederation of this nation, but are the fathers of deconfederation.

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Hamilton: One of the most pronounced feelings expressed by the people across this country is of deep disturbance. This disturbance is being covered not only by the flag issue, but by a whole series of events. We are in the middle of preparing to celebrate our centennial in honour of the Fathers of Confederation, but by the actions of this

government over the last 18 months we are making a mockery of all that the Fathers of Confederation sought to achieve.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hamilton: Tonight I intend to use the words of the Liberal members, not only in this house but in many other places across Canada, to show the type of confusion which exists. One cannot overlook the existing rights of the people of Newfoundland, British Columbia, Quebec or Ontario, or any other province. One cannot overlook the concern of residents of Canada for what has been happening. The purpose of bringing this country together 100 years ago was to join together as one nation, to do what could not be done by six, seven or eight separate colonies.

Mr. Habel: You cannot do that by division, as you are attempting today.

Mr. MacEwan: Read your paper, Joe. Look at the sports page.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Chairman, I hear a voice that rasps from disuse talking about division.

Mr. Woolliams: Isn't that terrible.

Mr. Hamilton: One hundred years ago we joined together for defence, for political reasons and above all to raise our economic standards.

Mr. Regan: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Hamilton: When I am finished the hon. member for Halifax can make his own speech.

Mr. Regan: It would be much more timely now.

Mr. Winkler: Is that the junior or the senior member for Halifax?

Mr. Regan: Will the hon. member not agree—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I think the hon. member for Qu'Appelle has indicated that he does not wish to receive any questions.

Mr. Regan: He is afraid to answer.

Mr. Hamilton: These hon. members do not want me to read what I am going to read tonight because it is the mark of division of this country that I brand them with. I said a moment ago that we are not satisfied to let these people facing us tear this country asunder. One hundred years ago we did not form a unitary government, we did not form a confederate government, we formed a federal state.

Mr. Woolliams: Right.

Mr. Hamilton: And with respect to those matters over which the federal government has jurisdiction every Canadian owes his loyalty to the federal government and to the federal government alone. When we hear this divisive nonsense being uttered at this time by so-called responsible ministers it makes us in the opposition wonder whether we can vote supply to such a government.

The situation confronting us is not unknown in our history. In any federal state there is always a tug-of-war between the central power and the provincial powers, because no matter how carefully you try to draft the respective jurisdictions there will always be overlapping and conflict. In our history we have seen power shift from one side to the other. We have seen a period when the provincial governments became stronger and the federal government became weaker. We have seen a period when the federal government became stronger and the powers of the provinces were reduced. One of these periods was from 1935 to 1957 and if you go back over our history you will see that there was good reason for it. In order to meet the challenge of the depression the people of Canada were quite willing for the federal government to assume extra powers to try to bring the whole strength of the nation to grapple with the very serious economic difficulties. During the war there was a tremendous expansion of the federal power and I believe all Canadians were glad to see this power assumed by the federal government so that we could prosecute the war with maximum effectiveness.

Following the war there was a period of rehabilitation, but the tendency to centralize did not stop with the end of the rehabilitation period. It continued, and there is no doubt that in the latter years of the Liberal government which was in power from 1935 to 1957 the Conservative party began to object to this centralization on the ground that it was not so necessary, and on the ground that it was being pushed beyond the point of good sense.

When the government changed in 1957 the new Conservative government tried to strengthen the provinces financially. This was done by increasing their share of federal revenues from three direct taxes. It was done by increasing the grants and by increasing the number of joint programs. All these

things were done to strengthen the ability of the provinces to carry out their responsibilities within their jurisdictions. This program cost the federal government almost twice as much as was spent in 1956-57. It is a matter of common knowledge that there would not have been a single deficit in the period 1957 to 1963 if it had not been for our trying to strengthen the provinces.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hamilton: In arranging the distribution of the revenues between the federal and provincial governments there was none of this take it or leave it attitude at the conferences. We consulted with the provinces, listened to their case and tried to do the best job we could do for them.

Take a look at the things we did. When we moved into those areas where there was concurrent jurisdiction and into those areas which were strictly provincial in jurisdiction we were scrupulously careful not only to consult with the provinces but to get agreement. I give as evidence of this—

Mr. Byrne: The Columbia river treaty?

Mr. Hamilton: —the resources for tomorrow conference. I give as evidence of this the negotiations in regard to the Columbia river treaty. We set up a joint liaison committee between the federal government and the province of British Columbia. The Liberals had been unable to do anything since 1944 with regard to the development of the Columbia, but we got the Columbia agreement moving forward. We carried the support of the government of British Columbia every step of the way. The minutes of that joint committee are available for ministers of the crown to read. This is one of the best examples of a federal government with power over an international river co-operating with the owner of the resource, the province of British Columbia.

I give as another example the joint programs we embarked upon where the provincial governments were consulted not only singly but together until we got agreement all across the country. There was none of this uproar we have today. I give, for example, the ARDA program. So far as agriculture is concerned the ARDA program was within the jurisdiction of the federal government, but because it moved into areas which were under the jurisdiction of the provinces there was very careful consultation and agreement. All during the tremendous amount of action that took place to get at the problems facing Canada there was not a serious quarrel with any province.

An hon. Member: Just among the ministers.

Mr. Tardif: Nobody gets into a quarrel when he does not do anything.

Mr. Hamilton: Never in the history of federal government was so much done in so short a space of time as we did it. But what happened in 1963 when the new government came into power?

Mr. Woolliams: Calamity.

Mr. Hamilton: Without any consultation with the provinces, without any agreement with the provinces, the federal government rushed into the Canada pension plan, into the Department of Industry legislation, into university scholarships and so on.

Mr. Benidickson: What is the matter with them?

Mr. Hamilton: Every one of these things was an invasion of provincial rights.

Mr. Benidickson: What is the matter with them?

Mr. Hamilton: Not only was there strong objection from the provinces but there was such an uproar all across the country that the government turned in panic and confusion and began the greatest retreat since Napoleon left Moscow. The government has moved into its old policy of centralization and I ask you, Mr. Chairman, why? There may be two reasons. First, eight members of the new government were ex-civil servants indoctrinated with civil service ideas and they wanted to follow the old fashioned policy of encroaching on provincial rights. More important than that is the second reason. The second reason was that in the new government there was a new group of men who believed in their own writings as the gospel, and that the only way to govern the country was by planning and interference with the affairs of business in this country.

Mr. Benidickson: Barry Goldwater.

Mr. Hamilton: These planners got on the treasury benches. Read what the Gordon commission report says. Read what the present Minister of Finance said in his Kingston paper of 1960. Read that book, "Mein Kampf".

Mr. Francis: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Hamilton: You will find that all those things that came about in the budget were

mentioned prior to that time in these documents. These people who came into power tried to plan and direct the economy under the guise of a protective nationalism. This is the reason for the policy of the federal government of interfering with provincial rights. The reaction of the provinces was so strong—

Mr. Benidickson: I want to know if that is the Progressive Conservative defence.

An hon. Member: It is nice to see the minister of mines here.

Mr. Hamilton: —that the federal government fell back and followed up this panic by one of the longest retreats we have ever seen. As a matter of fact, so great was the confusion going into the year 1964 that they had to think of something to avoid this powerful public confrontation, not only between Quebec and the federal government but between all the provinces and the federal government, that they dragged in the flag issue to try to cover up.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

Has the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) the right to try to incriminate the province of Quebec at this stage of the discussion by stating unceasingly "Quebec with Ottawa, Quebec versus the other provinces"?

Is the hon. member unable to prove himself purely and simply a Canadian who speaks on behalf of his party for Canada and not only in the name of one province?

[*Text*]

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member's translation system was not working too well. I made it very clear that this reaction from the provinces was a reaction from all the provinces and not only from Quebec. I am actually trying to point out that Quebec is not the culprit in this matter. I am trying to say that the provinces had their rights infringed during the first three or four months of the new Liberal government régime, and so strong was the reaction that the federal government retreated to such a point that they are scattering to the four winds. The people of this country, in Quebec and every other province, are concerned about what is happening. It is for this reason I am concerned about these petitions that are beginning to come before us and I am wondering if we should even vote supply to keep this government in power any longer.

I should like to start by quoting from a speech the Prime Minister made which is reported in a well known Liberal newspaper, the Winnipeg *Free Press* for Tuesday, October 27. The speech by the Prime Minister dealt with the subject of co-operative federalism, and the portion I wish to quote is in quotation marks:

> It means that the federal—the central—government should not enter provincial fields without the willing consent of the provinces; that in all matters over which jurisdiction is shared in the constitution, the federal government should co-operate closely with the provinces; in some cases, and always by agreement, taking on the responsibility for action; in others, again by agreement, leaving that responsibility to the provinces; in still others, sharing both the responsibility and the action.

Then, this Liberal writer says, and I quote:

> This is a bit hazy, but if it means what it seems to mean, questions are surely in order.

Then, this writer goes on to deal with another minister in this article and quotes what the minister said in the House of Commons. I am taking the liberty of quoting from the article rather than from the *Hansard* report. I was present in my place when this answer was given to an hon. member to my right. This is what the Minister of National Health and Welfare said, and this was two days after the Prime Minister's speech:

> It is not only unusual but I might say rather improper for a federal government to request heads of provincial governments to approve either in advance or concurrently what is wholly federal legislation.

Here we have one minister saying it is even improper to discuss a matter with the provinces, while the Prime Minister is laying down all the conditions for consultation, for action and responsibility. This contradiction is causing confusion for more reasons than would appear on the surface. We have other people out making speeches. One is a Quebec minister who went across to Europe and spoke about what is happening at the present time. This is the man who won fame and fortune as the head of the Montreal stock exchange, Mr. Kierans. I will read his little statement:

> The federal government...is running superfluous ministries of industry, agriculture, resources and fisheries—

Not only does Mr. Lesage say the federal members from Quebec are superfluous, but here is one of his ministers saying that four federal departments are superfluous.

Mr. Regan: What did you say in China?

Mr. MacEwan: He said that the junior member for Halifax should be quiet.

Mr. Hamilton: If the hon. member who represents a port city would do a little more to encourage trade where trade possibilities are, he would be a help to this country.

The Chairman: Order, please; the two hon. members for Halifax are rising on points of order.

Mr. Lloyd: I should like to have the name and date of the newspaper from which the hon. member is quoting.

Mr. Woolliams: Take the gum out of your mouth so you will look like a member of parliament.

Mr. Lloyd: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Halifax on a point of order.

Mr. Lloyd: I believe it is the privilege of members to speak in this house. If there is any point an hon. member wishes to discuss or any question concerning this parliament, if the hon. member will be honest enough to state his proposition in such a way that he cannot run and hide but will state his proposition on any platform anywhere, I will be happy to take him on.

Mr. Regan: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member has suggested that I do not concern myself with the proper interests of the port of Halifax. I would only suggest in answer that if he did as good a job for the prairies as I do for Halifax he would be well off.

Mr. MacEwan: We will quote that.

The Chairman: Order; these are not proper points of order. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle should continue.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that by now you must be used to this high level of interruptions that occur. I think when the people of these constituencies read the high intellectual level of the interruptions made by their members, these members will not be back.

I was speaking about a Quebec minister who holds the view that we have no right—

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Chairman, I rise—

Mr. MacEwan: Look who has come out of the bulrushes.

Mr. Byrne: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure the house will agree with me that I have a legitimate point of order. I should like to refer to Beauchesne, citation 157, paragraph (6), which reads:

> 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.

At the outset of his remarks, the hon. member said that a large part of his speech was going to be taken up with newspaper quotations. I think at this point, Mr. Chairman, we should have a ruling. There is no doubt about it the hon. member is completely out of order when he reads at length from newspapers and quotes those who have no responsibility as representatives in the House of Commons.

The Chairman: The point of order raised is a legitimate point to the extent that the newspaper articles from which the hon. member for Qu'Appelle has been quoting may reflect upon a debate before the house. I did not notice, however, that there was a reflection to any extent on actual debate in the house in the quotations used by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, and I think he should be allowed to continue.

Mr. Byrne: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, the debate that is taking place is one that has been chosen by hon. members themselves, dealing with repatriation of the constitution. The hon. member having introduced the debate, when he introduces quotations from those outside the house he is, in my contention, abrogating the rules of the house and should cease and desist from such practice.

Mr. Hamilton: In the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, my sympathy goes out to you.

There is not too much time for me to finish my remarks but I want to make my point doubly clear. At the beginning I said that of all the things that were disturbing the Canadian people today the worst was the confusion in high places here in Ottawa. At first they thought the government was overcentralizing. Now it is not even holding the positions that have been traditionally held and as a result, more important than any one other issue, monetary or political, the people of the country want it held together as one country.

However, we have all these different theories, some of which would mean that the federal government would be left with almost no power. Such statements are being made by people in high places in the Liberal party,

and there is no correction from the Prime Minister. There is no correction from any spokesman for the government. If any government ever needed a respite it is this one so that its members could get together and learn each others' first names, and find out what the course is, instead of one going this way, the other going that way and all the little ones scattering in every direction.

This is not only a schizophrenic government. This is a government gone completely mad, and because of this uncertainty in high places why should we vote it supply? Does it deserve this $740 million? Does it not think it should come in here and clear up these difficulties that are disturbing the nation? Why should we give it two months supply? There are big issues involved. For two or three years a situation has been developing in the province of Quebec and across the nation, but especially in that province where 83 per cent of the farmers get less than $2,000 a year. Who is going to stand up in this chamber and defend the people of Quebec?

An hon. Member: Balcer.

Mr. Hamilton: The people of Quebec are being bypassed. The same thing is happening in Quebec today that happened in my province and in Alberta 30 years ago. Indeed I suspect that not too long from now you will find knocking at the doors of this parliament building several hundred, if not several thousand farmers from Quebec asking, "What are you doing about our problems?" All we get is this double talk.

It is said that all we want is a flag with one maple leaf on it. What will that do to help the farmers not only of Quebec but all through the Ottawa valley, and all through northern Ontario, through New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland? I have been there and I have seen their problems. Just walk down the streets of Montreal today and try to explain to those people how happy they will be now that they have got a flag that is coloured red, with nothing of their religious background or traditions displayed on it. What a mockery this is.

Why should we vote $740 million to a government that allows these conditions to continue? This government has allowed all the policies we initiated to die on the vine and fade away. Why not ask the Canadian people if this double talk is what they want? We did not bring the flag into the house. It was not in the speech from the throne. It was brought in by the Prime Minister, and he has to take it out.

Who wants a flag when the weakness we have is due to the fact—

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member's time expired about three minutes ago and the Chair allowed him those extra minutes in order to take interruptions into account.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle has expressed a good many views which I am sure are unanimously held on this side of the chamber, unless you want to count the leader of the Liberal party in the far corner. He expresses most of the sentiments which are agreed to by the government—or perhaps it might be the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, because they voted for his flag.

The Chairman: Right at the outset, and before the hon. member calls it ten o'clock, I would invite him to relate his remarks to the resolution before the committee.

Mr. Bigg: Ten o'clock.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, the house is expectantly awaiting some announcement from the house leader that will be of importance to the people of Canada. Has he anything for us tonight?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the most important announcement to be made is that when interim supply is dealt with by the house we will go on with other business. When we reach that happy stage tomorrow we propose to submit the redistribution bill for consideration by the house, and if that is disposed of by the house we will then call the hours of labour legislation.

At ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 3, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

FISHERIES

AMENDMENT OF REGULATIONS RESPECTING KILLING OF SEALS

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I have stated on several occasions in reply to questions by hon. members that all aspects of Canadian sealing operations conducted off the east coast of Canada were being carefully examined with a view to bringing more restrictive regulations into effect before the next sealing season starts next March. I am pleased to be able to inform the house that new regulations to conserve the seal stocks and to ensure the use of humane methods were passed by order in council P.C. 1964-1663 on Thursday, October 29.

In view of the interest shown by many hon. members I wish to outline a few details of the new amendments to the existing seal protection regulations.

During the sealing season of March and April, 1964 newspapers and television stressed that very young seals were taken in this fishery and were killed with clubs. Unfortunately the inhumane aspects of the fishery were exaggerated by giving prominence to the few instances when inexperienced hunters did not kill the seal with the first blow. Hundreds of letters and petitions of protest were received from interested individuals and societies in Canada and the United States.

A month or two later another storm of protest arose when an erroneous article appeared in a German weekly newspaper which was widely reprinted by other European papers and, more recently, by certain Canadian newspapers. Indignation was aroused because the article stated that the seal herds off the east coast of Canada had declined from 20 million to 1 million animals during the last two years. The estimates of our scientists, based on aerial surveys and tagging experiments conducted for many years, indicate that the decrease has been from 3 million to 1¼ million animals over a ten year period. The feelings of humane persons were shocked by the statement that the animals were deliberately skinned alive in order to produce a more beautiful pelt. This statement was completely without basis.

Because of the widespread public concern I instructed officials of my department to examine all aspects of the seal fishery, including the considerable body of scientific evidence on the condition of the stocks, the effectiveness of the current seal protection regulations and their enforcement, and the methods used in commercial sealing operations. A meeting was then held in Moncton on May 20 with representatives of the Canadian sealing industry to discuss proposals to amend the seal protection regulations. A draft of the new regulations was prepared, and this was discussed again with industry representatives at a meeting in Ottawa on October 1. I then invited representatives of the major Canadian conservation and humane societies to meet with me on October 14 to obtain their views on the draft regulations. Careful consideration was given to all the views expressed by the representatives of these various interests.

The new regulations provide for much stricter control both to conserve the seal herds and to ensure against inhumane practices. To give better control over sealing operations, all vessels over 30 feet and all aircraft used in sealing will now require licences, as will all the seal fishermen they carry. As a conservation measure, the season for licensed vessels and aircraft will be shorter both in the gulf of St. Lawrence and in outer areas. To protect the mature females, which are most important for the maintenance of the herds, the killing of adults is now prohibited in the so-called breeding patches where the seals have their pups. To reduce waste it will be required for the first time that all seals killed in any one day must be landed ashore or on the sealing craft that same day.

The new regulations limit the use of aircraft for transporting sealers or skins to the gulf of St. Lawrence south of 50 degrees north, where their use is now well established, and in this area the number of young harp seals taken by vessels and aircraft will be limited to 50,000. This is an important new measure. To reduce inhumane practices the new regulations require that the clubs used

be long and heavy enough to kill at one blow, and that no seal shall be skinned before it is dead. The use of set lines with hooks for catching seals is also prohibited.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that these measures will assure the maintenance of the seal herds and will go a long way to reduce inhumane practices and waste. I wish to assure the house, however, that my department will maintain the closest possible surveillance of the seal fishery so that, if necessary, further restrictions can be put into force. During the coming season commencing early in March, 1965, our patrol of sealing operations by land, sea and air will be greatly intensified to assure that the regulations are observed. The results will be carefully studied.

At the request of major Canadian conservation and humane societies I shall provide an opportunity for representatives of these societies to visit the site of sealing operations and obtain first hand knowledge. After the 1965 season it is proposed to hold further discussions on the regulation of the fishery both with the industry and with the humane societies.

I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that these measures will maintain the seal herds and permit the Canadian industry to develop in an orderly manner. This industry is very important to many coastal communities dependent on the resources of the sea.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure there will be general satisfaction with the announcement made by the minister, although I was somewhat surprised that he went out of his way to criticize various Canadian newspapers which in the interests of the preservation of humane methods of killing gave publicity to what was apparently gross cruelty among certain sealers though not by any means the majority of those who participate in sealing.

I want to say, too, that what is set forth in the announcement is further evidence of the beneficial effects of public opinion when aroused. All over this nation men and women in all provinces were asking for action. I am glad that action has been taken, and also that in the regulations now to be promulgated provision will be made for conservation so the industry may flourish and expand while at the same time ostracizing everything in the nature of cruelty.

[Mr. Robichaud.]

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries a question to clarify an aspect of the welcome statement he made regarding sealing regulations. Is it anticipated that nationals of other countries will be excluded from hunting seals in the gulf of St. Lawrence? Will the coordinates under the legislation that was passed be established in time, and will this have the effect of excluding all nationals from sealing in the gulf of St. Lawrence and other national waters? Second, what initiative is the Canadian government taking with regard to the general problem of the conservation of the seal herds as far as sealing on the high seas is concerned?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the first question I wish to assure the hon. member and all hon. members of this house that there will be no discrimination in so far as Canadian or foreign vessel operators are concerned; in other words, all foreign vessels will be subject to the Canadian regulations. In connection with the effect these further regulations will have on operations outside the gulf of St. Lawrence, this matter, as I have stated before in the house, is under consideration by ICNAF. New regulations have been suggested for discussion. They have already been ratified by a certain number of countries, but I understand that more countries are going to accept these regulations so that we can make them effective according to the ICNAF terms of reference.

I may also add that in so far as the operation of foreign vessels in the gulf of St. Lawrence is concerned, they will be subject to the implementation of the law of the sea.

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister indicate whether regulations have yet been made to govern the use of helicopters in the seal hunt?

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Speaker, I made it very clear in my statement that helicopters were affected by the new regulations.

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

RECOVERY OF CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP BY LORD THOMSON OF FLEET

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 and I should also like to draw this question to the attention of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. In view of the fact that, as reported in this morning's *Globe and Mail,* the premier of Quebec, Hon. Jean Lesage, has accepted a decoration, namely the Grand Cross of the Royal Order of the Phoenix, from His Majesty King Constantine of Greece, and presumably the premier of Quebec is retaining his Canadian citizenship, can the minister inform the house whether Lord Thomson of Fleet, who accepted an honour from Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, will now be permitted to recover his Canadian citizenship?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I will be pleased to look into this matter.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

CANCELLATION OF PROGRAM OF COMMENT ON ROYAL VISIT

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State.

Is the minister aware that, according to an editorial in yesterday's *l'Action Catholique,* the C.B.C. refused to present or produce a program on which Mr. Lorenzo Paré had been invited to express his views on the occasion of the Queen's visit to Quebec City? The C.B.C. claimed that the subject was too controversial but, on the other hand, they invited Mr. Berque, from France, whose program was recorded at the Palais Montcalm last October 2, to describe to Quebec the beauties of the separatist-communist revolution.

Is the Secretary of State aware of those facts?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In accordance with the instructions given to me by the house itself, it is not in order to comment upon statements made in newspapers.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Could the minister inquire of the C.B.C. authorities as to which Montreal clique, within the corporation, decided not to present an interview with newspapermen on the occasion of the Queen's visit in the province of Quebec, under the excuse that the matter was too controversial, while at the same time the same clique gave to a notorious communist the opportunity to be heard over the C.B.C.?

Would the minister inquire about the reasons behind such action and then tell the house what is going on in the C.B.C.?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to get the information for the hon. member and the house.

[*Text*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

DELAY IN APPROVAL OF WINTER WORKS PROGRAMS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Labour whether he is in a position to answer the question I put to him yesterday.

[*Text*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker. In reply to the question raised by the hon. member concerning the municipal winter works incentive program, a number of municipalities which have projects on which they are ready to start work have been unable to submit their applications to the provincial governments and to the federal Department of Labour by the commencement date, November 1. As a result the total number of applications received this year is less than last year.

To help meet this situation the provinces are being informed that applications, covering acceptable projects, received in the Department of Labour by November 9 will be accepted with effect from November 1, and if this date does not give complete satisfaction consideration will be given to a later date.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the minister tell the house why approval of those municipal loans was delayed?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I think the delay has resulted from the processing of the forms which had to be translated and sent out anew this year. This may have caused the delay which we are attempting to meet by this particular method.

REQUEST THAT PENDING LEGISLATION BE CONSIDERED BY HOUSE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to the Prime Minister in connection with a matter that has been raised on a number of occasions, namely the request of the truckers across Canada who operate in interprovincial trade to have the question of the labour code submitted to a committee so that an opportunity will be available to them, and to such other industries as the wheat pools, to press for their exemption from the code when the rate of pay of their workers is over $1.25 an hour. I may say the truckers' average rate of pay is $2.90 an hour.

Again representations have been made to me asking that these people be given an opportunity to make their views known. In view of the fact that we have brought this to the attention of the Minister of Labour on a number of occasions I would ask the Prime Minister, in the interests of all Canadians, that this matter be permitted to come before a committee so that evidence might be placed before it to support the request of these two organizations and of others who believe they should not be subject—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —to the provisions of the labour code providing their rate of payment is $1.25 an hour or more.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): It was only yesterday that the Minister of Labour said this matter was under consideration. Meanwhile I can assure the right hon. gentleman that the representations which have been received from the organizations in question have been given very careful consideration indeed.

PICTOU COUNTY, N.S.—REQUEST FOR ACTION TO RELIEVE UNEMPLOYMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry. I should like to ask the minister whether he has received a telegram from the president of the united steel workers of America, local 4702, Pictou, Nova Scotia, regarding the possibility of a naval refit to help out the unemployment situation in that area. If so, has the government decided on something in this regard, or will this request be taken into consideration?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I have received a telegram, a copy of which the hon. gentleman has read. We are now exploring any possibility there may be to help out the situation at Pictou.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.—ALTERNATIVE EMPLOYMENT FOR MEN TO BE LAID OFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry concerning the economic livelihood of a number of my constituents. Is he able to report any successful efforts relative to securing an alternative source of employment for the men at the Enamel Heating plant at Charlottetown, whose present work contracts are soon to terminate?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, as a result of efforts made by the Department of Defence Production arrangements have been made to provide the necessary base load of work for Enamel and Heating Products Company to enable them to compete successfully in the production sharing program with the United States. This arrangement has been and is working out quite satisfactorily, and I think the workers of Enamel and Heating should be rather pleased at what has been done in this direction.

PRESS RELEASES ON WINTER WORKS IN ENGLISH ONLY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Lapointe, may I advise him that there is a weekly summary of press releases sent to both French and English language newspapers. We have attempted to keep this list up to date and observe it meticulously. If there is a newspaper to his knowledge which is not receiving these bulletins in the appropriate language and he draws the situation to my attention, I will be glad to remedy it.

TRADE

SUGGESTED VISIT TO MAINLAND CHINA BY MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the fact that one of the senior ministers of the U.K. government has visited mainland China to discuss trade matters with the Chinese government, would the Minister of Trade and Commerce consider doing the same thing?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I am under the same disability as my hon. friend when he was a minister. He did not go to China either. However, I have had some discussion with my hon. friend the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and in view of the special relations or lack of relations that exist between the two countries I would have to be guided by his general policy in this respect. This does not necessarily rule out a visit, but the situation would have to be looked at very carefully before a minister of the crown, whether myself or someone else, would go.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

DISTRIBUTION OF APPLES TO MARK NATIONAL APPLE MONTH

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, may I direct attention to the fact that November is national apple month. I know it is not necessary to address a question to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Trade and Commerce or the minister of national health on the importance of our apple production, its value as an export and money maker for Canada, the apple's prime health giving qualities and its great enjoyment in eating, for these are well known. And, Mr. Speaker, may I say in particular, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, that the apples distributed today to hon. members, senators and members of the press gallery are of the famed B.C. variety known as "Delicious," and a delicious reminder that November is national apple month.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Inquiries of the Ministry

STATEMENT AS TO FRENCH EDITION OF GOVERNMENT TELEPHONE DIRECTORY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I wish to answer a question which the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) asked me some time ago concerning the date of publication of the French version of the telephone directory of the government of Canada.

I am informed that this directory will be ready within three weeks and that steps have been taken to ensure that in the future both editions be printed at the same time.

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question of the Secretary of State.

Can he tell us why, this year, the French telephone directory will be printed six months after the English directory? Can he also give us the reasons for this unwarranted delay?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the English version was sent to the translation bureau too late. Furthermore, despite all our efforts at the present time, the translation bureau is overloaded with work.

Mr. Grégoire: I would like to ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the fact that the translation bureau is overloaded with work, does the minister intend to increase the personnel of the federal translation bureau?

Mr. Lamontagne: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. I will have supplementary information on this subject for the hon. member for Lapointe and for the house when the estimates of my department are discussed.

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the Secretary of State. Could he tell the house whether the delayed publication of the telephone book is due to the fact that members of the Ralliement Créditiste systematically refuse to pay their phone bills?

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

The hon. member for Lotbinière has just mentioned the fact that members of the Ralliement Créditiste systematically refuse to pay their phone bills.

Inquiries of the Ministry

I must say that I rise on a question of privilege on behalf of most members. We protest against the fact that we are being asked to adopt measures in the house and that the government fails to implement them afterwards.

In addition, the committee on procedure and organization has recommended that those phone bills be paid; now, the government has ignored this recommendation and still refuses to implement a measure already passed by the house on two occasions.

We do not refuse to pay those telephone bills, but we feel that the government should implement measures adopted by the house.

[*Text*]

REPORTED PRESSURE ON DISTRICT RETURNING OFFICERS TO RESIGN

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State.

Could he check with the chief electoral officer whether it is true that Liberal organizers have brought pressure to bear upon district returning officers to force them to resign?

I would ask the Secretary of State to seek information from the chief electoral officer and to report to the house.

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much that there is any basis to the accusation implied in the question, but I will be glad to secure that information.

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

When we ask the Secretary of State to check whether our information is correct, he does not have the right to say that we are making implications or accusations. That is dishonest on the part of the minister.

I have the right to ask the minister to get information—

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member for St. Mary would care to rephrase his question, because it seems to me it contains certain allegations which should be substantiated by facts.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Secretary of State.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

[*Translation*]

Could the Secretary of State inquire from the chief electoral officer whether pressure was brought to bear upon the returning officers so that they would resign from their jobs?

Mr. Lamontagne: I shall be pleased to obtain this information, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

PROCEDURE

INQUIRY AS TO IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as chairman of the house's internal economy commission.

Does the minister intend to take action with respect to the report of the special committee on procedure and organization and more particularly concerning report No. 12 or 13, which was unanimously carried by the house and which deals with telephone, telegram and telecommunication expenses?

[*Text*]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): I am not aware precisely what the hon. member has in mind, but if he is referring to the right of members to have their long distance telephone bills paid I would point out that under the legislation applicable this could only be done with the approval of the house, and that the commissioners of internal economy have not brought forward any submission on that subject for approval by the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question?

Has the President of the Privy Council read the report of the special committee on procedure and organization which received the unanimous approval of the House of Commons, recommending the implementation of Bill No. C-91, passed last year, which provided that telephone expenses incurred by members be paid by the internal economy commission?

[*Text*]

COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

ASSISTANCE TO PROPOSED WEST INDIES FEDERATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, arising out of an article which appeared in this morning's edition of the Toronto *Globe and Mail* to the effect that a new West Indies federation has been agreed upon by seven of these British colonies, including Barbados. Does the government intend to convey to Britain and to the seven colonies concerned Canada's special interest in this project, and does the government intend to offer special aid to the fledgling nation once it achieves federation, since Canada's relations with the proposed new nation should be closer than those with any other country?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Canada has noted with great interest the formation of this federation and has already expressed in a message its best wishes and congratulations. I would call the attention of my hon. friend to the increase in Canada's external aid program which is designed to provide greater assistance to the Caribbean area.

IMMIGRATION

DEPORTATION OF FAMILY OF FORMER DOMINICAN REPUBLIC OFFICIAL

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. On the C.B.C. news last night there was a story to the effect that Mrs. Espaillat, the wife of the ex-security chief of the Dominican republic, is being asked to leave Canada by tomorrow midnight. As I understand it, her visitor's visa expires November 20 and she has been given no reason why she has to leave tomorrow. I wonder whether the minister could explain to the house and the country the reason for the sudden desire to deport Mrs. Espaillat and the three children who are attending school in Montreal.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Espaillat was deported from the country several months ago while Mrs. Espaillat remained in Canada with her children provided she would herself look after her departure for Portugal. She obtained from Portugal a visa providing for her entry into Portugal until the beginning of November and it was essential, in order to maintain the unity of that family, for Mrs. Espaillat and her children to join Mr. Espaillat before the said visa expired.

I was informed this morning that the Portuguese government was willing to extend Mrs. Espaillat's visa until next spring so that her children could at least complete the school year they have started in Ottawa. I am now reconsidering the case in the light of that new development.

ONTARIO—MOVEMENT OF SKILLED WORKERS FROM HONG KONG AND JAPAN

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Could he tell the house whether it is true that Canada will bring over 15,000 workers from Hong Kong and Japan in order to meet an acute shortage of manpower, as stated by Mr. Stanley John Randall, minister of economic development of Ontario?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the report is true. I did read it in the newspapers, and I have no doubt that if Mr. Randall, when he returns to Canada, has any proposals of this kind to make he will take them up with the proper federal authorities.

AGRICULTURE

QUEBEC—MEETING WITH MINISTER RESPECTING MILK POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister tell the house whether he has met lately with the Quebec provincial minister of agriculture, Mr. Courcy, concerning a new milk policy?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I met the minister of agriculture and his officials a week ago today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Paul Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Is he in a position to announce a federal-provincial agreement intended to improve the situation of the dairy industry?

[*Text*]

Mr. Hays: Not at the moment, Mr. Speaker. When we are it will be announced in the usual way in the House of Commons.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question.

Does the Minister of Agriculture intend to consider the policy which was in effect before his appointment to the office of minister of agriculture, a policy which was satisfactory for farmers?

[*Text*]

TURKEYS—INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TO MAINTAIN PRICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, while we are on the subject of agriculture I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he has thought of, discussed or is prepared to institute any immediate plan in regard to the turkey producers, who he is driving not only to the wall but up the wall?

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, as a colleague of mine would say if he were here, this is a question of urgent national importance which I will address to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Can she tell the house whether there is any significance in the fact that all the hon. ladies on the Liberal side of the house are today dressed in red?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that this matter falls within my departmental responsibilities. It is difficult enough for one woman to speak for herself let alone for two others, but I imagine it has something to do with the fact that not only is it the more prominent of the two Canadian colours but it is also the colour of the party we represent.

[Mr. Matte.]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

H.M.C.S. "BONAVENTURE"—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON FIRE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. J. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence concerning newspaper accounts of a fire which is alleged to have taken place on the *Bonaventure* when in drydock at Saint John. Would the minister have any information to give the house about this matter?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I have very little additional information. As has been reported there was a fire on the *Bonaventure* which began in one of the refrigeration areas. Regrettably it resulted in tragedy, in that one civilian worker was asphyxiated. An investigation is being carried out to determine the cause of the fire.

LABOUR RELATIONS

MARITIME UNION TRUSTEES—APPEARANCE BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Can the minister report any success in his efforts to have the maritime trustees appear before a parliamentary committee?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, there has been under discussion with representatives of other parties a motion which would refer this matter to the industrial relations committee, giving that committee the opportunity of meeting with the board of trustees. It is my wish, if this motion can be adopted without debate as soon as it appears on the order paper, that the board of trustees appear before that committee.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Is there any foundation for the press report to the effect that the members of this board will be resigning immediately after the election of the S.I.U. officers has taken place?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard a report to that effect.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO INCLUDE COOPERAGE TRADE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, may I answer a question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg. In respect of the circumstances stated by my hon. friend affecting the cooperage trade, this is the result of a decision taken by the local insurance officer, ruling this group as not eligible for insurable employment. These persons are free to appeal this ruling to the commission itself and later to an umpire.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): I have a supplementary question. Would the minister not agree that the national employment office, or the inspectors employed by that office, were derelict in their duties in that in 1959 they made no mention of these facts as presented by the minister, and in view of the fact that contributions have been accepted from the employer of these coopers since 1959 and benefits have been paid? Would he not agree that it is unfair to place this responsibility upon the coopers at this time, when it appears that the deficiency lies within his own offices?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the ruling made in 1959 was disregarded by the principals involved, who continued to make contributions on behalf of these employees.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question. From what source does the employer obtain unemployment insurance stamps?

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question which relates to the answer given by the minister to the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg. The complete disregard of the regulations in 1959 would be impossible unless the unemployment insurance offices also disregarded the regulations. Surely the responsibility rests with the department itself.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION RESPECTING BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. H. A. Thomas (Middlesex West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister give the house any idea what position in the legislative priority list is occupied by the government's legislation in regard to veterans benefits?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the whole question of program and priority is now under consideration. I hope there will be an announcement made in this regard before the end of the week.

SUPPLY

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

INTERIM SUPPLY

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $740,710,974.77, being the aggregate of

(a) two twelfths of that total of all of the items to be voted in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965, as reduced, except finance item 15, mines and technical surveys item 25, national research council item 10, and transport items 15 and 25 for which the proportion is one twelfth and atomic energy item 5, external affairs item 20, forestry item 25 and legislation item 20 for which no proportion is being released, $651,829,576.84;

(b) an additional two twelfths of the amount of public works item 70 (schedule A), of the said main estimates, $666,666.67;

(c) an additional one twelfth of the amount of fisheries items 5 and 10, legislation item 5, mines and technical surveys item 70, post office item 1 and public works item 40 (schedule B), of the said main estimates, $20,263,800.00;

(d) two twelfths of all of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (A), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, except national defence item 56a, and loans, investments and advances items L12a, L17a and L37a for which no proportion is being released, $20,612,522.50;

(e) an additional two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103a (schedule C), of the said supplementary estimates (A), $872,966.67;

(f) nine twelfths of the total of the items to be voted in the supplementary estimates (B), laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, $46,215,108.75;

(g) two twelfths of the amount of transport item 103b (schedule D), of the said supplementary estimates (B), $250,333.34;

be granted to Her Majesty on account of the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Chairman, once again this committee is being asked to vote a sum, in round figures, of $740 million.

An hon. Member: Filibuster.

Mr. Bigg: The cry "filibuster" is being made already today; the same old cry by the same old gang. Last Easter we were being asked to pass a similar amount, roughly $700 million,

without debate. As you realize, we missed our usual Easter recess because of that cry "filibuster".

The people of Canada have the right to know why we are spending this large sum of money. The people of Canada, through the press, have complained that we here are not doing our duty as members of parliament. I can assure you that we are going to do our duty in this regard. We are going to consider this vast sum of money with great care. We are going to scrutinize the workings of all the departments concerned, and briefly consider the record of what the government has done during this longest and most tiresome session of parliament since 1867.

I am one of the first to admit that the legislative program during this long and arduous session has not been impressive, because the Liberals have failed to give us that leadership of which they boasted during the last two election campaigns.

The Liberals said they had the answers to our problems and would show us how to run this country if elected. Do they have the answers to the problems facing agriculture? The Conservative party when in power had the best minister of agriculture that Canada has ever had. He was the man who sold a billion bushels of grain at a favourable price, putting at least western Canada on its feet. I have very good authority for making that statement. I refer to the present Minister of Agriculture who had this to say at Falher, Alberta, as reported in the Toronto *Star* of October 30, 1964:

> "I think the last Liberal government had forgotten the farmers during its declining years," he said. "I'll even go further—I think that on the basis of its record with our farmers, the last Liberal government deserved to be kicked out when it was."
>
> He said the present government has continued the agricultural policies started by the Conservatives and expanded them.

I only wish they had. After the tremendous criticism of our sales of wheat to red China and other communist countries, the Liberals in fact continued to sell to these countries; but they claimed that our administration had had nothing to do with bringing about those sales and that they were the result of the efforts of civil servants and the wheat board. Now that they are selling grain to the same countries they say they did it all, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce would be the first to claim that he had had a great deal to do in this regard. It is a sad state of affairs when the present Minister of Agriculture can only say that it was a good idea to put his own party out, and that the only contribution he has made to Canadian agriculture has been to continue our policies. Again I say I wish he had.

Mr. Hays: Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the hon. member—

The Chairman: Is the minister rising on a point of order?

Mr. Hays: I am rising on a question of privilege. It is quite all right for the hon. member to quote me, but I think he should give the whole quotation where I said that "1964 is drawing to a close and it now seems"—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Lambert: Make your own speech.

The Chairman: Order. That is not a question of privilege.

Mr. Bigg: I will be delighted to accommodate the minister. After saying that his government had continued the agricultural policies started by the Conservatives, and had expanded on them he went on to say:

> We have tried to show the same kind of concern for our farmers under the present government as was shown by the previous government. I won't take anything away from them on that score. They did things for our farmers that should have been done long before. My only objection is that they only went half as far as they should have.

That is a very good point. I will be the first to admit that we did not solve all the problems of agriculture, nor did we ever pretend to; but we made such a tremendous change that even the present Minister of Agriculture has to admit that the previous Liberal administration was completely derelict in this regard. I can speak with some authority for the people of western Canada because that is where I have lived all my life, and my constituency of Athabasca is in the northeastern part of Alberta. I can say on their behalf that there has been very little comfort in the new, expanded policy of the Liberal government. What has happened to the price of beef? What has happened to the price of pigs—

Mr. Winkler: And fowl.

Mr. Bigg: —and to the price of turkeys? Not long ago the minister said he had stabilized the price of turkeys by importing some eight million pounds of turkeys from the United States.

Mr. Winkler: Twelve million now.

Mr. Bigg: He stabilized the price, but where did he stabilize it? At a level which has hurt not only Canadian producers of turkeys but has affected the prices of beef and pork as well. Nothing the previous administration ever did could have given the minister the idea that the way to stabilize prices was to import turkeys from the United States and lower the price so the small turkey farmer can no longer make a living. If that is the kind of action he is going to take, and this is why I rose to speak, then it is time not only he resigned but the whole government, and handed back the reins of office, especially in the agricultural field, to those who knew what they were doing.

This is not the only field in which we are lacking leadership today. On the government front benches we have a whole crowd of confused stars. Where are we going with regard to international policy? No statements are made in the House of Commons to enlighten us, but from everything I have been able to read in the press it would appear that the government is in favour of recognizing red China completely. Is this going to maintain our friendship with the United States, which alone preserves the safety of our modern world? Before we go off half cocked with a unilateral plan I think we should discuss the plan with our neighbours to the south. My position in this regard is not new. I have always favoured full co-operation with the United States, with honour.

This administration did not know where it was going with regard to atomic bombs or atomic missiles. It is not so long ago that the Minister of National Health and Welfare said it would be the sheerest folly to bring atomic weapons into Canada and the Minister of National Defence, of all people, agreed with that statement. Then the government changed around and brought in atomic weapons without any regard whatever for Canadian sovereignty. Now we have them on Canadian soil and we have no sovereignty in this regard. I understand we are now going to try to negotiate out of atomic weapons. This is a fine time to take such action. As we would say on the farm, this is like locking the barn door after the horse has escaped. We are all looking for more leadership in international affairs.

When the present Prime Minister took office he had won the Nobel peace prize. He knew how to get along with people. He knew how to get all the nations of the world together. But what does he know about getting Canada back together again? One hundred years ago the president of the United States was Abraham Lincoln, who is famous in history as the man who split rails. If we go on the way we are we will have a prime minister who will be famous for splitting Canada, and I for one want no part of it.

We are patting ourselves on the back now that we are becoming a great big grown up nation and are going to repatriate the British North America Act. How is that going to make us a greater nation? I am not against repatriating the British North America Act. As a matter of fact the British North America Act was drafted in Canada and passed by the British House of Commons at Westminster in one of the shortest debates in its history. We drafted the British North America Act, and if there is anything wrong it is because we have not lived up to it.

We need a strong federal government in Canada. Our problems are great. There is great inequality in the wealth of the provinces. Are the provinces going to opt out of all the things that are of benefit to them? I do not think so. I think it would be a retrograde step to introduce this new formula which says that two, three or any number short of all the provinces can change the basic structure of the British North America Act. If the provinces will examine the British North America Act they will recognize that it is a great charter of freedom.

Without the co-operation envisaged by the Fathers of Confederation, the founders of our country, we would have no country called Canada. We would have been absorbed by the United States at least half a century ago, probably at the time of Laurier and the free trade experiment. The reciprocity experiment did not work and we wisely threw it out. Since that time Canada has gone steadily forward. But Canada has not gone forward at times when the provinces have been selfish. Canada has gone forward when the provinces have seen themselves as integral parts of a great state, one state, one country, but a country in which minorities will always be protected.

Whenever the present government want to make a point they try to pretend that the Conservatives are the great imperialists and that we have tried to keep Canada in her diapers. I do not think so. It was a great Conservative who drew up the British North America Act in the first place in co-operation with his Conservative partner from Quebec,

Cartier, a man equal in every way to Macdonald in vision, loyalty and integrity. Macdonald and Cartier would turn over in their graves today if, after 97 years of co-operation, they saw the Liberals proceeding as rapidly as they can to undo all they did and dreamed of. A formula for amendment, indeed. If the British North America Act were lived up to by the provinces and the federal government it could still be a complete formula for freedom for all people who live in Canada.

We will be glad to have the British North America Act back in Canada, because we are in fact a grown-up nation, and have been for 50 years. Great political hay was made out of this cry that the Conservatives were imperialists, and William Lyon Mackenzie King won an election back in 1926 on the phony issue that we were being dictated to by Westminster. In 1867, when the B.N.A. Act was passed, Macdonald and Cartier and all those who went over there were annoyed by the fact that the British parliament passed the B.N.A. Act without debate. They thought it was a slur upon Canada that it was not important enough to worry about whether or not we took our complete independence. As a matter of fact Mr. Bright, who was famous for championing the underdog in British politics back at that time, even suggested that they cut the strings entirely and turn Canada adrift and let her go completely on her own. Is this imperialism? They gave us everything we asked for, and more, in 1867.

The British parliament bore the full cost of defending us, and it was not until 1914-18 that Canada made that magnificent contribution which showed that she had in fact grown up and appreciated freedom under the British flag such as no other colony or nation has ever enjoyed. I think the greatest freedom has been enjoyed by those same Quebec people. We still have them with us today, and I and all hon. members know that it is a very small but vociferous group in Quebec who believe in separatism. I was very pleased to hear one of our usually loud and outspoken members say he believed that in the British crown we really have the essence of freedom. This I believe.

I think it would be a good idea if we went back to 1925 and 1926 and read again what happened at that time. I think hon. members will all realize that when we took away the prerogative of the crown to call a successor between elections and try and form a government, we lost a very, very important part of our freedom under the parliamentary system. It is possible now for a leader, not knowing where he is going himself, to blame the opposition for every move and to threaten parliament with an election.

Everybody knows that the people of Canada have had too many elections. They have had at least two too many, one in 1962 and one in 1963, when a vicious campaign of half truths and complete falsehoods destroyed the confidence of the Canadian people in an administration that in five short years had certainly done more for western agriculture than all the previous Liberal administrations since 1867.

Even this was used in every husting east of Winnipeg to say that western Canada was a spoiled baby. Western Canada only enjoyed what she should have always had, something approaching a fair share of the national income. I say, Mr. Chairman, that the former administration instituted these programs; the ARDA program, for example. I suppose hon. members opposite say this was their program, but it was brought in by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, as everybody knows. This is one of the reasons I said, and I say again, that he was the greatest minister of agriculture Canada has ever had. He is still full of ideas; he is still full of drive; and I know, and you know, that if he were back in that same position he would expand the ARDA program and give the maritime farmers, the small Quebec and Ontario farmers, the same hope that has regenerated agriculture throughout the west.

We hear the present Minister of Agriculture say he has expanded our program. I want to know where. It is no good talking about total farm income; we want to know how much of that income is distributed amongst the smaller farmers who need it the most. This vertical integration, the kind of legislation this government has brought in to back up the large corporation farms, is not putting one dollar in the pockets of the small farmers; and I understand from the bureau of statistics that we are losing 14,000 family farms a year.

How long can this go on; and what kind of a country are we going to have when they are all sitting in the city looking for free wine and corn oil, etc., to be produced on collective farms? The happy, small farm in Canada has always been our strength, and I want to see continued the policy of the former administration under the present Leader of the Opposition and his then minister of agriculture. He introduced the ARDA program into this house. Only under this program can the small farmers, not only in western Canada but also in eastern Canada,

derive any hope; otherwise they will be leaving the farms in even larger numbers than the present rate of 14,000 a year.

I do not think the people of Canada are interested in long winded talks about ideologies, about whether or not you like socialism. They are interested in simple things, such as can they earn a living? They were able to earn a living thanks to our government and to the policies we instituted when in office. We must go to the small farmers in Quebec and give them a chance to live and see they have the amenities of living. An automobile these days is not a luxury; it is a necessity in this country of ours. Also, Mr. Chairman, I believe that every home in Canada should have television in order that they may participate in this great educational program that we want. That is why I have pressed for greater television coverage. So far I have not been able to get it, but I will keep on pressing for it. I do not care if I never make a name for myself as a statesman, as long as we feed the people who sent me here and improve their standard of living.

If some of our leaders would stop worrying about the history books and would get down to brass tacks, dollars and cents, income security, this country would be a great deal better off. I do not think you have to be a socialist in order to give this country security. This is the richest country in the world by far, as far as capital is concerned, when one considers what we have produced already and the potential that is ours. In my district of Athabasca 500 billion barrels of oil are there for the taking, and what are we doing about it? We started it. We should do something in this respect and get this inertia out of our policies.

We can all now say that Mr. Hees is a great man. Why? It is only because he is not in our party any more. Isn't he the same man? It was not Mr. Hees alone; he was encouraged by a whole front row of people who were on the march.

Mr. McIlraith: Leaving the party.

Mr. Bigg: He has not left the party, and the flattering office which you people gave him did not get him into your party either. Personally, Mr. Chairman, I am a great admirer of Mr. Hees. He got this country rolling. How did he get this country rolling? It was because he listened to the backbenchers of his own party. George Hees did not think he had all the answers; he consulted us on many occasions, and if we came to him with a bright idea he used it. It was not all window dressing; he put Canadian manufacturers and Canadian products back in the markets of the world.

Then it was said that our minister of finance was a terrible man for the way he dealt with one of the spoiled boys of the party opposite. What did he do? He devalued the dollar and the present Minister of Finance wrote a book about it, "Troubled Canada". I tell the house that Canada is still troubled, and it is troubled because the government has the author of that book as Minister of Finance. The sooner we get him out, the better.

There are those who want to weaken the federal system. What about education? It is said, "Don't talk about education; that is a provincial right". Everything in this country is too hot to handle, but if the government does not handle it somebody else will. And in handling it the government should not play around with socialism.

I warn you people over there that if you continue allowing the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to make up your minds for you, he may well end up sitting in the Prime Minister's chair, because he has more intelligence than all of you put together. You have got to do what he says. You brought in a stillborn flag, but when he brought in his flag you all voted for it like a flock of sheep. If he is your leader put him in office and let's get going. If he is the dynamic leader you think, then let's have him over there.

Or why don't you have the hon. member for Villeneuve? He speaks out; he isn't silent, but 80 per cent of you people are silent whenever there is a controversial issue too hot to handle.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): We are keeping our eyes on you.

Mr. Bigg: You had better have your eye on me, because you will hear more from me. Your half truths and your propaganda machine will do me no harm unless you go to the people I represent and show you are doing something to help them earn a living. My people are tired of talk; they want action. Your own Minister of Agriculture admitted we took action, and he knows. He is a farmer; I will say that for Harry. He knows what has happened to the price of cattle since you fellows got in.

My people want something done about the price of farm machinery. You people brought in a bill to fix that, but I defy you to tell me how you have reduced the price of farm

machinery by one cent for farmers in western Canada or elsewhere. I speak for myself. A lot of you people don't have far to go on week ends and are able to commute to your homes. Maybe that is why you are keeping the session going.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Stop talking and we will go home.

Mr. Bigg: On September 8 the hon. member for Mégantic moved that we stop talking about things which really do not count and get on with important legislation, but every one of you voted against that. You had been accusing us of filibustering, but on September 8 every Liberal in the house voted to continue the flag debate. You really did not want your own flag, or you would not have sent it to the committee. In that committee you had the mother of that flag sitting there. It was supposed to be a non-partisan flag, but of course that is impossible. That is why I for one never wanted the flag to go to a committee. We knew we would end up with the flag proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. The members of the committee went in knowing they were going to vote for the flag of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Fourteen to none.

Mr. Bigg: Yes, we understand how that was worked. If you want me to go through it I shall put it on the record. You brought in Hobson's choice, the devil or the deep blue sea. You voted in that plugged committee 9-4 against the red ensign and you thought that was the end of it. I have news for you.

An hon. Member: Ten to four.

Mr. Bigg: You are good at hair-splitting, but what are you doing about the price of turkeys? We can't eat maple leaves. This is not the place to talk about spiritualism. William Lyon Mackenzie King relied on his crystal ball and his little helper who is now the Minister of Transport, but we need more than that. Give the people action; then they will not be ashamed to pay you $18,000 a year. We raised our own income, didn't we?

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): You did not vote against it.

Mr. Bigg: If you have anything to say why don't you stand on your feet and say it? Would you like the floor?

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): I said you did not vote against it.

Mr. Bigg: Against what?

[Mr. Bigg.]

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): The increase in salaries for members.

Mr. Bigg: No. I think I am worth it. I can't say that you are. I backed policies which raised the price of cattle and stabilized family income on the farms. I am proud of the small part I played, and with the same amount of devotion to the Canadian people I think I could earn $18,000 a year anywhere. I am a lawyer, and I am devoting what small legal brains I have to looking through the holes in your specious arguments. I am an advocate for the people of Athabasca, and they know it. I spend 100 per cent of my time representing them, and I don't care if we have a recess or not. This is my life. I will spend 24 hours a day 12 months of the year here if you will produce some results for my people. But if you don't come up with something dynamic I will be here when you are forgotten.

If you members from Quebec want to be returned from Quebec, then do something for the little people of Quebec. Give them a chance to earn a living and share in the wonderful opportunities we have. No people ever had greater opportunities than those facing the Canadian people today. We are fighting over dimes when we should be having dollars. In some cases little, petty provincial governments are shuffling dimes around when they should be using dollars, and this is due to lack of vision and co-operation. When we have an administration that gets things done we should get behind it and stop telling lies about it. Whenever you people introduce something good I will vote for it. You are in the driver's seat.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): And you are talking.

Mr. Bigg: In this chamber you are supposed to stand on your feet and make your contribution. You are not helping Canada by heckling me. If you have a contribution to make I am willing to sit down and listen to it.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I must interrupt the hon. gentleman to advise him that the time allotted to him has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Chairman, while we are studying interim supply, and after the fashion of various members of the official opposition, I should like to put on the record a few short quotations which are assuredly relevant to today's debate.

The first quotation is taken from Psalm 115 and reads as follows:

—eyes have they, but they see not;
They have ears, but they hear not:

The other quotation, taken from St. Luke, chapter 23, says this:

—forgive them; for they know not what they do.

Mr. Knowles: Amen.

Mr. Lambert: So you are innocent.

[*Text*]

Mr. Thomas: I am happy at the opportunity to take part in this debate on interim supply. I know there are some objections to the length of time which has been consumed by this debate, but one of the duties of members of parliament, particularly members of the opposition, is to seek to guide the government along right lines through control of the monetary supply.

I think the members of the government will be ready to agree that across this country today there are a great many worried people. They are worried over the conduct of business in this house—

Mr. Lloyd: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thomas: They are worried over the proposed imposition of a flag. They are worried over the conduct and performance of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and they are deeply worried over the proposed formula for amending our Canadian constitution and the effect it is likely to have on Canada in the years ahead.

I should like to deal first with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Back in the thirties the corporation was set up for several purposes, the chief of these being to foster Canadianism through disseminating Canadian news, sports, educational achievements, science, history and whatever else might be going on in Canada which the Canadian people should know and which no outside news media could possibly supply to the Canadian people in the same way a national broadcasting corporation could. Its purpose was to foster national unity. It was concerned only with radio in those first years. Later on, when television took its place alongside the other media of communication, the C.B.C. arranged for the broadcasting of television programs.

Now, no organization other than a government organization could possibly provide the remoter areas of this country with radio and television facilities, particularly the latter. This was one of the fundamental purposes of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, to provide these facilities in the remoter areas which would not be attractive to private enterprise because there would be no profit in broadcasting to those areas.

Then again, in addition to supplying these facilities to remote areas, another purpose of the corporation was to keep open and active our east-west lines of communication. We in Canada live in five regions spread roughly along the 60th parallel of latitude. These five regions are separated by areas of rock and communication is difficult. This has always been one of the problems of Canada. It has made the construction of railways very expensive. It has made construction of communicating east-west lines very expensive. But these east-west lines of communication are essential to the well-being and continuation of our national existence.

On the whole the C.B.C. has done a very good job of serving Canada. The corporation has produced some very good programs. It has brought into this country some very good programs. Nevertheless, in recent times particularly, the C.B.C. seems to be letting down its standards—I would not like to say of decency, but it is letting down its standards of, shall we say, acceptability. There is no reason why the C.B.C. should become a showcase for pornography, but there has been serious criticism of the content of some recent programs which have been broadcast over our national facilities.

I submit to this committee that nothing should be broadcast which would cause embarrassment in any way in an average well adjusted Canadian home when all its members are sitting around watching television. I submit that freedom of speech and truth should not be used as an excuse for broadcasting subjects and pictures which are ruled out in polite mixed company. In other words, if it is not lowering the standards of decency, the C.B.C. in recent times has been guilty of lowering the standards of acceptability. Acceptability cannot be defined by law; it can only be defined by public usage and by public acceptance. The C.B.C. has violated this law of acceptability.

I should like to read the committee a letter from a lady who lives in the constituency of Middlesex West. The letter is addressed to Mr. Alphonse Ouimet, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, with a copy to myself. It says:

Dear Mr. Ouimet,

I have just shut off our television set in disgust and indignation during this evening's program "This Hour Has Seven Days". If you are in any doubt as to the reasons, I suggest you check the

program content. The freedom its producers allow themselves is no licence for insensible insult. There are still areas of decency.

I protest too the general terms two weeks ago of this same program during the visit of H.R.H. Queen Elizabeth. I do not know whether on that occasion Dr. Laurier LaPierre was reading from a prepared script or airing his personal opinion. In either case I was ashamed as a Canadian citizen that he, over a publicly owned medium, called into question the right of the Queen to be in Canada at all.

I would suggest, sir, that it is past time to withdraw the privilege from the opinionated individuals associated with this program of presenting their private viewpoints along with a number of very low-taste items.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. A.G. McColl,
38 Lonsdale drive,
London, Ontario.

I have before me a clipping taken from this morning's *Globe and Mail* entitled "Professor and cleric defend C.B.C." The article is as follows:

A Unitarian minister and an associate professor of art have spoken in defence of the C.B.C., under fire recently in speeches by members of parliament and in a strongly worded petition signed by women's groups.

George Swinton, associate professor at the University of Manitoba's school of art, said in an interview that overzealous, self-appointed spokesmen for the general public attempting to suppress truth and fact because they do not like them are vicious, irrational and un-Christian.

That is one person's view. I will have some more to say about that later.

Rev. William P. Jenkins, in a Sunday address to his congregation at the Unitarian church of Winnipeg, said members of parliament and a group of women were seeking, in the name of morality, to enforce a rigid censorship of Canada's most popular and penetrating medium of communication.

The defenders referred to the declaration of Canadian women, a petition circulated among women's and church groups and carried door to door in some communities, and to members of parliament's criticism of the network for an interview with George Lincoln Rockwell, leader of the American nazi party.

The women's petition said its signers aim "to end the domination of a minority who misuse the C.B.C. to spread propaganda for perversion, pornography, free love, blasphemy, dope, violence and crime".

Mr. Swinton said groups that accuse the C.B.C. of contributing to juvenile delinquency, alcoholism and immorality have not the slightest idea what morality really is.

It is the duty of the C.B.C. to show the truth and things that really exist, even though they may be unpleasant, he said. "Bigots are like ostriches with their heads in the sand. They think if they don't look at something, it doesn't exist.

He said Canadians "should be grateful to the C.B.C. for defending our freedom of opinion and expression".

[Mr. Thomas.]

Mr. Jenkins said a victory for pressure groups against the C.B.C. would mean the end of all free expression on television, a body blow to the cultural growth of Canada and a long step toward totalitarianism.

He said Canada cannot remain free unless the people face and examine the problems of morality.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment on the suggestion that it is the duty of the C.B.C. to show the truth and things that really exist. I agree this is true, but I think all of the members of this committee would agree that there are some areas of our lives which are not to be exposed to the public view. People do not exhibit themselves when they take a bath. On nearly every toilet door in the country there is a lock. We do not wash our dirty linen in the living room. Mothers do not change their babies when there is a lot of strange company around. There are certain areas of our lives which are kept private, and it seems to me that this fact should be recognized by the C.B.C.

Surely the C.B.C. know what is acceptable in polite social circles; and surely what is acceptable in polite social circles should be respected by the corporation. Why the Canadian people has to accept some of the tripe, to use that expression, which is put over the C.B.C. networks and which is certainly a cause of embarrassment to many people, I do not know. I cannot understand the attitude of the management of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in permitting this sort of thing to continue. I think that one incident where, according to accepted standards, an improper and indecent program is broadcast by the C.B.C. is sufficient for the severest disciplinary measures to be taken against the producers of such programs. I do not know where we can start except at the top of the C.B.C., not at the bottom. Mr. Ouimet himself should be held responsible for what is broadcast on the C.B.C. networks. The producers all the way down to the bottom of the ladder should have a thorough understanding that this far out type of program, which may be acceptable to a very small minority of Canadians, is found to be objectionable and embarrassing by the average viewer of television. I say that the C.B.C. should know better than to broadcast this type of program, and everyone in the organization should understand that.

Now I come back to a clipping taken from the London *Free Press* for January 6, 1961, which illustrates the sort of thing to which I am referring. This is a Canadian Press report which is as follows:

Arch Oboler, controversial movie producer-director-writer, is making a film in Toronto about the Kinsey report and is using Canadian actors.

Leo G. Carroll, veteran Hollywood actor best known for the Topper series, will play the lead and will be supported by Canadians Kate Reid, Austin Willis, Sharon Acker, Toby Tarnow, Garrick Hagon and Maud Whitmore. Scenes are being shot at the grounds of the Canadian national exhibition, Malton airport and in Toronto streets and at a church.

The plot takes the form of a symposium on the famed report, chaired by Carroll. The title of the film is "One Plus Two".

Calling Canadian actors and technicians "nothing but wonderful," Oboler refused to divulge the cost of the movie but said that the film should take about five weeks to shoot.

Said Oboler: "I've written something like 700 plays, but this is the one dearest to my heart."

If ever there was a subject that was not fit for showing in the living rooms of homes in Canada it is the Kinsey report, yet we have producers who think that this sort of thing is good for public showing. I should like to stress again the point that there is an element in the C.B.C. that is going too far. It is going beyond the point of acceptability by the Canadian public.

The former government was unable to rectify this situation and the present government seems unable to take care of it. Certainly something should be done. I think when we are considering granting the government further interim supply, during which time we have the right to raise grievances and demand recourse, is a suitable time to impress upon the government the fact that this sort of broadcasting and programming must be stopped.

I should like to read a short excerpt from a speech made by Mr. Alphonse Ouimet to the Toronto Rotary club on November 25, 1960. Mr. Ouimet stated:

I wouldn't be surprised if every person in this room who follows C.B.C. programs is mad at the C.B.C. for something they saw or heard yesterday, or will be mad at us for something they will see or hear tomorrow or the next day. I would be less than honest if I did not admit that there is much that is not to my particular taste either, but I believe in freedom of taste.

Perhaps we all believe in freedom of taste, but within reason. We do not believe in unrestricted freedom of taste. If we followed that reasoning where would it lead us? It would lead us to the fringe of lunacy, indecency, immorality and everything that accompanies those things. Let us believe in freedom of taste, yes, but within reason. The C.B.C. has exceeded the limits of reason by some of its recent programs.

Mr. Ouimet then went on to say:

I don't want to labour this point. Canada, thank goodness, is not made up of 18,000,000 sheep, and we all know it.

Despite their differences of opinion, and their differences in taste, most Canadians, when they see a program they dislike, are fair enough to remember the number of programs they did enjoy. They probably also remember that the other fellow may have other preferences in programs—and that he, too, is a shareholder in the C.B.C.

Broadcasting—the kind of broadcasting we have in Canada with C.B.C.—has something for everyone.

Again we have this suggestion that there is something for everyone and freedom of taste. This freedom should not go beyond the point of reason and acceptability, but the C.B.C. has gone beyond that point.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I need say anything further in this regard. I hope I have made my point clear and that the government will do something about this situation. There is a problem in this regard, but surely if the present management of the C.B.C. does not understand the standards of acceptability in Canada today, changes should be made in that management.

At this time I should like to make a few comments in connection with the proposed formula for amending our Canadian constitution. The suggested formula has caused grave doubt in the minds of many Canadians. I think we all believe that the repatriation of the Canadian constitution, providing for its amendment in Canada without having to refer it to the government of Great Britain, is desirable. However we do not want to weaken our nation because of our anxiety to repatriate our constitution. It is better to leave things alone than to damage our national unity. It is better to leave things alone than to prejudice our future well-being as a nation.

In 1867 two levels of government were established, a national or federal level, and a provincial level. The powers of each were clearly outlined. Under sections 91 and 92 the powers of the federal government and the provincial governments were clearly stated. The language aspect of the situation was covered by section 133. This is not a long section, and for the sake of those people who may read *Hansard* I think it would do no harm to put it again on the record.

Section 133 of the British North America Act, which deals with languages, reads as follows:

Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the houses of parliament of Canada and of the houses

of the legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this act, and in or from all or any of the courts of Quebec.

The acts of the parliament of Canada and of the legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both languages.

That is the way the language problem was settled back in 1867, and this solution has served Canada for 97 years, and has been the basis for the use of languages in this country. The problem of representation in parliament was dealt with in sections 51, 52 and others, and the admission of new provinces was dealt with in section 46. The Fathers of Confederation made a long and careful study and gave lengthy consideration to the drawing up of this act, and it has been found to be a good act.

I should like to quote from an editorial in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of October 30, 1964. It is headed "Present Constitution O.K." and reads in part as follows:

One of the crowning glories of confederation and of the foresight of the founding fathers has been the fact that the structure which they built has withstood these changes without being altered in any fundamental way.

The second paragraph of the editorial goes on to say:

No convincing case has been made in Quebec or elsewhere for any basic changes in the constitution. On the contrary, there is every evidence that the B.N.A. Act, a superbly flexible and adaptable document, is as capable of meeting the nation's needs today as it was in 1867. Even Premier Lesage of Quebec has conceded this.

The Chairman: Order. I have to bring to the attention of the hon. member that unfortunately his time has expired, unless he has unanimous agreement of the committee to continue.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Chairman: I regret there is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman, in listening to hon. members on the other side who have spoken this afternoon I had occasion to look up the word "filibuster" in the Concise Oxford Dictionary. It is defined here as an "obstructionist in legislative assembly". I want to spend a few moments of the committee's time to suggest to the committee that what we have been hearing again his afternoon is a continuation of what has been an obstructionist technique in this legislative assembly, the House of Commons.

[Mr. Thomas.]

Mr. Rapp: The same as you did in 1963.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): May I ask a question?

Mr. Turner: Certainly.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is in substantial agreement with the argument put forward by the hon. member for Middlesex West?

Mr. Turner: In answer to the hon. member's question may I say that whether or not I am in agreement with what was said by the hon. member who has just taken his seat is irrelevant because I want to suggest to the hon. member that what we have been hearing during the last seven days, and I say this with the greatest respect to him, has been irrelevant and I do not want to compound that irrelevancy by getting into that type of argument this afternoon. May I say that the subject matters that have been discussed on interim supply have been noted for the fact that they have not really constituted a proper discussion of interim supply at all. Members have been talking about patriation of the constitution and the amendment of the British North America Act, when this measure will be brought before the House of Commons in due course and will open up at that time an opportunity for relevant and appropriate discussion. Members have been talking about the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, when the estimates of the Secretary of State have not yet been brought before the house but will be brought forward in due course. There has also been discussion about the flag, when this matter is on the order paper already and should therefore not be a proper subject for debate on interim supply. Indeed it is the object of a report by a committee of the house, which report is before the house.

I should like to cite to the committee a few figures. Out of the 182 days that this house has been sitting this session, 76 have been taken up with estimates and supply. Yet the estimates of only eight out of 23 government departments have been passed. We are now on the 26th day of debate on interim supply during this session whereas in the nine previous sessions of the House of Commons interim supply took only 22 days.

Mr. Kindt: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member a question? When he is speaking would he mind addressing the members of the house and not the press gallery?

Mr. Turner: I wanted to make sure that the hon. member would hear me. During the

years of Conservative administration no interim supply debate was prolonged for more than two days, except the debate in December, 1962, which took seven days because in that instance no budget had been presented in the 1962-63 session—

Mr. Lambert: You are wrong.

Mr. Turner: —and only seven days had been allowed for the consideration of estimates.

The Chairman: Order. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George who started his remarks by expressing the opinion that perhaps some members who had spoken before him had not been entirely relevant to the subject matter of the resolution. I am in accord with him to some extent but I do not think that, as the Speaker says, two wrongs make a right and I would hesitate to recognize that he is in order when he discusses past proceedings of the house under the guise of suggesting that perhaps some of the contributions to the debate have been irrelevant. It may be that what he is saying now is by way of preface to other remarks, and if that be so perhaps he could get to the subject matter and essence of his speech.

Mr. MacEwan: Talk about the water levels on the great lakes.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman, in response to your suggestion I should like to talk about interim supply, because the time spent in debate in this house involves the taxpayers' money—

Mr. Lambert: How would you know? You are never here.

Mr. Turner: —and within that scope I would hope Your Honour would find me relevant. With regard to interim supply, the first interim supply debate took two days, the second interim supply debate took one day, the third interim supply debate took seven days, the fourth took nine days and the fifth has taken seven days up until today for a total of 26 days. All I want to suggest to Your Honour is that the proposed flag resolution appeared in *Votes and Proceedings* on May 26, 1964, between the second and third interim supply debates, which may explain these figures better than any further words of mine.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to participate in the debate this afternoon, but since the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources (Mr. Turner) apparently wants to lecture us, I feel it is my duty to say a few words.

I object to any attempt by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George to muzzle the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot, or any other member.

We have rights, and in rising to deal with the remarks and representations made by my constituents, I am only performing my duty. Therefore, even though I have great regard for him and even consider him as a friend, I spurn the lecture that the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George tried to give us.

Mr. Chairman, I also have a few remarks to make about the C.B.C.

I feel that this crown corporation is costing the Canadian taxpayers so much money that we should look into it. I feel that we do not get our money's worth from the C.B.C.

Of course, the C.B.C. presents very good programs, but it also presents some that are not so good, and some that are definitely bad. Therefore, I will deal for a while with the unfavourable aspect, even if I have had very little time to prepare the remarks I am going to make—

Mr. Drouin: Would the hon. member allow a question?

Mr. Ricard: What does he mean by the remarks.

Mr. Drouin: What does he mean by the C.B.C.?

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be corrected by my hon. friend from Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes (Mr. Drouin) when I use an English word instead of a French word, but I think that in doing so I merely follow the example set on several occasions by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Tremblay) who dealt the other day with "bands." Besides, he used other English words during the remarks he made in French in this house.

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to tolerate a few interjections from the other side of the house, but I must warn you that if those who always remain seated cannot do otherwise than make interjections from their seats, I will have no alternative at a certain time but to reply in kind.

Some t.v. programs are especially shocking; they encourage delinquency and are a danger

to our youth. Some of those programs are definitely indecent and they should not be shown to our young people.

Other programs also intended for teenagers are equally indecent. Some of them undermine the established authority, whether it be the family, the parish, the province or the country. Other programs present a simply revolting aspect of crime to young people; and in this connection, I would point out the remarks made last year, if my memory serves me well, by the chief of police of Montreal, Mr. Robert, who said that unless steps were taken to cancel certain programs on crime, we would find it very hard to control our young people.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter which was sent to me—

Mr. Choquette: By a parish priest.

Mr. Ricard: Not by a parish priest, but contrary to the hon. member for Lotbinière, I receive letters from parish priests; perhaps the parish priests of his riding do not trust him enough to write him.

Mr. Choquette: I receive letters from bishops.

Mr. Ricard: I often receive letters from parish priests, but this letter is from a citizen of Varennes. It reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Ricard:

Even though I am a Liberal, I sympathize with Mr. Balcer with regard to the destruction of his car. As I have written to many members and ministers for years, the cause of these acts of violence and gangsterism, of this flippant attitude on the part of young people is the t.v. films—

Mr. Chairman, you have a family, as I have, and you know by personal experience that a picture has a very important and far-reaching influence, especially on youth.

Therefore, it is important that films shown on our t.v. screens are not detrimental to our youth. I think it is our duty, as representatives of the people, to watch over the protection of our families.

I am certain the minister is anxious to give all his consideration to that question and that he will revise, if that is possible, the answer he gives to questions directed to him: "I have no authority whatsoever on programs shown by the C.B.C."

Decency as well as the moral well-being of our children require that the minister do his utmost to ensure that our youth will not be corrupted.

Going on to another matter, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the house that the C.B.C. is not as careful as it should be concerning the broadcasting of news. One does not need to listen too long to certain news programs to notice that there is partisanship among the C.B.C. staff.

When the time comes to present news unfavourable to a political party—and so that there should be no misunderstanding, I say that I mean the party to which I have the honour of belonging—

Mr. Chrétien: Dubious honour.

Mr. Choquette: Pitiful honour.

Mr. Ricard: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Choquette: I say it is a pitiful honour because I would be ashamed of being a Conservative myself. You can be sure of that. Your party is trying to destroy confederation.

Mr. Ricard: In the mouth of the hon. member, the word "shame" is meaningless because he himself is a shame for the house. If I had a piece of advice to give him, I would suggest that he keep quiet; he would at least be showing some respect for his constituents.

Mr. Choquette: After the next election, you will be quiet because you will be nothing.

Mr. Ricard: I was saying, in spite of the remarks and ill-timed and perhaps naughty interjections of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette)—

Mr. Choquette: I merely laughed, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Ricard: I was saying that the C.B.C. did not always give a true report of facts.

You have heard those Liberal members, Mr. Chairman, they are not allowed to speak.

Liberal members are allowed to make noises and interjections in this house but they are not allowed to rise in their seats to give their personal opinions.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. I do not make any noise in the house, I only laugh at the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot who is utterly ridiculous.

Mr. Ricard: This, Mr. Chairman, will not prevent me from continuing with my remarks—

Mr. Turner: What a pity.

Mr. Ricard: I did not think the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George could stoop to the level of the hon. member for Lotbinière. I am quite amazed.

The Chairman: Order. May I ask hon. members to come back to their senses and allow the hon. member who has the floor to pursue his comments without being interrupted?

Mr. Ricard: I thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Liberal members have to be called to order, in view of the unwarranted interruptions and interventions they keep on making when a Conservative member has the floor.

The Chairman: I have to tell the hon. member that I must also call him to order and ask him to co-operate with the Chair by limiting his remarks to the resolution now before the committee.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what I have been doing all along, and if I was forced to digress it is due to the lack of seriousness of the members opposite.

The C.B.C. costs the Canadian citizens $86 million per year. It seems to me that it would be fair and advisable for this corporation to spend more cautiously the funds that are being provided to it by the Canadian taxpayers and workers.

I believe, I do not only believe but I am sure, that many expenditures are incurred inconsiderately.

Money is no object to the C.B.C., especially in regard to television. The responsible people in that corporation incur any expenditure that comes to mind. It is true that in so doing, they only follow the example set by the government itself; last spring, when the C.B.C. president's annual salary was increased from $20,000 to $40,000 it could have been increased by an additional $10,000, as was stated before us by the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne).

As you can see, Mr. Chairman, we do not have to go any farther to find an example. The C.B.C. is criticized for its inconsiderate spending, but the example is set at a higher level, that is by the very people who direct the business of this country.

I would therefore—

Mr. Guay: Demagogy.

Mr. Ricard: Now, the hon. member for Lévis believes he should also interject, for, as may be seen, he is not allowed either to speak in the house.

Mr. Guay: I would not want to speak like you; I would rather remain silent.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, this is another proof that the Liberal members on the opposite side of the house can do nothing but interject.

Mr. Guay: You are acting as demagogues, and this is not any better.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, it is therefore important that a thorough inquiry be made into the C.B.C., in order to introduce sound financing in its management. I am convinced that the C.B.C. could, and with a lot less money, give better programs, offer high quality programs that would promote culture and information.

Furthermore, I am of the opinion that the Prime Minister should launch an investigation into this matter.

It is no secret that the C.B.C. harbours a core of separatists who are a real danger to our society. If the members on the opposite side of the house had the courage to deal with this matter, if they had the courage to state publicly what they think in the bottom of their hearts, they would corroborate what I am saying at this moment. This is also another area which the minister should investigate in order to bring about the remedies required.

Furthermore, there exists an extraordinary patronage within the C.B.C. Unless he knows certain officials in the C.B.C., it is impossible for the ordinary citizen to obtain a position or do business with that corporation. You cannot do anything or get anything if you do not have the ear of the person responsible for patronage within that crown corporation.

That works against the people in general and should not be tolerated in a country like ours. The minister should stop saying he can do nothing in that respect. The Secretary of State should take into consideration the grievances and recommendations made by his colleague from York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) and give closer attention to the steps which should be taken to correct that situation.

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Ricard: Certainly.

Mr. Drouin: Could he give us the name of the person responsible for patronage within the C.B.C. so that the minister who answers to the house for the corporation may take the necessary steps and put an end to the situation mentioned by the hon. member?

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, that will not be necessary since the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes knows him even better than I do.

Mr. Guay: Let us hear you give his name.

[*Text*]

Mr. Kindt: I am delighted, Mr. Chairman, to have the opportunity of participating in this supply debate, particularly since the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is in his seat in the chamber. This afternoon I should like to talk about Indians because I happen to have five reserves in my area, and I consider the Blood Indian reserve, being so close to it, as one of the five reserves. At least the Indians from it come over to Fort Macleod and we see a lot of them.

These Indians entered into a solemn obligation with the Queen and the federal government in 1877 at Blackfoot Crossing south of Cluny in Alberta. Over five or six thousand Indians were present, and Colonel Macleod, the head official of the federal government, attended the drafting of treaty No. 7 and the signing of it. This particular treaty may not mean a great deal to present day officials of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. I would say to them that as far as the Indians are concerned, there is nothing more sacred than the obligations they undertook at that time and there is nothing more solemn than the promises which Her Majesty's representatives made on that occasion. They sealed them by saying that as long as the rivers flow and the sun shines these obligations of the federal government would be carried out. I would remind the committee that this treaty was not made between the Indians and any minor government—any local government, or provincial government. It was made between Her Majesty's representatives and representatives of those nations which were ceding certain territory. The Indians agreed to this treaty. It took them seven days to do so. And anyone who reads treaty No. 7 can see the rights which were given on that occasion to these Indians and the benefits which the government of Canada received. To have called such a meeting as the minister of citizenship had in mind without first consulting the Indians on matters which pertain to them is entirely wrong—wrong in principle and wrong in practice. These Indians feel affronted by this type of procedure.

Under this treaty—and I have a copy of it here in my hand—the federal government promises to set up reserves. Reserves are named for the Blackfoot, Blood and Sarcee bands. A reserve is named for the Peigan band of Indians. It was to be on the Old Man river near the foot of the Porcupine hills at a place called Crow's Creek. The reserve of the Stoney band of Indians was to be in the vicinity of Morleyville. They gave $25 to every man, woman and child in order to have the treaty signed on the occasion when they all met at Blackfoot Crossing south of Cluny in September, 1877. Our representatives on that occasion gave these Indians a solemn assurance that they would pay the salaries of all such teachers to instruct the children of the Indians as Her Majesty of Canada might deem advisable, when such Indians were settled on the reserves and should desire teachers. Well, the present government is doing that. We are providing teachers. But whenever there is any change in the treaty rights which the Indians enjoy, the Indians deserve, and indeed, as citizens of this country they are entitled to expect, that whatever government is in power in Ottawa, there should first be consultation with those who are primarily affected. First of all, the Indians should be consulted. Then the administration should obey the treaty obligations which the federal government undertook.

This treaty No. 7, I would say, was one of the worst real estate swindles I ever read in my life. What did they receive in return for ceding that entire territory? In addition to having certain reserves set aside they were to receive, the treaty says—and I shall read the committee some of the terms:

> Her Majesty agrees to supply each head and minor chief, for the use of their bands, ten axes, five handsaws, five augers, one grindstone, and the necessary files and whetstones.

Well, a whetstone might have been a very valuable piece of equipment to an Indian. At the same time there is not much monetary value attached to any of these things which were given to the Indians as part of a settlement. Later, the treaty promises to give to the Indians, if they wished to go into agriculture, "two hoes, one spade, one scythe and two hay forks." Every three families were to receive one plow and one harrow, and for each band—

> —enough potatoes, barley, oats and wheat (if such seeds be suited for the locality of their reserves) to plant the land actually broken up. All the aforesaid articles to be given, once for all, for the encouragement of the practice of agriculture among the Indians.

As some spokesmen for the Peigans have said to me when I last visited them—and I have a great deal of contact with these Indians—it was a case of a bunch of sharp lawyers talking to a bunch of savages. That, undoubtedly, is a fair summary of what happened. In the event, Crowfoot signed this treaty and the Indians felt that in signing it they had done the right thing. They did get their reserves and they do enjoy certain rights

and privileges. One of them is that before anything in the treaty is changed the federal government must go back to the Indians and discuss the proposed change with them. It is necessary to get the consent of the people who are most concerned, and discuss the matter with them before discussing it with anybody else. This is only fair in view of the solemn undertaking into which Her Majesty entered by virtue of the agreement with these Indians.

Those who were privileged to attend the ceremony which marked the signing of this treaty back in 1877 at Blackfoot Crossing remembered it as one of the most solemn occasions in the history of western Canada. As a token of respect, Crowfoot and some of the other chiefs were brought east where they were wined and dined by the federal government. They were taken to government house. They were sent down to Montreal and Toronto and were taken around various places, and then returned to their respective reserves in southern Alberta.

My purpose in recounting this visit is because other events took place. Even if it is at the ministerial level, the idea of the federal government is to make changes affecting the Indians. The government wants the provincial governments to make these changes. But let us not fool ourselves: the Indians are a proud people. They entered into obligations, laid down their arms, and so on, as a result of solemn pledges made by the federal government. In speaking on their behalf here today I feel I am only doing what should be done and raising matters which should be understood by the minister and his staff in their relations with the Indians.

Before I close there are some other items I should like briefly to mention. I do not think I need spend any time on the flag question, except to say that some of the things I do read disturb me. They leave one with the feeling that whoever is spreading the propaganda concerning the flag might be a little more considerate of the truth, instead of creating a wrong impression of what is taking place and may yet take place in the days ahead. If the flag issue is buried, as it should be, nothing will be done and no one will be harmed. If it had not been for the Conservative party we would have today a three maple leaf flag flying throughout the country. Even the committee has indicated—

The Chairman: Order, please; would the hon. member kindly resume his seat. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member for Macleod but I have listened to him with great interest until now. I feel that all hon. members, including the hon. member who now has the floor, should exercise great restraint and caution when discussing the question of the flag issue. To my mind this is a matter which should not be discussed in the present proceedings because it has nothing to do with any of the items before the committee. If I may refer to standing order 39(2), it is there stated that discussion in committee should be strictly relevant to the matter before the committee. Therefore I humbly and earnestly suggest to the hon. member that discussion might be left to some other occasion.

Mr. Kindt: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, every other hon. member who has taken part in this debate has talked about this matter and I ask for the same privilege. That is item No. 1.

The Chairman: I do not know which other hon. members have discussed the flag issue, but certainly that is the position which the Chair must take as regards the hon. member who has the floor at the moment, namely that that subject is not relevant to the resolution before the committee at this time.

Mr. Kindt: Well, Mr. Chairman, I register an objection to your ruling and just let it go at that. As far as I am concerned I have plenty of subjects to talk about. However since payment for the flag committee comes out of the revenue which we are being asked to pass, I think I have a legal right, as has every hon. member, to talk about any subject pertaining to it.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member seems to contradict what he said a moment ago when he recognized that he was prepared to accept the ruling of the Chair. If he does, then I would ask him to pass on to another subject.

Mr. Kindt: I think I am being denied my rights as a member and should have the same privilege as all other hon. members who have spoken on this matter. Why did the Chair not make a ruling at the beginning? Mr. Turner on the other side spoke for ten to 20 minutes on the flag.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman, I think the record will bear out the fact that I spoke for no more than five minutes. I would also ask the hon. member to follow the rules of the house and to refer to my constituency.

Mr. Kindt: I apologize but I could not remember his constituency. Which is it?

Mr. Turner: St. Lawrence-St. George.

Mr. Kindt: Thank you. Now, turning to some of the other issues raised in the press, it seems there is a general impression that people from the west are opposed to this, that and the other. As a matter of fact, I have a press cutting before me headed "Anti-Dief line-up grows". I should like to tell all hon. members that here is one representative from western Canada who is 100 per cent behind the Leader of the Opposition. There is no question but that the Grits, the Liberals, would like to get rid of him more than any other man.

Some hon. Members: Oh, no.

Mr. Kindt: They say "Oh, no", but the very fact they say that means "Oh, yes".

Some hon. Members: Oh, no.

Mr. Moreau: Heaven forbid.

Mr. Kindt: In connection with this feeling of the people, let me say I am going to speak at a meeting of the Legion next week at Barons, and the Legion there covers members over the whole area of southern Alberta. It will be a good meeting and there will be in no respect whatever any friendly talk about the present Prime Minister, his program on the flag and other matters.

Since I am prevented from raising some of the matters I had in mind I shall close my remarks by saying to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration that I would hope he would come out to my constituency and meet the five or six thousand Indians who live there, and also give them an opportunity to meet him, either in Calgary or Fort Macleod, or some such spot. If he did that he would learn from them what their views are regarding their treaty rights. I will go one step further and suggest that he should make an honest effort to reread these treaties and to put down in writing his interpretation of what they mean to the Indians. The officials of his department are not aware of these rights. I received a letter some time ago, and in order to answer that letter I purposely worded a request for information to the department in such a way that to answer they would have to read treaty No. 7. I did receive an appropriate answer from the department, so I know that at least one official read treaty No. 7. We are making a little progress.

I hope the minister, for the sake of his relationships with the Indians, will give them what they deserve and what Canada as a nation has promised to give them. Let me repeat, so long as the sun shines and the rivers flow the rights given under these treaties should be respected, and they must be respected, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Badanai: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member for Macleod permit a question?

Mr. Kindt: Yes.

Mr. Badanai: Is he aware of the fact that the minister made a statement recently in this house to the effect that the Indian bands would be consulted before any changes in the services provided to Indian communities are made? In view of that statement, no change will be made without consultation.

Mr. Kindt: I am aware of that statement, but why did the department not call the Indians together and ask them whether they want these changes? I think the department is going at it in the wrong direction. You are ignoring the rights and insulting the Indians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, in order to give a breather to the Conservatives who continue their marathon, and to give them a chance to charge their batteries, because it seems they intend to continue the same marathon until Friday, I will make a few remarks with respect to the doings of some people within the C.B.C. The C.B.C. was mentioned this afternoon; it is a crown corporation whose yearly deficit of $80 million has to be paid by the Canadian taxpayers, and when we ask questions of the Secretary of State about it, it is practically impossible to get any information. We always get the answer: "the C.B.C. is a crown corporation which does not have to reveal such and such information", so that it is very difficult to get any information.

A while ago I heard the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot use rather strong language in connection with the C.B.C. when he told us that there is partisanship within that corporation and that it harbours separatists.

However, the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot forgot to tell us that when his party was in office, there was also partisanship in the C.B.C. and that it is perhaps at that time that separatism started within the C.B.C. because at the time when his government was in office, there were one million unemployed in Canada, the greatest number of them in the province of Quebec.

Maybe that is one of the reasons why there are within the C.B.C. people in favour of separatism.

Are they to be blamed, or should we not rather blame those who tolerated an economic system which produced poverty in the midst of plenty for six years, while we had one million unemployed in Canada in 1962-63?

Mr. Chairman, there are shortcomings at the C.B.C., as I said time and again, there is especially a socializing group in this corporation, where parliament is treated in an indifferent, indeed, offhand manner; for those people, a member of parliament or a minister has no importance. But it is noteworthy—and Liberals as well as Conservatives noticed it, and it is not new—that as soon as a socialist from abroad visits this country, the C.B.C. presents interviews with those socialist visitors from France, Belgium, the Soviet union, in short, from any part of the world. Yet, those C.B.C. people refuse to give more or as much importance to what happens here in Canada in our own country.

At noon I mentioned an editorial published in *L'Action* of yesterday, signed by Mr. Lorenzo Paré. The title is:

In the caldron of *Le Devoir's* witch.

Mr. Paré says this:

L'Action had published an editorial giving the reasons why, in our opinion, the Queen deserved a nice welcome in Quebec. Local C.B.C. officials—

This is in Quebec city.

—asked us whether we would be prepared to express again the same opinions on the national TV network. Of course, we were. We had to get approval from Montreal, which refused to accept this plea for the Queen on the pretence that the C.B.C. avoided controversial issues.

However, in the same telephone call in which they refused a commentary on the forthcoming visit of the Queen, the C.B.C. offered us, from Montreal, to take part in a televised conference by Mr. Jacques Berque who advocates separatism for Quebec as a preliminary to the triumph, in our province, of the Marxist revolution.

In the opinion of a small C.B.C. Montreal clique the Queen's visit to Quebec was "too controversial an issue"; but the separatist and communist revolution was not. The interview with Mr. Berque was taped at the Palais Montcalm, on October 2 last.

Who is this Jacques Berque? He is a bird from France: he has visited us three times in less than two years, and one visit lasted a month. A specialist in "decolonization", he has come to "sell" the French Canadians the Algerian recipe of blood and bombs. He is the one who wrote, between two trips to Montreal, that "Quebec will soon become a gigantic Cuba". He is the high priest whose words one finds, almost literally, in the *Parti Pris* communist manifesto, and the speaker provided for the students of the University of Montreal—

—by the Marxist or socialist organization of the province of Quebec.

Does this crown corporation, which exists, thanks to the funds supplied by the French Canadian public as well as the English Canadian public, in short the Canadian people, have the right to act in this manner, to refuse that wholesome discussions be broadcast over its network while such people as this Jacques Berque are invited to appear on its network?

That is the situation. In my opinion the minister is in a position to find those who are responsible for the programs which are presented to the listeners throughout the province, to the televiewers throughout Canada.

A while ago I heard Liberal members say: Why not give us the names of the socialists with the C.B.C.? We are not even capable of finding out who is responsible for the programs in general, for this or that program. It would seem that no one person holds a responsible position within the C.B.C.

You request information from the president of the C.B.C., Mr. Alphonse Ouimet, and he dares to reply to you without even signing the letter. In fact, it is only signed with a rubber stamp.

That is the manner in which the members of parliament requesting information are treated by the C.B.C. officials. And this is why I object to these flagrant abuses.

I mentioned several times the fact that during the national news, at half past ten in the evening, the C.B.C. out of a ten minute period devotes only one and a half minutes, two minutes, two minutes and a half at most to the events taking place in Canada, inside our own boundaries, while we are told about what the socialists and communists of the world are doing.

Why not give more importance to events at home? Why not invite more regularly and more often speakers who are able to inform our Canadian people right here in Canada; in short, why not invite authentic Canadians? But no, they invite people like Mr. Berque, to mention only one.

Not so long ago another individual, a man by the name of Chartrand, of Montreal, spent a month in Cuba. As soon as he returned, he was a guest on the C.B.C.'s press conference program, to inform us that since Castro took over in Cuba the country has become an earthly paradise and all that is missing now over there is American soap and toilet paper. Imagine telling us that on the C.B.C. network.

Recently the new attorney general of the province of Quebec gave a conference or presided over a meeting of the members of the Montreal chamber of commerce. Mr. Chartrand was there and interrupted the speaker with abusive remarks.

If Mr. Chartrand or any other Canadian did the same thing to Mr. Castro in Cuba when he holds a meeting, he would be shot on the spot before he had time to break or try to break a meeting of the Cuban dictator.

They ought to be logical at the C.B.C., a crown corporation which spends every year $80 million of the Canadian taxpayers' money, instead of broadcasting programs likely to shock the Canadian people and especially the French Canadians.

The French Canadian people are not revolutionaries. They want justice in their country and they want justice from the C.B.C., whose broadcasts should be of such a nature as to inform the public and not to rouse it, as it is the case at the present time.

I have received anonymous letters from Montreal, advising me that the C.B.C. will not invite me any more to press conferences broadcast from its studios. As a matter of fact, it has been more than a year now since I was invited to press conferences by that corporation. It makes no difference to me, for I shall make use of private television in due time. But, here again, it is discrimination.

Who tells the C.B.C. to invite so and so but not to invite somebody else? We have no objection to seeing Liberals, Conservatives, New Democrats or Social Crediters invited to press conferences. But we do object to having the C.B.C. commit the most glaring and awful injustice toward the Canadian people.

Not all the staff of the C.B.C. should be held responsible. The ordinary employees are respectable men and women who work hard at their jobs. We have here in the press gallery some model employees. There is Mr. Grenier, Mr. Poliquin, Mr. Baulu, model employees who are keeping Montreal informed on what goes on in this house.

But who, in Montreal, is authorized to cut down the news submitted? Who are the responsible parties? That is what we should like to know. We want to know the people we are paying and we want to know those who are interested in presenting to us the supporters of subversive doctrines in the world. That is what we want to know: the programming authorities, and even those above them. Surely, there are some, but we cannot know their names.

[Mr. Caouette.]

When we put questions to the minister responsible in the house for that corporation, he replies that he will get information. He makes inquiries and the next day, he says: Well, nobody is aware. Thus, they pass the buck. One says it is not his fault and he passes the buck and the next one says: It is not my fault either.

There is no one responsible at C.B.C. and yet, we are sometimes presented with absolutely stupid programs, and that is an understatement. The C.B.C. must be brought back to reason and the government must see to it that the greatest importance is attached to what is going on in that corporation.

The C.B.C. is not "Radio-international," it is not "Radio-France", it is not "Radio-Cuba", it is the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

The C.B.C. should first of all be concerned with what is going on in Canada and it should inform the Canadian population on that. That is its role and it is for that purpose that this crown corporation was set up.

And let the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation at least respect the intelligence of Canadians in all provinces.

As far as French programming is concerned, let them at least respect what is happening in the province of Quebec as well as the intelligence of our people.

The C.B.C. is the organization responsible for the publicity given to terrorism in the province of Quebec.

I agree that there are separatists, that there are people who do not share the views of others; I admit that there are people who want to attain a greater degree of independence and of freedom; but they should resort to honest means and not to bombs and blood, as Mr. Berque wishes. It is not in bloody revolutions that the people find their way. In every bloody revolution, it is the people who suffer and pay with their liberty.

Mr. Chairman, the C.B.C. should be the champion of security, of freedom of the press and also of freedom of speech. On the other hand, these freedoms are not one-way freedoms. There are means of holding a dialogue, of reaching an agreement, and also there is always a means of discussing, but the C.B.C. definitely does not allow it.

Mr. Chairman, those are the few remarks I had to make regarding the C.B.C. I think that all the political parties in this house are fed up with the actions of certain C.B.C. officials.

That Montreal should dictate the policy of the corporation at Quebec or at Ottawa, we do not agree; with respect to French

programming, this is neither logical nor normal. Let those in Montreal who are unable to assume their responsibilities be removed from the positions they are now holding.

Terrorists and other persons should stop being paid to try and arouse the people or attempt to stir up a revolution. That crown corporation should stop being used to cater to the lower instincts of human nature. On the contrary, it should appeal to people's intelligence and common sense and present educational programs that will raise the intellectual level of the nation instead of lowering and depreciating it.

Mr. Chairman, so far as French programming is concerned, many are afraid to criticize the C.B.C. for fear of some kind of retaliation or to have officials of this crown corporation replaced.

Mr. Chairman, whatever threats some official of the C.B.C. may choose to make, this will never stop me from exposing evil where it exists, from denouncing such communists as may be hiding within the confines of the C.B.C., because it is not those people who are paying for the C.B.C., but the whole Canadian population. Let us assume our responsibilities as members of parliament and let us stop playing politics.

I heard a short while ago the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) blame the Liberals and suggest that they tolerate the doings of the C.B.C. The Conservative party tolerated it the same way during the six years they were in power. Let us not pass the buck but, all together, let us take our responsibilities and make the necessary changes in order that the C.B.C. may reflect a truly Canadian spirit directed towards its destiny.

[*Text*]

Mr. Cantelon: Mr. Chairman, one always listens with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for Lapointe, and we did so today. I must confess that his vehemence and his emphasis do not always convince us he is correct. However, I feel that some of the points he made today indeed merit very full consideration. I cannot agree with him, though, when he attributes to the past government the programming mistakes of the C.B.C. today. This seems to me to be carrying the principle of responsible government just a little bit too far. I do not see how any government can be responsible for actions that take place after it is out of office. This indeed is the responsibility he would have us accept.

I know that during the last few days a great deal has been said about the C.B.C. generally, and in particular about its programming. I should like to add my voice to these comments because the conduct of the C.B.C. undoubtedly affects my constituency much more than it would the constituency of the hon. member for Lapointe or the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George.

Mr. Caouette: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am the member for Villeneuve, for the information of my good friend.

Mr. Turner: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The C.B.C. is in the constituency of St. Lawrence-St. George.

Mr. Cantelon: I did not say these gentlemen were not concerned with the C.B.C.. However, I believe I am still right in my contention because the only television programs available in my constituency are those brought to us by the C.B.C. These are the only programs we are able to see, so I believe I was quite correct.

The C.B.C. is of concern to the Kindersley constituency, particularly because it is one of those unfortunate fringe areas where television coverage is such that it is described by the operators as a class B or class C fringe zone. Those of you who have had experience with this will know it is not too good. As I have said before, the C.B.C. is of concern to my constituency because it is a constituency in which there is nothing but C.B.C. coverage. The private network has no coverage in the area. Obviously, for these reasons, and since we have no alternative, C.B.C. programming concerns us very much.

When we learn that the C.B.C. intends to invest $128 million in developing, expanding or consolidating services in the three major cities of Ottawa, Montreal and Toronto, we are very much concerned indeed, and I think I ought to say we are not very happy about the situation. No one, I believe, could expect us to feel other than that this is an unfair use of the taxpayers' money. It is the taxpayers' money when we, in parliament, are asked to vote $88 million this year to cover the operating deficit of the C.B.C. In this respect, I should like to quote from the Winnipeg *Free Press* editorial of August 13 of this year, as follows:

> The financial statement of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for 1963-64 shows the continued expansion of the government owned corporation. During the year the C.B.C. received, as a grant from parliament, some $78 million; in advertising revenue, interest, etc., it took in a further $33 million, giving total revenues of $111 million.

Expenses, however, totalled $115 million, leaving the C.B.C. some $4 million in the hole, over and above the $78 million subsidy it received from parliament.

More alarming to the Commons public accounts committee, however, was the sharp increase in C.B.C. capital costs, particularly those relating to the consolidation of facilities in Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal.

Those are the facilities to which I just referred.

A year ago the cost of consolidation was given as $83 million. But last month the C.B.C. president told the committee that this figure had been raised to $105 million. Now the annual report raises it again, this time to $128 million.

In other words, up and up it goes and there does not seem to be very much control.

The committee has expressed "grave concern"—and understandably—at the size of these capital outlays. It is particularly concerned at the amount of money being spent in these three eastern cities when there still remain areas of Canada that do not have adequate television facilities. Part of the C.B.C.'s purpose as outlined in the annual report itself is "By using its physical resources to bring the national program service to as many Canadians as finances allow".

Now, I would not want anyone to think that I regret spending this money. I know, and everyone knows, that we cannot have a good C.B.C. operation unless money is spent. In this country in particular where much of the service must be given to rather slimly settled areas, there is no way in which enough money can be garnered to carry the whole load. Generally speaking we feel however that in past years the C.B.C. has been doing a fine job. I think we feel also that in recent years there has been a tendency, first, to forget that all Canadians and not just the heavily populated areas are entitled to satisfactory service and, second, the C.B.C. goes to the homes—I want to emphasize that point—goes to the homes and should regard its programs in a corresponding light.

The hon. member for Calgary North, who was a member of the public accounts committee and so had an opportunity to study the accounts of the C.B.C. at some length, and who is familiar with the Glassco report, had some very pertinent points to make about the C.B.C. and its financing. I think the most important one is the fact that parliament has no practical way of controlling the expenditures of the C.B.C. We might refuse to vote the money asked for, but to me this is an impractical procedure and I feel many others feel this way too.

We suspect that in the operations of the corporation there are areas where the money might be directed to other purposes, and areas where there are inefficiency and waste. Unfortunately there is no committee specifically charged with the responsiblity of reviewing the C.B.C.'s operations, particularly its financial operations.

True, the government makes much of the fact that it has appointed an advisory committee outside the house to bring in a report and the President of the Privy Council says that a house committee will be set up to study this report. This sounds fine, but it is not what we want. If the government proceeds no faster in this matter than it has in others, we will be discussing the C.B.C. two years from now, and meanwhile the C.B.C. will be spending in its usual, unrestrained way. This is an organization that consistently overspends its budget and it seems to say, "Why not—the deficits are paid by the people." If it were a private corporation, as the hon. member for York-Humber suggests it should be, certainly no deficits would be incurred. However, I would be one of the last to suggest that the corporation be sold to private interests. There are strong reasons why it should not be.

It is my belief that the C.B.C. is primarily an instrument of national policy. It should be a unifying force for the nation and this, with perhaps some exceptions, it has been. It should be its interest to maintain and develop a Canadian culture; and I mean a Canadian culture, not a French Canadian or an English Canadian culture. So far I have not been able to see anything especially remarkable in French Canadian culture which indicates it is worth retaining, in preference to a truly Canadian culture which we might, and indeed should, develop. However if the French Canadian wants to keep it, let him, so long as he does not want to force it down the throats of the rest of us. I am sure this is the way he feels about English Canadian culture. He does not want to be compelled to accept English Canadian culture, and I think most of us are generous enough to concede him the right that we want for ourselves.

Nevertheless, this will never be a nation if we do not develop a truly Canadian way of thinking and unify our two diverse cultures. The C.B.C. is one factor that should assist in the melding of the two cultures. I am not foolish enough to think that this unification will mean similarity. This is most unlikely, but it ought to mean a greater interchange and much more co-operation between the two parts of Canada concerned, and certainly

the C.B.C. has its part to play in that interchange. I doubt if it would play such a part if it were a private business. Indeed, if it were it seems to me we would find U.S. programming and United States events taking a disproportionate amount of the time of the medium. This would lead to even faster and greater Americanization than is occurring. Neither English speaking nor French speaking Canadians care for that. Although we may admire and respect the American way of life I think we prefer our own.

I would like to return again to the principle of one of the comments made by the hon. member for Calgary North as recorded at page 9472 of *Hansard* for Tuesday, October 27, when he said:

> In order to deal effectively with the C.B.C. from year to year there is no question in my mind that we need a standing committee on broadcasting and a committee should be set up immediately to go into the affairs of the corporation forthwith.

There is no question in my mind either that a committee is necessary.

It is quite apparent that the board of directors does not exercise effective financial control. If it did, would it tolerate consistent overspending? Surely no board cares so little for its reputation that it would allow the company it controls to overspend year after year. This in itself is sufficient reason.

Since I have previously pointed out that my constituency is limited to the reception of C.B.C. television programs I would like to ask what is going on? I would also like to emphasize the dissatisfaction which many of my constituents, if not most of them, feel with some of the programs presented. Of course I refer particularly to the far out plays—I suppose the C.B.C. would call them artistic dramas, the sort of thing which we have been subjected to this last two years.

At once I would like to make the point that the C.B.C. is not a theatre in the accepted meaning of the term. A theatre does not have the entrée to the living room of the home. No indeed, people who go to a theatre are spending the night out, if I may put it that way. They are adults, the majority of them, with fully formed characters not likely to be influenced by the licence and immorality, and the preoccupation with sins of the flesh which a good proportion of recent C.B.C. plays has shown.

People who go to the theatre choose to do so. But the t.v. sets in my constituency must be turned off if people in their homes do not want to watch the play shown. Indeed parents may do this, but parents cannot always be in the home when such plays are shown, and the t.v. set may be running whether they want it or not. Tens of thousands of Canadians have this reaction, and the best article to state their view that I have come across is one written by Patricia Young in the July 30 edition of *Our Sunday Visitor*, which is the most widely read Roman Catholic weekly on this continent. I quote from the article as follows:

> Recently, a prominent C.B.C. official, Mario Prizek, in defending some of the television fare that has been coming our way these days, is quoted as saying: "If you don't get some angry reaction from the public, what you're doing doesn't matter to them." I've got news for Mr. Prizek and others of his ilk who seem to have made it their cultural duty to fritter away our hard earned Canadian tax dollars "getting angry reaction." In 1951, when the findings of the Massey commission on broadcasting were made public, the broad objectives of the national system of this public corporation were given as being "to maintain a flow of information and ideas throughout the country." Information, Mr. Prizek, ideas—not a constant assault on character, patriotism and our accepted moral standards.
>
> Of course, some perverted viewers may have an unhealthy preoccupation with homosexual prostitution, pornography and sadism, but the subjects hardly rate the morbid attention, time and money being spent on them. Take a look at a sampling of the "art and culture" being offered to us by the men who have been hired to spend our tax dollars for us. There was "Two Soldiers," a drama in the Quest series, which depicted two servicemen returning from the army. Not only were they devoid of patriotism, but mouthed the typical ban-the-bomb line and had become homosexually involved (because of their army service?) Oh yes, the public reacted angrily and the Saskatchewan command of the Canadian Legion passed a resolution strongly condemning it.
>
> You can bet your life we're angry, Mr. Prizek—and justifiably so. Remember "A Second Look" on February 9th, which featured Ralph Ginsburg of New York, publisher of Eros and other pornographic magazines, who was allowed to defend his case on this public corporation of ours despite the fact that he'd just been convicted on 28 counts, sentenced to five years in jail and fined $28,900 for peddling his filth? Obviously, he was happy enough to come across the border and state his case. After all, there was all that taxpayers' money waiting to be spent in the name of "art and culture". And how about the Observer, produced in Toronto and shown on February 13th. Here was a St. Valentine's day offering for starry-eyed romantics which featured Dr. Albert Ellis, who was introduced to us as a "prominent sexologist from the U.S.A.". Did he dwell on the delights of St. Valentine's day? No, sir; that would be kind of "corny" and wouldn't provoke any "angry reaction". Instead, he offered his "professional" view that premarital and extramarital sexual relations were not only normal but necessary, and the best thing for family life!
>
> On May 13th, we saw The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner on the Festival

series. This gave a distorted conception of religion by showing a pious religious fanatic turn into a man who indulged in violence, rape, perversion, drunkenness, and murder. Certainly, Open Grave, which purported to be a modern day analogy of the Crucifixion, was a sickening perversion of the truth, showing as it did a modern "Christ" as a "misunderstood" ban-the-bomber who was persecuted for leather-jackected fascists" who dared to call him a communist! On June 4th, came to the Trespassers—a C.B.C. radio show on the Assignment series, where we heard the users of marijuana bragging about the joys of using the stuff and making a case for it to be taken off the restricted list in the interests of "personal freedom".

There is a lot more on the same lines but I am afraid I will run out of time if I read it all, so I had better proceed.

As the hon. member for Grey North said in this house a week ago:

Each play appeared to be an effort to outdo the previous one in vulgar language and in portrayals of seduction and illicit love.

Thousands of television viewers across the country were alarmed and disappointed to think that the C.B.C. with its great influence would give time to such revolting plays, which not only displayed bad taste but could be instrumental in promoting immorality in our young people.

With this view I agree 100 per cent. Thousands of television viewers across the country were alarmed and disappointed to think that this kind of stuff could be presented.

Now I should like to refer to some correspondence I have had from my constituency. I would begin by referring to a letter which I received on October 16. It reads:

Dear Sir:

It is with deep regret that we of the Leader "Little Flower" parish council C.W.L. have to protest some of the C.B.C. presentations on television. That such scandalous, licentious, illicit, lewd, irreligious and corrupt pictures are shown is beyond our comprehension. We expect pictures of uplifting and educational qualities to be viewed on a country-wide scale.

We sincerely hope that you, our most worthy representative, will voice our opinion to the C.B.C. and trust that action will be taken to bring us films worthy and fit to be seen on a country-wide scale.

I referred this matter to the Secretary of State. He treated my request with great courtesy and brought it to the attention of the C.B.C., which replied.

As to the quality of reception in my constituency, this is something which has been of concern to us for years. I could best bring it to the attention of the committee if I were to read a letter which I have received, together with a reply on behalf of the corporation. Here is the letter I received on August 20:

[Mr. Cantelon.]

I do not know if you get the opportunity of doing anything relative to our T.V. reception in this locality, but when we read about the C.B.C. spending millions on added facilities in areas where they already have half a dozen outlets, it sure does burn us up living in these fringe areas.

As you know we seldom have a real clear picture, always snow, and most of the time so bad that one can hardly make it out, this summer it seems to be worse than ever, and everybody complaining, the sound has been worse than ever, an odd time you can hear other stations butting in to say nothing of local interference.

Then there is the item of antennas. I imagine they are all 40 feet or more and hundreds of these in a town of our size certainly does not add anything to its general appearance, to say nothing of the cost of them, plus the service. With such a weak signal naturally the antennas have to be kept in good shape, regardless of their unsightly appearance.

These points are not to be laughed off lightly, especially when one sees such large sums of money being spent by the corporation in the consolidation and development of existing facilities. Again, I appreciate the courtesy of the Secretary of State in dealing with this particular problem and I should like to retail his comments briefly. He said:

Unity, Saskatchewan, is situated just outside the "B" service contour of CFQC-TV-1, Stranraer, Saskatchewan, which is a rebroadcasting station of CFQC-TV, Saskatoon, at present an affiliated station of the C.B.C. television network. The corporation does not have a television station of its own in Saskatchewan.

Incidentally, I think it is time something was done about this. I know there is a freeze at present but surely it is time for this freeze to be taken off. The reply continues:

The corporation did make an application to reserve a channel in Saskatoon and was on the verge of applying for authority to establish a station when the freeze on applications for alternative service stations was effected. It has been announced that this freeze will remain in effect until after the report of the committee on broadcasting has been received.

I believe this may be far too long. The letter goes on:

You may recall that the recommendation of the board of broadcast governors for the Stranraer rebroadcasting station was challenged in the courts by Swift Current Telecasting Company Limited, owners of CJFB-TV, whose application for a television rebroadcasting station in Kindersley, Saskatchewan, was recommended for denial by the B.B.G. At the appropriate time, if the corporation is granted authority to proceed with its plans for a television station in Saskatoon, the present Saskatoon station CFQC-TV will no longer be affiliated with the C.B.C. network. In this event, the Swift Current Telecasting Company Limited, which is affiliated with the C.B.C. television network, has given the C.B.C. and the B.B.G. notice that it will apply for authority to establish a station of substantial power to serve the Kindersley areas. In this way, the area would receive a proportion of C.B.C. service along with local and regional programs via Swift Current.

Unity, Saskatchewan, is on the fringe of the "B" service contour of this proposed station.

With these comments, Mr. Chairman, I should like to call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Cantelon: Mr. Chairman, when I called it six o'clock I was left with only a few minutes of time, and in these few minutes I should like to deal with two matters which were brought up by previous speakers. First, it is evident that Liberal members do not want a committee to supervise the spending of the C.B.C. or to recommend program regulation. The hon. member for Halifax made this abundantly clear, in my view, when he listed three reasons for not having such a committee. These reasons are to be found at page 9443 of *Hansard* and the first reason is because it would be contrary to the principle of independence. Just what does he mean by that? Independence to do just as the C.B.C. pleases? I call that licence. I am sure the hon. member would agree it should have freedom to work within the framework of what is envisaged as its prime function. As that great prime minister R. B. Bennett saw it when it was created, it was to be a vehicle for national education and for national unity. I am sure he did not see it operating within that framework as a vehicle to deprave the morals of the youth of this country. We need a committee to check that licence. We need a committee to see that it does not subvert that purpose and to bring it back to reality if it does.

The second reason the hon. member gave was that it would be using parliamentary time to discuss the internal direction of a crown corporation. When I consider the many ways in which we use time in parliament I must confess that this does not disturb me very much. His third objection was the lack of expert knowledge by members of this house of the broadcasting art. I just wonder whether he is really making this suggestion seriously. We deal with a great many matters in this house on which it can be said that many members are not too well informed. This is partly due to the fact that there are inadequate opportunities for the members to become so informed. However, his criticism does not seem to me to be a valid one, for if we are going to deal with the work of the C.B.C. I am sure there would be many members who would be interested enough to inform themselves on the business of the C.B.C. and be able intelligently to discuss it and to deal with it. So much for his objections.

The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George spent five minutes this afternoon accusing my party of filibustering.

Mr. McIlraith: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cantelon: If we are, then we had a good lesson from the Liberal party in 1962-63. He can quote figures, but the facts are that the government does not know how to run or how to organize the business of parliament and the business of the country. This has been demonstrated over and over. Does he need proof? There were the 60 days of decision; the withdrawal of the withholding tax; the fiasco of the 1963 budget; the painful orthodoxy of the 1964 one; the 11 per cent sales tax reduced to 4 per cent, upped to 8 per cent and which finally will become 11 per cent; the Canada pension plan with its "three times and out"; and the 38 pieces of legislation which the Prime Minister would have had us consider before summer recess. A Prime Minister should know more about the business of the country than that. And so one could go on ad infinitum, but I think I have demonstrated the point I set out to make, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the last speaker have clearly summarized the reasons why this country is facing today some of the gravest problems in its 97 years. There are grave doubts about our future expressed in every area of this nation, and these doubts do not decrease as time goes on but rather increase. They increase because people are concerned not only about the manner in which the present government is endeavouring to run the country but the manner in which it is giving away, around the bargaining table, rights which have been accepted as federal in nature and, even more than that, rights which have been accepted as necessary if we are to maintain a strong federal system in this nation of ours.

On September 17, in a press conference in Vancouver, the Prime Minister stated, among other things: "We have had more federal-provincial meetings in the last year and a half than I think in any other period". I believe that is true and I have no argument with that statement. The only realistic argument in this regard is that the federal government is taking an awful beating from the provincial

premiers at the federal-provincial meetings. If we are to continue to have this type of conference, and that appears to be the case, we will end up without a federal system of government, and without a nation.

Mr. Lloyd: Why not get the facts?

Mr. Coates: The elder spokesman from Halifax once again is speaking from his seat. I cannot understand what he is saying, but perhaps he will get up on his feet at a later date and make some contribution to this debate. I am sure his constituents are very anxious for him to do that. I think he should make some constructive suggestions, in view of the problems in his constituency which did not exist 18 months ago.

Mr. Lloyd: You are well informed, sometimes.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Chairman, I come from a part of Canada which cannot afford to allow a weakening of the federal system. There is a great deal of concern in the province of Quebec about its future, where it is going and how it is going to obtain the financial assistance from the people of this nation, and the people of Quebec, necessary to run its affairs in a manner satisfactory to the citizens. If this problem does exist in the province of Quebec I suggest it is the type of problem which is of some concern to the people of that province. If that is a problem there, what must be the problem in the Atlantic provinces, which have been battling these difficulties for a much longer period of time? Those provinces received no assistance whatsoever from the federal government until the Conservative administration took office, and lost that assistance which it received for six years as soon as the present government was re-elected to office.

I have no argument about the fact that the province of Quebec has financial problems, because I believe that is the situation. That may very well be the basic reason for the unrest we have heard and read so much about lately on television and in the newspapers. I do not believe this government is giving enough attention to either the economic problems of the province of Quebec or the economic problems of the whole Atlantic area. This is of great concern to the maritime provinces because unfortunately we do not have as many people to speak for us as do other provinces. Furthermore, fortunately or unfortunately, we do not have so many unstable residents who, when they do take action to bring their problems to the attention of the public, do so in a manner which neither befits that province nor the nation as a whole. We in the maritime provinces try to bring attention to our problems in a sane and sensible manner. However, we have received nothing but rejection from the government of the day.

If the Prime Minister of this nation spent less time at the table with the provincial premiers giving away federal rights and more time placing legislation on the statute books of this nation, it would be of benefit to the people of this nation. We would not have the provincial premiers on our backs so often, because the people of their provinces would be more satisfied with what was being done by the government in Ottawa, and less concerned about the fact that the provincial governments need more money to take the action which should be taken in the first place by the federal government.

Mr. Chairman, it is all very well for one government to blame another for the difficulties which arise within a nation, but what we have got to face more than anything else is that, unless we maintain a strong federal system, we have no chance of surviving as a nation. It is the height of ridiculousness to talk about associated states. What we need is one nation from coast to coast with equal opportunity for all, wherever they live. There is only one way to obtain this type of future welfare for our people, and that is by maintaining a strong central governmental system.

In this nation, which really has only two rich provinces—Ontario and British Columbia —and some other provinces which were have-not provinces when the Conservatives came into office in 1957, but have had many of their ills cured by the actions of the Diefenbaker administration during those years, there is only one area that is deserving of preferential treatment as far as I am concerned, and that is the area which lies east of the eastern Ontario border. It is absolutely essential that the federal government establish policies which will be beneficial to all these provinces. That cannot be done by a weakened, vacillating government which makes one blunder after another, earning little or no respect from anyone with whom it holds conferences. That is the situation which exists today. The provincial premiers look at the federal government and at its record during the last year and a half, and say to themselves that any negotiations will be a piece of cake, because the federal representatives are diplomats and believe that diplomacy is a matter of agreeing to everything suggested. That is an illustra-

tion of what we have received from the government in the way of negotiations at the federal-provincial level.

There has never been a more realistic statement made during the past 18 months in relation to federal-provincial negotiations than that made by Premier Robarts of Ontario on October 22. Here is the premier of one of the rich provinces speaking, one of the men who is in the best bargaining position, no matter how you look at it, one of the men who has less to fear from an economic point of view from the erosion of federal powers as we see it today. Yet we find the premier of Ontario stating that he is finished with these special deals that have been going on between the federal government and the province of Quebec, that he will not countenance separation either by one province or a group of provinces and that he will not countenance the contracting out of federal-provincial programs unless there are guaranteed national standards in these fields.

From the point of view of a member from the Atlantic provinces these were mighty good words to hear. This is the type of words we like to hear spoken, because there is no hope for us in the Atlantic provinces if the present government allows this country to be balkanized as is the case at present in the propositions it is putting forward. In an article which appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star* of September 11 Joseph Scanlon stated among other things that $200 million would be made available to the province of Quebec on the basis of contracting out agreements which would run until 1970. He lists in detail the various programs which the government of the province of Quebec plans to contract out of and they include hospital insurance, old age, blind and disabled persons pensions, health grants, forestry agreements, campground and picnic area agreements. Some of them expire before 1970 and some of them continue until 1970.

But what a dangerous situation is inherent in this contracting out program. Where do we go when this is finished? How difficult must the financial situation of the province of Quebec be if the government of that province has to turn to this type of method to secure the finances it needs to discharge its duties to its citizens. There must be other ways. There must also be other ways in order to protect the have-not provinces of this country and to see that they are assured of at least minimum standards in every area of services.

Along with the erosion of federal responsibilities a degree of disunity has developed in this country which no one would have anticipated even five years ago. I say five years ago because I consider that period of time a good yardstick. In 1959 our Queen visited us, as she did this year, and all one has to do is to go back to 1959, recall her visit then and compare it with her visit this year. When she visited Canada in 1959 we were a happy people. We looked forward to her coming. We celebrated in a joyous manner while she was here. There was great pride in our achievements and great hope for our future.

She came this year and before she even arrived there was tremendous concern that if she did come she would never leave alive. Harsh words were spoken about her. She came to the beautiful and gracious city of Quebec, and Quebec was like an armed camp preparing for the visit of a dictator. What a change in five years. Why? Why all of a sudden have we become so disenchanted with our own country? It is strange indeed that so much could have happened in such a short period of time.

There are many things that one can point to as reasons why this change has taken place. Certainly one of the reasons is the fact that we have so many parties in the house at the present time. I think another realistic reason is found in the fact that that portion of the Social Credit party which later became the Ralliement Creditiste party decided they had an opportunity to grasp a good deal of power and influence in the province of Quebec. They developed a nationalistic feeling in that province which they cannot now control, nor for that matter does it seem that anyone else can control its outer fringes.

There is also the fact that the people of the nation could not make up their minds as to what party should form the government and they still have not made up their minds. I have no doubt that if we had an election tomorrow there would be a good deal of difficulty in trying to predict what number of seats any party would have when the votes were counted. But associated with this reason is the fact that in the election of a minority government the people were convinced they were going to get able and aggressive leadership, and instead they got a government that has been accident prone ever since it took office. I do not think you have to take my word for that, Mr. Chairman. Too many articles have been written by too many men in the press gallery who were formerly strong

and devout supporters of the Pearson team as it went to the people in 1962 and 1963. The Liberals had all the answers during those two campaigns but today they neither have the answers nor do they know in what direction they are going, nor can we be sure they will be going in the same direction today as they were going yesterday.

In order to fortify my statement I will put a few short quotations on the record from a number of men who, apparently, have become disenchanted with Prime Minister Pearson and his followers. The first is Peter Newman, well known for his articles about the Conservative government of John Diefenbaker, and their attitude when in office. I am looking for the quotation and there is so much interesting material here it is difficult to find. He says:

> Although there have been almost none of the brassband disasters of the Diefenbaker years, in my opinion the domestic policies of the Liberals have been a grave, quiet failure.

They just sort of rolled up their sleeping bags and died.

Then, there is this article in the Montreal *Star* of September 12, 1964 entitled "Mr. Pearson's Diet of Crow":

> No one eats crow with nicer manners or more grace than Prime Minister Pearson.
>
> One concludes he must like the dish, since he returns so often to the table.

The article continues in that vein and is no kinder in its treatment of the Prime Minister as it reaches the end. Then, there is Charles Lynch, certainly not a writer to whom we could ever point as one who gave us strong support. He has made similar comments on more than one occasion. I think, from a maritime point of view, what he says about the Minister of Finance is interesting. The Minister of Finance is the one who is well known as the man who was going to solve all our problems in the maritime provinces by giving us a one way ticket out. Charles Lynch says this:

> Mr. Gordon is an optimist—it would be uncharitable to call him a cockeyed optimist, after all the other things he's been called—and he really believes these new measures will work, and will benefit the economy, and will erase the memory of his measures to keep Canada Canadian last year, which wrecked his budget and nearly wrecked him.

These are not very kind words about the man who was one of the strong advocates of the Pearson team. These are the men about whom we are concerned, about whom I am concerned as are most Canadians, because we wonder what our future is and where we will be when we celebrate our 100th anniversary.

[Mr. Coates.]

We have a lot of serious problems facing us in the next three years. If we could get some decisive policies from this government, if we could see ourselves going forward with programs which were in the best interests of Canada, if we could hope that they would try to shore up the powers of the federal administration at the conference table rather than continually being forced to give in and back down, if we could hope that this government would provide that type of leadership for this country they would receive our support because it would be the type of action we know would be in the best interests of Canada.

How can you stand back and review the sad story of the first 18 months this government has been in office and want to allow them to give away any more of what we have worked so desperately hard to build in the last 97 years? I do not blame Premier Robarts for making the statement he did in the way he did. It is like a professional playing in a game with an amateur. After a while, you get tired of winning and I would think that this must almost be the case with the provincial premiers as they sit down at the table with the Prime Minister and his cabinet ministers. They must not only get tired of winning, but they must see what is happening to this nation as a result of the fact they are winning every round. There are not many more rounds in this fight if we keep watching the Prime Minister get flattened in the ring. If he is flattened many more times in the same round, the championship will be awarded to the provinces and we will have ten associated states, but not for very long. We will become, whether we like it or not, a part of the United States of America because there will be nowhere else for us to go.

I would think the people of Quebec would be more concerned about this situation than anyone else because they seem to be so jealous of the special rights they have received under the British North America Act. Surely, they are not so unrealistic as to believe they could maintain that culture they love so dearly, and that language they love so dearly if they became part of the United States. Certainly they cannot exist as an island on the North American continent for any great length of time.

The Chairman: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dionne: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that anyone could accuse me of having

impeded, in any manner whatsoever, since the beginning of this session, the work of this house, if the word "work" can be considered as appropriate.

Most of the time I observed, and this allowed me to note interesting facts which explain to a certain extent the economic disarray which at the present time afflicts the people of Canada.

At the beginning of my remarks allow me to sum up some facts which one can easily observe daily in this house: approximately 50 per cent of the questions asked at the beginning of the sittings are out of order, because they are not urgent and even a great number are futile. The press gallery attracts too many members who are more interested in showing off than in looking for true solutions to the present economic problems.

In my opinion, this unrestrained pride denotes a state of mind which is incompatible with the duties and the responsibilities of a representative who must first of all endeavour to serve his electors before helping himself.

One would not need to look around very long to find illustrations of the results of such a state of mind. The flourishing speeches delivered in view of raising the dignity of the representative of the people will carry no results if the persons concerned do not attempt to prove seriously that they are somewhat conscious of their responsibilities.

In my opinion too many seem to strain their ingenuity through a verbiage which is often useless, to waste much of the time of the house, by repeating time and again, with some variations in delivery, the same things which were previously said.

I concede that, in politics, repetitions are better than contradictions. However, I have known liars who would come to believe their own lies just by repeating them often enough.

Certain politicians should be careful on that point, lest responsible observers notice that rather weak side of their personality.

I know that parliament is a place where one must necessarily expect discussions, since we are here to legislate and to amend the laws governing our land, but it is always a good thing to stick to a happy medium and I feel that one should not break too often the rules of normal limitations. Consequently, I would be in favour of any reasonable amendment to our standing orders which would make it possible for us to get practical results from our discussions.

In final analysis, that is what the Canadian people expect from us.

At present, we do not seem to find the time to consider serious legislation but that does not stop us from wasting time in spite of the fact that, in all walks of life, Canadians have to pay the taxes we levy.

I fail to understand how a certain number of supposedly serious people can be so lacking in their responsibilities to those who, at the price of great sacrifice, pay us high salaries that we do not have too much trouble negotiating. Those who claimed that members of parliament would be more interested in their work if they were well paid or better paid, must admit that the results of this session do not prove them right.

Those who are responsible for the introduction of legislation should make use of the best talents in the drafting of the various bills in order to prevent contradiction and especially to display enough foresight so as not to be faced with the alternative of having to make radical amendments as a result of pressures or discussions indicating want of foresight incompatible with common sense.

I would add that the problem is not a lack of legislation; I rather think that there is too much—it is somewhat like the flag models; we have thousands of them, but we lack determination on the means to take to adopt one.

This brings to my mind a thought which sums up a form of diplomacy in politics consisting in giving what we do not have and promising what we cannot give.

We have perhaps too many politicians who practice this kind of diplomacy; it is a cooing diplomacy which gives a great deal of expectations without any fulfilment.

The financial and economic situation in this country requires that personal political ambitions be left aside and that all people of goodwill endeavour to direct our country towards the objectives wanted by all Canadian citizens; peace, security and freedom to live in accordance with the vast potentialities of the country; this constitutes a great program of activities requiring an active and well-understood co-operation.

We have within reach a very efficient instrument of action, provided we get the loyal support of the majority of citizens of goodwill.

Among the various ways of celebrating properly the centennial of our confederation we should include, in the light of our errors and achievements, the firm determination to prepare for the future another 100 years better than those the Canadian people have

lived through since the 1867 confederation, taking into consideration the facts existing now, with the knowledge that tomorrow's happening is often the result of yesterday's or today's action.

We should consider the situation of the Canadian people as a whole who have to support three governments, municipal, provincial and federal, paying taxes of all possible kinds conceived by the servants of our present financial system which is in continuing disagreement with the existing economic realities with its powers, it becomes a determining factor of the type of living the citizens of our country may enjoy.

And here I believe it is in order to quote an excerpt from a pamphlet entitled: "Merci du Communisme", written by Reverend Father Dugré of the Jesuit order. He said:

When hungry people ask for bread or for houses, should we give them a fine admonition or a house? When a young nation wants to avail itself of its vacant resources to develop, establish its sons, work for its own self, organize a fruitful life, why support it for ten years through the dole, while saving the national wealth for foreign capital?

By the way, I can say that I had personal knowledge of the famous ten year depression, and I may add that I have never forgiven the administrative system of that time for having kept us, healthy young men, ready to prepare their future, deprived for ten years of the possibility of earning 50 cents per day, or at least, deprived of the work we wished to have. And now I shall resume the quotation:

If there is a country which offers the possibility of a temporal life, it is indeed ours. In those resources challenging us, which God puts at our disposal, we should find a fuller life, or, otherwise, we shall clumsily go against the Creator's will, without being able to put the blame on Him. The fault will be that of the idle leaders, of the improvident ones, who apologize for their inertia by practicing what they call a strict economy.

Our democracy is imperfect, often hypocritical and heartless. It pays too little attention to legitimate complaints or grievances. It is too soft with important people, too hard on the little man. Such a thing ought never to happen in this young country of ours, with its potential prosperity amounting to millions which is hampered by miserable money or only meant for immigrants. There has been too much election politics. What we need is a social policy, aimed at the well-being of the family and the common good rather than for the benefit of friends and contributors to the slush funds.

Those words should make politicians stop and think, at least those who are still able to do so. This booklet is so interesting, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot help quoting another excerpt for the guidance of our planning experts and socialist-minded people. Speaking of Russia, Father Dugré states:

[Mr. Dionne.]

Property, they claim, is being made collective, but you go ahead and try to make your streetcar ticket collective just to see who gets the ride? Communists have stretched to the extreme a calculation which is only half-right. They believed that boundless land, tremendous plants and big housing projects could save labour, heating, etc. They forgot that man is not a set of figures, but has various likes and dislikes, inclinations and aversions. And experience has also shown that 20 plants staffed with 100 men can produce more than just one plant with 2,000 employees, and with less control and more relaxation. Remember the sophism about the house being built by two men in six months; therefore, by 12 men in a month, 300 men in a day, 3,000 men in an hour and 180,000 men in a minute. It can no longer work, and yet the figures are right—

Mr. Chairman, in a civilization where the value of labour is of vital importance but runs the risk of being ignored or jeered at because of lucre, dishonesty and class struggle; charity must replace fear and compromise in the relations between management and labour if the world is to be saved from communistic materialism and if labour is to regain its true worth. It is not in the midst of constant insecurity that labour can carry out its lofty mission of feeding mankind.

Several labour leaders and businessmen begin to admit that a source of income other than the salary must be found in order to ensure a more equitable distribution of the increased production due to technological progress and developments of all kinds. Distribution methods applied up to now according to scarcity will have to be changed so as to adjust to an era of abundance.

There is an interesting article in the August issue of the *Reader's Digest* entitled:

Will robots control the world?

In a magazine published in 1936 appeared a summary of a study conducted by several scientists who had met in order to find a solution to the problems prevailing at that time. May I quote a few excerpts of an article by Mr. P. Barraud, an engineer:

In short, while the production equipment is work and leisure and, in this way, eliminate destibution have to be completely reorganized.

Therefore, there is only one problem: to distribute the actual wealth, the purchasing power, work and leisure and, in this way, eliminate destitution and insecurity. Let us keep in mind this scene of distribution among children:

10 children, 2 apples, the strongest wins;

10 children who have money, 2 apples, the highest bidder, if protected by police;

10 children, 15 apples, each his own according to appetite.

This is a symbol of the present crisis. We are acting like children.

We must restore the balance between the purchasing power and the value of consumable goods, probably through a distribution of the purchasing power based on needs and not on a piecemeal accountable inventory, or on work which no longer requires energy.

The first step will be to condemn the following ideas:

1. scarcity;
2. value based on supply and demand;
3. freedom of price, work, trade and profit;
4. capital having priority over purchasing power;
5. domestic money based on gold.

We are not building castles in Spain nor proposing a theory, but the consequences of obvious facts.

Canadians are willing to work to manufacture goods. The government should manage to find the money, but should not take it from the needy.

It is not by looking for new terms to qualify the unemployed that idle hands will be provided with an income.

The fact that there are several kinds of unemployment: frictional, residual, chronic, or extended does not provide any income to a discouraged and inactive person.

A sound and orderly economic system geared to the needs of society must provide the necessary factors for security and should enable the people of a country as rich as ours to earn a decent living.

Production is too profit-geared and forgets that its purpose is consumption. I believe that now, during the debate on interim supply, is the time to cast an eye on the way our country is getting into debt. It would help us to see where our system is getting us.

As Canada grows and develops, the national debt increases. Under a system where new developments must be represented in dollar values, and where every new dollar is created in the form of a debt, we have here figures that are astounding. In 1867, the national debt was $93 million. In 1912, $500 million; in 1920, $3,041,529,587.

In 1939, the debt was $3,710 million; in 1947, $17,660 million, and in 1963, over $20 billion.

In the answer to a question I had put on the order paper under No. 854 concerning the amount paid in interest by the Canadian government on the national debt since confederation, we find that Canada has paid to financiers the fabulous amount of $15,287 million, from July 1, 1867 to March 31, 1964.

Mr. Chairman, imagine what could have been done in this country with this fabulous amount of $15 billion in interest only on the national debt.

When the country is in a state of lethargy, during a depression period for instance, its debt remains stationary or increases very little. It is when the country is very active, in wartime for example, that its debt increases the most.

Any increase in the production capacity represents progress and should bring in dividends to the shareholders of Canada, to Canadians. To attain this, the government should, on behalf of the population, issue and distribute new money in order to finance new activities. But when this is left to the banks, which are lending with interest, to supply the necessary funds for progress, it is impossible, financially, to make such progress without running into debt.

We have reached a point where we do not hear any more about the possibility of paying the debt of this country, since too great a percentage of the revenue is being used to pay the interest only which amounts to more than $1 billion.

The government of this country is doing precisely what the law does not normally allow a citizen to do that is "the non-payment of its own debts".

Our wise politicians from all parties may claim to know many things, but they seem to forget that the modern monetary system is above all an accounting system and that accuracy must be its prime quality: accuracy in the outstanding volume of credit. Since this credit represents the method of payment, it is obvious that it should be in keeping with the goods to be disposed of.

The greater the number of products offered for sale, the better prepared to buy them the consumers should be, since these products are made for them. This is not the case at present, control by the banks being what it is. Money is scarce whereas products are plentiful and there are machines and hands waiting for orders to start producing. We find credit controls under various forms and we know there are so many needs to meet.

Of all the dictatorships mentioned in history, of all those at least that we are able to see in action today, the most widespread is, of course, the financed dictatorship. As soon as a country passes the threshold of civilization, it passes under a financial dictatorship.

And this kind of dictatorship has made more victims, imposed more hardship, caused more suffering, wiped out more talents, broken up more homes than any other kind. It left more moral and physical ruins than all wars, however devastating, in the history of the world.

The succession of parties in power changes nothing. It seems that governments are there

to tax, impose restrictions, preach hardship, even if there is everything in the country to ensure an easy living for everybody.

This is the same financial policy imposed by the same system upon the men who are in command whether they are from one party or the other.

This does not mean that the financiers are those who invented political parties. No, but as soon as parties became established in politics, first with modest slush funds supplied by those who are favoured with public contracts, the world of finance found there an excellent machinery to control public affairs.

Electoral funds have assumed proportions—and chains also.

All financial credit originates in the bank. By monetizing the national credit on behalf of the government, by means of debentures, the banks are making of the government, whatever party it belongs to, a perpetual debtor. By monetizing the production capacity of the great corporations to which it lends the credit thus established, the banks are placing in bondage the very ones who are filling up the election coffers so as to obtain the protection of the law.

Thus it can be seen that either directly or indirectly, the banking system is placing the government under tutorship. The time has come, I believe, for the people who have the welfare of the country at heart to find another way of coping with this problem.

The present government has succeeded in securing the greatest number of members by means of American financial assistance or publicity. Goods that are subject to such a high pressure advertising campaign always find buyers in the long run, be they of good or poor quality.

In this country we have heard the words "economic crisis", brought about by the stock exchange financiers; we have had deflation, inflation, regression and you know that I am forgetting some; but when all is said and done, it is always a money problem.

The demoralizing situation in 1929 left unforgettable marks which we still feel today. The old parties can no longer count on a meek body of citizens, ready to accept their unforgivable negligence; they will have to admit that the present financial system is obsolete and that it must be replaced by a system intended to help rather than subdue human beings.

Here, I quote from a newspaper published in Montreal an item entitled "Philosophy of Life", and written by H. Louis Arbour:

> One of the greatest mistakes of modern times is that stupid belief in the necessity of poverty. How many people imagine that the poor are necessary and indispensable.
>
> If in God's creation plan there is no room whatsoever for material wealth, we believe it is our duty to state that poverty also was excluded therefrom. In his great mercy and infinite province, God gave to the earth the power and the order to nourish all his children. Material wealth belong to this world and if they are so badly distributed now, God is not to be blamed. Only man is guilty. We are poor amid a phenomenal affluence. It is up to us to organize in the best interest of all.

In a democracy, the essential function of the government is to manage public affairs according to the principles set up by the people themselves, through their representatives. It is not the function of the government to interfere in the fields of private or co-operative enterprises, to assume responsibilities which belong to the individual by right, or to interfere with the rights of the individuals, except in order to protect the rights of the others.

The purpose of a national finance system is to supply an acceptable means of exchange with an adequate purchasing power, in a free economy, to make possible the distribution of goods equal to the value of the nation's production at a given time, so that each and every citizen may get at least the vital minimum.

A major objective of any well organized society must be to help each citizen obtain by his own work the necessary financial resources to be able to get, for himself and his dependents, an acceptable standard of social welfare, without having to resort to the services of the state. When that is impossible, society must assume the cost of such an acceptable social service, so that this service can be within the financial reach of citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude my remarks by quoting this thought of the founder of the distributive economic doctrine of social credit, Major Douglas:

> Social Credit is a new strategy for an old battle, between the tyrant's will to dominate and the individual's will for freedom.

[*Text*]

Mr. Chatterton: Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak on this debate on interim supply I want to refer to a question which I believe will be one of greatest importance in the history of Canada, namely the question of the relationship of the federal government to the provincial governments. I propose to divide my discussion into four general parts under the following headings: (1) federal-provincial fiscal arrangements; (2) co-operative federal-

ism and the process of opting out; (3) proposed amendments to the British North America Act; (4) unilateral provincial action to create barriers along provincial boundaries.

First then, Mr. Chairman, with regard to federal-provincial fiscal arrangements, we have a revenue pie, and the question arises as to how this pie should be divided between the federal government and the provincial governments. One could further ask how the local governments should receive their share. It is largely, though in my opinion not exclusively, the responsibility of the provincial governments to say what share of this revenue pie the local governments shall receive.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should make a few comments about what has happened in recent years with regard to the splitting of this revenue pie as between the federal and provincial governments. The British North America Act delegates or gives to each of the federal and provincial governments certain rights of taxation. Early in the war, I believe in 1941, by agreement the provincial governments gave up to the federal government the important rights of direct taxation, particularly in respect to income tax.

Let us consider what the federal government has paid to the provincial governments in recent years. In the fiscal year 1956-57, for example, the payments by the federal government to the provincial governments amounted to some $689 million. This amount increased in the fiscal year 1961-62 to $1,500 million, which is more than double what was paid in the fiscal year 1956-57. Those were years in which the previous government was in power.

I remember very well how that government was blamed for operating under large budgetary deficits. The fact is that if there had not been an increase in the payments to provincial governments there would not have been federal budgetary deficits during those years. There was no thanks given to the federal government of that time for those increased payments to the provinces. As a matter of fact, the government of that day was blamed for the large deficits it was incurring. This trend has been continued by the present government.

In the fiscal year 1963-64 the payments by the federal government to the provincial governments amounted to $1,900 million. Just recently, under the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Revision Act, a further increase was made by the present government in the payments to the provincial governments. In 1964-65 there is to be an increase in those payments to the extent of some $87 million. In the fiscal year 1965-66 there is to be an increase in the payments of $167 million. In the fiscal year 1966-67 there is to be an increase of $264 million.

I refer to these figures, and the recent Federal-Provincial Fiscal Revision Act because of the interesting feature that appears in this legislation in respect of the distribution of these payments paid by the federal government to the various provinces.

When the previous government introduced the equalization formula it was designed to help the have-not provinces. Those provinces generally are conceded to be the four provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Under the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Revision Act, passed a few months ago, that trend seems to have been changed. Under that provision the total sum of $218 million, in round figures, is to be paid to the provinces in the three years ending 1966-67. Of that amount some $136 million, or 61 per cent, is to be paid to one province, which is not one of the four have-not provinces. Those provinces receive a total of $44 million, which represents 20 per cent of the equalization payments under this provision. I mention that fact only as an aside. My main theme is, how is the revenue pie being divided between federal and provincial governments?

What should the test or criterion be as to which government, federal or provincial, needs the biggest slice of this revenue pie? It seems to me as a layman that one of the criteria that might be used is the extent to which each of these governments has a budgetary surplus or deficit. Quite often a government, such as the federal or provincial governments, will have a planned budgetary deficit for political reasons. However, in general terms it seems to me that the extent to which the expenditures of the government exceed its revenue is a good indication of the need of that government, and the extent to which that government feels it can increase taxation so as to increase its revenue.

Let us take a look at the deficits of the provincial governments as compared to the deficits of the federal government in recent years. In the five year period, 1960 to 1964, the combined budgetary deficits of the provincial governments amounted to some $12 billion. In the same period of time the budgetary deficits of the federal government amounted to some $29 billion. That is more than twice the combined deficits of the provincial governments. One might ask, what does twice

the deficit mean? I have tried to relate the deficits of the provincial governments to the deficit of the federal government by relating them to the total revenue of those governments.

Expressing provincial deficits, for a four year period, as a percentage of the revenue available to the provincial governments, we find that the deficits amount to about 8 per cent; whereas in the case of the federal government, the deficits in relation to the revenues amount to over 8 per cent. My contention is that when it comes to splitting up the revenue pie between federal and provincial governments, the provincial governments have had their share.

In 1961 Hon. Donald Fleming, who was then the minister of finance, told us that during the federal-provincial conference held late in 1960 the provincial representatives to those conferences put their demands to the federal government, and that if the federal government had acceded to those demands it would have had to pay out some $2 billion each year in order to satisfy the provincial governments.

It is traditional that provincial governments place more and more demands upon the federal government, but the question is, how should this revenue pie be divided among the federal and provincial governments. A further question then arises as to what are the proper responsibilities of each of these levels of government.

I call to mind what the premier of British Columbia said in a brief he presented to the federal government late in 1960. He said that the proper source of revenue to finance education was income tax. At that time the provinces had given up their rights in respect of income taxes, by way of agreement. In 1961, under the new arrangements made by the previous government, that right was returned to the provinces, allowing them to levy income taxes. After the premier of British Columbia had received the right again to levy income taxes, no longer was this a proper source of revenue to finance education.

We then come to the question as to what are the responsibilities of the federal government compared with those of the provincial governments. Certainly the provincial governments have major problems but it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there are certain questions which, although under our constitution they might properly be provincial responsibilities, are problems that can be solved only by either direct or indirect federal action, and this certainly involves federal expenditure.

I have in mind, for example, higher education. Late last year the Canadian universities foundation requested that the federal government make available the sum of $300 million in matching capital grants. There is the question of northern development. There is the problem of the urbanization of Canada. In my opinion one of the major questions that will face Canada in the next quarter of a century will be what is to be done to solve the problems created by people moving into the metropolitan areas. Certainly the actions that federal governments have taken to date with regard to urban renewal have merely scratched the surface.

Another federal responsibility that will have to be faced is medicare. There is the question of water resource development across our country and the question of a transcontinental power grid. There are innumerable questions such as these that obviously have to be tackled by the federal government, although they may not be clearly its responsibility under the constitution. Therefore there has to be a reappraisal of the position of the federal government in relation to the provincial governments in so far as the division of revenue is concerned, and it seems to me that the premier of the province of Manitoba put his finger on the right spot when he said that there should be a clear definition of priorities in so far as the federal and provincial governments are concerned.

The next heading I want to deal with under the general question of federal-provincial relations is that of the so-called co-operative federalism or opting out process. Throughout the world today there is a trend promoted by necessity for governing bodies to get together and through a more central organization solve the problems which are common to the lesser parts. A good example of this is the creation of the common market, but even in Africa there is a general movement, though a halting one, of the emerging countries to get together to see whether in a co-operative fashion they can solve the problems that each of these countries faces.

It seems to me that today in Canada the trend is in the other direction. I know it is said frequently that Canada is a country of widely differing parts and therefore it is necessary for each of these differing parts to have a large measure of autonomy. The fact is that Canada is a difficult country to govern, largely because of the differences of

geography of its parts, but also because of ethnic differences; but by the same argument I think it is essential that the central government introduce a certain measure of equal opportunity in every sector of these differing parts of Canada.

When we are considering the problem of opting out, co-operative federalism and the relation of citizens of Canada to their provinces and the federal government the question arises, which am I first? Am I first of all a Canadian and second a provincial? I believe the hon. member for Queens raised this question in his very thoughtful speech a couple of days ago, and this brings me to what seems to be a problem in at least one of our provinces. I refer to a speech made by the Minister of Justice on October 20, 1964, before the chamber of commerce of the district of Montreal. As found on page 9 of the released text of the minister's speech, he is talking about the position of the members of parliament from the province of Quebec, whether there is a difference in loyalty, and he said:

> How, in practice, do these members of parliament reconcile their double loyalty as Quebeckers and Canadians? They do so by realizing that the cultural ideal incarnate in Quebec does not deny the political ideal incarnate in Canada. My colleagues and I are, to begin with, French Canadians; we seek intransigently the free flowering of French civilization from sea to sea, beginning with the province of our birth.

The words I want to emphasize in this quotation are:

> My colleagues and I are, to begin with, French Canadians.

It is this question of emphasis as to what I am first which it seems to me creates the problem in Canada today. The Minister of Justice seems to feel that he is first of all a provincial. Should I say that I am first of all a British Columbian and then a Canadian, or should I say I am first of all an English Canadian and then a Canadian? In my opinion there should be no question that we are first of all Canadians, and then after that we can offer our allegiance to our provinces or our municipalities or our ridings or whatever it may be.

There is a trend recently in Canada toward the decentralization of power from the federal government to the provincial governments. When I speak of centralization I am not referring to bureaucracy. Under the present government there is also a growing trend toward increasing control and increasing bureaucracy. For instance, in the d.b.s. bulletin for October 30, 1964 some figures are given with regard to federal government employment. The government of Canada together with its corporations and agencies employed some 341,153 persons as of May 31 this year, which is an increase of 2,619 from May, 1963. The bulletin goes on to point out that the increase in cost is some $20 million for five months of the year or some $50 million per year. This is a different kind of centralization. This is what I would call the growth of bureaucracy, and certainly it is a trend away from what the Glassco commission recommended.

But what I mean when I refer to centralization or decentralization is the division of powers between the federal and provincial governments.

In this regard, Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote from the Vancouver *Province* of October 6, 1964. This editorial is headlined, "One More Strike and They're Out". I quote:

> Any government can make a mistake and, through public forgetfulness or forgiveness, expect to survive. But when a government—such as the present Liberal administration in Ottawa —makes blunder after ghastly blunder, its life expectancy becomes precarious.
>
> This could explain why the government is under pressure from some of its supporters to take a tougher line with the provinces in a series of constitutional and tax talks which start in the capital this week.
>
> If Mr. Pearson and his advisers fritter away much more national authority by allowing the provinces to "opt out" of more national programs they can endanger the whole fabric of Canadian unity. Such weakness might be the last straw for the government, a minority government that holds office only at the pleasure of splinter groups in the House of Commons.

I skip part of the editorial and read another paragraph:

> Little more need be said about Mr. Pearson's so far unsuccessful effort to impose a new flag on the country. His misguided plan to promote greater national unity with his maple leaf banner has inflamed the most violent regional quarrel in years. It brought parliament to a standstill for more than three weeks and is still unresolved.

This, Mr. Chairman, indicates how editorial writers across the country feel with regard to this so-called co-operative federalism of the present government. There are one or two instances recently which I could cite relating to acts passed by this parliament. One is the Canada Student Loans Act, a piece of legislation that was excellent in its intent but I believe the Minister of Finance will find out when he has completed his investigation that serious weaknesses have shown up in the administration of this act. This results almost entirely from the fact the administra-

tion was left to the provinces, and the fact that the legislation did not apply to the province of Quebec.

Then, we have on the order paper a resolution relating to the Canada pension plan. The Minister of National Health and Welfare has assured us that the plan the province of Quebec will pass will be in major respects similar to the proposed national Canada pension plan. But what will happen in the years to come? We have been assured that there will be complete portability between all provinces in so far as the pension is concerned. What will happen if five or 20 years from now the province of Quebec, which is the only province that so far has indicated it will opt out of that plan, makes changes within its own plan? How portable will the pension then be if the Quebec plan differs materially from the Canada pension plan that is created by a federal statute and then applies to the other nine provinces? These are problems that may well arise in the future.

When it comes to this question of opting out, not only are the provinces allowed to opt out of new programs proposed by this government, but this government is going one step farther and allowing the provinces to opt out of existing, well established and proven programs. The Prime Minister, in his letter of August 15, 1964, gives the provinces the right to opt out of hospital insurance, old age assistance, blind persons allowances, disabled persons allowance, unemployment assistance, vocational training, health grants and several others such as forestry agreements, hospital construction, roads to resources and so on. It seems to me that the need to strengthen some of these programs by action by the federal government is even greater today than at the time these programs were instituted. For example, there have been a number of briefs presented by the forest industry of British Columbia to the effect that the federal government should take more initiative in carrying out research in so far as forest fire protection is concerned. Yet the proposal of the present government is that these provinces could opt out of these forest agreements.

In this regard, Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote from an editorial in the Vancouver *Province* of October 24, 1964. The headline is, "Leading Canada toward the abyss". I read a part of this editorial:

> From every part of Canada come indications that well-meaning peacemaker Lester Pearson is blandly and blindly leading the Canadian union into a bottomless manhole.

I skip a part and I quote again:

> This is supposed to mean a system of give and take between Ottawa and the provinces. But it is rapidly becoming a synonym for a division of this nation into a headless collection of minor principalities.

Again, I skip a part and continue to quote:

> Canada is changing its constitution (the British North America Act) through secret conversations between Ottawa and the provincial governments. The public will be told what is good for it in pompously phrased communiqués or in what leaks out from the secret meetings...
>
> Canada is in danger of ceasing to be a nation in the truest sense of the word and becoming a collection of provinces divided by regional and racial interests having few common goals and interests.
>
> Canada has stood united for nearly 100 years. It can fall apart in five if positive steps are not taken to avert such a tragedy. Already Premier Ross Thatcher of Saskatchewan has warned that his province would consider union with the U.S. if Quebec left confederation...
>
> In all this the chief burden of responsibility falls on Mr. Pearson and his government. It is the national government, charged with leading, not following, the provinces. This demands toughness and steadiness, and more than a little of what Winston Churchill calls a "touch of the brute" on the part of Mr. Pearson.
>
> "Co-operative federalism" sounds good. But it could be the death rattle of nationhood unless there is a great deal more federalism and a great deal less enthusiasm for the idea of subdividing our country into ten little satraps.

I am afraid that this government does not have this toughness to which this article refers, but they have demonstrated—

The Deputy Chairman: Order; I must interrupt the hon. member to advise him his time has expired.

Mr. MacRae: Mr. Chairman, I wish to enter this debate briefly this evening to make a plea to the government on behalf of a group of Canadian citizens who I believe are not being fairly treated. This particular group is the federal civil service superannuates. My submission is on behalf of all of this group in general but especially on behalf of those who retired between the years 1952 and 1958.

My attention was drawn to this matter early this year when I and the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton met in Fredericton with the Fredericton branch of the federal superannuates national association and heard their submission. These men and women have rendered loyal and faithful service to our nation, and in a great many cases they are suffering severe hardship because of the meagre superannuation they are being paid.

I would like to quote from a letter dated April 13, 1964, signed by Mr. Fred W. White-

house, national secretary-treasurer of the federal superannuates national association, and addressed to the Prime Minister. I shall not read all of the letter, just the parts that are pertinent to the point I want to raise:

Under the Public Service Adjustment Act 1958-59, no person who retired under the five year plan after December 1959 and under the ten year plan after December 1952, received any benefits. E.g. an officer of the immigration branch who retired March 3, 1954 as an I.O.7, received a salary for 1953 of $4,553.26, and his superannuation was computed on his last ten years of service, his salary in 1944 being $2,530. Had he retired the same day in 1964, he would have a rating of F.S.O.2 with a salary of $7,460 and superannuation would be computed on his last six years of service. This example applies throughout the service.

This particular group I have mentioned, those retiring between 1952 and 1958, are by far the worst off of all the superannuates. The letter goes on to say:

The United Kingdom increased pensions in 1952, 1956, 1959 and again in 1962. The commonwealth of Australia passed an act which came into effect November 13, 1963, granting increases to retired civil servants of that country. The government of the United States of America—

In which we are all deeply interested this evening.

—recognized the need for upward adjustment in pensions of its retired federal personnel some years ago and made periodic upward adjustments. A bill was recently passed to provide an escalator clause in that pensions of retired federal personnel would automatically be adjusted when the cost of living showed an increase of 3 per cent or more.

We know your government is aware of what other countries throughout the world have done for their retired employees and, as pointed out in previous representations, Canada is sadly lacking in this respect.

We are not unmindful of the fact that our basic superannuation plan is considered one of the best, and we would like to keep it in that category. This cannot be done unless amendments are made in the Public Service Pension Adjustment Act which are so vitally necessary, as we have tried our utmost to point out to your government.

These are some figures quoted in this letter which amazed me:

According to the Public Accounts of Canada, March 31, 1963, volume I, page 167, the public service superannuation fund had an accumulated surplus at that date of $1,724,116,105—

Note that figure of $1 billion.

—an increase over the previous year of $137,187,000. I am requested to state once more it is the considered opinion of the superannuates of this country that an upward adjustment in their pensions could be made from the superannuation fund without cost to the general public when such a huge surplus has accumulated, as shown in the above figures.

As reported in the press this morning, the Civil Service Association of Canada took this matter up with the Prime Minister yesterday, and I would like to place on the record the press release which the association issued:

The Civil Service Association of Canada today released the text of a letter to Prime Minister Pearson calling for a review of civil service pensions. The letter to the Prime Minister cites the straitened circumstances of many pensioners and calls for a new policy of periodic pension review.

The C.S.A.C. wants the government to ensure that retired civil servants will have their pensions increased by a percentage equal to any salary adjustment for active civil servants. The association asks for a cyclical review of civil service pensions, every two years, as is now the case with salaries.

The association spokesman went on to say that his organization had made representation on many occasions seeking an equitable system for periodic pension review. In asking for a new government policy for pensioners the C.S.A.C. says:

We do not believe that we exaggerate in saying the situation of many pensioners is tragic.

Reviewing the developments of the past 20 years the C.S.A.C. notes that the purchasing power of the 1943 dollar has been reduced now to 56 cents and the association declares that it believes "some regular procedure of periodic pension adjustment is necessary."

The actual resolution that was referred to reads as follows—and I wish to place it on the record for the benefit of hon. members interested in this problem:

Whereas in many cases, retired civil servants have been superannuated on the percentage of salary retirement, and

Whereas many of these retired civil servants, because of age, sickness or other reasons are unable to supplement their superannuation pay, and

Whereas the cost of living has steadily risen and continues to rise, causing hardship to those who, after, in many cases, long and faithful service to the country are now living in very straitened circumstances with no consideration being given to adjusting pensions, when salary increases are being given or considered for government staffs, therefore

Be it resolved that the government implement on a regular two year cycle a review of pensions for all superannuated employees, and that pensions be adjusted in line with the percentage of salary increase granted employees during this period, and

Be it further resolved that moneys to cover such increase be recovered from the general consolidated revenue fund.

There is also a table included which I will not put on the record but it emphasizes that the 1943 dollar is now worth only 56 cents.

I would therefore ask the government, and more specifically the Minister of Finance, who I regret is not here and neither is his parliamentary secretary—but I see the President of the Privy Council in his seat and I am sure he is deeply interested in this problem—

to take action at once on behalf of these people, who I believe are being unfairly treated.

There are many problems facing our nation in this day and age. Some of them have been discussed during the last few days of this debate. There is the constitutional problem and a great many others such as the unrest in one of our founding provinces, a province in which I am deeply interested; the increase in crime, especially among juveniles in our larger cities; the impact of automation which is changing the whole pattern of employment, and the large number of Canadians we find who are without proper skills and education and who form the hard core of the unemployed.

But there is another problem that is pertinent to what I have been discussing this evening, the very insidious problem of inflation. Almost every monthly release of the dominion bureau of statistics shows an increase in the cost of living. The purchasing power of the dollar is going steadily downward year by year. Inflation falls especially heavily on those who are living on fixed incomes, particularly those who are living on small annuities and pensions. We know, of course, that over the past eight years old age pensions have been increased in several stages, from $40 until they now amount to $75 a month, and we are also aware that there have been corresponding increases in pensions to the blind, the disabled, and others. There remains the group of people about whom I have been speaking. I think more could be done for them by government, not only by this government but perhaps by the previous one, too. Those who have served this nation and who have retired on very small pensions, and upon whom the effects of inflation have fallen most heavily—these are the people upon whose behalf I have taken a few minutes of the time of the committee this evening.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

The house in committee of ways and means, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

INTERIM SUPPLY

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 31st March, 1965, the sum of $740,710,974.77, be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada, as set forth in the resolution concurred in this day in the committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. McIlraith thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-135, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1965.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the bill be read the second time?

Mr. Knowles: Now, by leave.

Mr. Churchill: Next sitting.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the wish of hon. members that the Chair call it ten o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: May I ask the leader of the house about the business tomorrow?

Mr. McIlraith: The first item of business tomorrow will be the completion of the further stages of the appropriation bill. When that measure is completed we will call the estimates beginning with the items of the agencies for which the Minister of Industry reports to the house—those items which have not yet been dealt with. Then we shall consider the items for which the Minister of Labour reports and, after that, the Departments of Forestry, National Revenue, and Public Works.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask whether we shall continue with the main estimates on Thursday and Friday, if the appropriation bill is completed?

Mr. McIlraith: I think I will reserve answering that question until the morning; I had not quite anticipated that it would be asked.

Mr. Knowles: I trust the minister will not forget the Canada pension plan?

Mr. McIlraith: I never forget that plan, Mr. Speaker.

At ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 4, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

TRAFFIC ON BORDEN-CAPE TORMENTINE FERRY SERVICE

Question No. 2,046—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. How many trucks, trailers, automobiles, buses, were carried by the Borden-Cape Tormentine ferry service in each of the years 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963?
2. How many railway freight cars were carried in the same years?
3. How many automobile passengers were carried in these years and, how many railway passengers?
4. What are the figures in each category mentioned in questions 1, 2 and 3 for January 1 to September 30, 1964?
5. What was the amount received from sale of transportation tickets in each of these years?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows:

1. 1953, 102,680; 1954, 104,735; 1955, 123,145; 1956, 127,955; 1957, 140,190; 1958, 142,000; 1959, 157,778; 1960, 161,420; 1961, 178,474; 1962, 199,189; 1963, 214,409.

2. 1953, 46,885; 1954, 47,819; 1955, 53,286; 1956, 55,979; 1957, 50,313; 1958, 54,983; 1959, 54,377; 1960, 51,241; 1961, 44,674; 1962, 43,933; 1963, 46,238.

3. It is not possible to determine the actual number of railway passengers for the years 1953 through to 1961, as a breakdown of this information was not kept prior to the year 1962.

	Automobile passengers including driver	Railway passengers
1953	291,130	—
1954	292,509	—
1955	335,861	—
1956	324,257	—
1957	346,885	—
1958	351,131	—
1959	367,864	—
1960	390,613	—
1961	426,495	—
1962	484,327	18,781
1963	523,543	24,274

4. As statistical data for the month of September are not yet available, the following information relates only to the months from January to August 1964.

Number trucks, trailers, automobiles, buses, 172,797; railway freight cars carried, 37,433; number automobile passengers, 441,275; number railway passengers, 23,953.

5.

Year	Vehicles	Passengers	Total
1963	$183,472	$108,600	$292,072
1954	188,713	108,164	296,877
1955	229,936	125,982	355,918
1956	222,270	131,033	353,303
1957	252,415	138,685	391,100
1958	261,728	130,272	392,000
1959	312,300	173,500	485,800
1960	324,100	178,800	502,900
1961	338,000	187,100	525,100
1962	376,103	213,399	589,502
1963	379,235	222,669	601,904

C.N.R. LANGUAGE COURSES, QUEBEC

Question No. 2,097—**Mr. Marcoux:**

1. Did the C.N.R. organize English courses for French speaking employees and French courses for English speaking employees in the Montreal area and, if so, since what date?
2. Are the courses free of charge or are the employees entitled to a full or partial refund?
3. What is the exact number of employees, male and female, who benefit by such courses?
4. Has the C.N.R. organized English courses for French speaking employees and French courses for English speaking employees in the Quebec city area and if so, since what date?
5. Are those courses free of charge or are the employees entitled to a full or partial refund?
6. What is the exact number of employees, male and female, who benefit by such courses?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of the Canadian National Railways advises as follows:

1. French courses for English speaking employees commenced in September 1963 in the Montreal area; English courses for French speaking employees are in the course of being organized and teaching should commence shortly.

2. The entire tuition cost of the courses is borne by the company.

3. Three hundred and ninety-seven employees, of which 64 were female, have benefited from these courses.

4, 5 and 6. Neither English nor French courses have been organized by the company in the Quebec city area.

[*Text*]

PERSONNEL IN FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS OFFICE

Question No. 2,111—**Mr. Grafftey:**

1. How many officials are now working in the privy council office of federal-provincial relations?
2. How many of the above mentioned officials are working on a full time basis in this office?

Mr. Jack Davis (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1. There are two officials specifically attached to the provincial relations secretariat of the privy council office. However, many of the other officials in the privy council office are concerned from time to time with federal-provincial meetings on particular questions with the federal-provincial aspects within their particular fields of responsibility.

2. The total time spent by the two officials working directly for the secretariat would average from two thirds to three quarters of their working time. The time spent by other officials varies considerably, depending on circumstances.

*FRENCH CANADIANS IN R.C.A.F. AND R.C.N.

Question No. 2,164—**Mr. Grégoire:**

1. How many French Canadians occupy key positions in the R.C.A.F.?
2. How many French Canadians are there in the R.C.A.F.?
3. Are personnel based in Ontario allowed to send their children to French language schools subsidized by the Department of National Defence?
4. How many French Canadians will remain after the integration of the three services?
5. Is consideration being given to the appointment of French Canadians as commanding officers of R.C.A.F. bases in Quebec?
6. Do French Canadians in English provinces have their own schools as do English Canadians stationed at bases in Quebec?
7. What is the proportion of French Canadians in the R.C.N.?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): This question is in 7 parts. The answer to parts 1, 2, 4 and 7 is information not available.

3. Military personnel residing on D.N.D. property in Ontario who wish to have their dependants attend French or bilingual schools, are given financial assistance.

5. The general policy of the Department of National Defence is to appoint bilingual officers as commanding officers of R.C.A.F. bases in Quebec.

6. The Department of National Defence does not maintain schools in provinces other than Quebec solely for French speaking dependants. However, the department contributes to the payment of taxes to the local separate school board with respect to the children of French speaking military personnel who live on crown property and who request such assistance; it contributes the equivalent of such taxes if, for some reason, the child attends a French language or bilingual school outside the district.

[*Text*]

*ROYAL COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS ON MEDICAL EDUCATION

Question No. 2,166—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Has the government given consideration to the implementation of the Hall commission report recommendations on medical education, as distinct from the recommendations as a whole, so that the future quality of medical care in Canada will not be jeopardized?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): No. The report of the royal commission on health services is being intensively studied and the recommendations dealing with medical education are receiving a great deal of attention, but must be related to other aspects of the report.

*OWNERSHIP OF OFFSHORE MINERAL RIGHTS, B.C.

Question No. 2,170—**Mr. Basford:**

1. What progress was made at the recent federal provincial meeting with regard to settling any conflicting claims to the oil and mineral rights of the offshore area of British Columbia?
2. What is the immediate course of action proposed to be taken by the government of Canada to determine the question of the legal ownership of the offshore oil and mineral rights in the offshore area of British Columbia?

Mr. John N. Turner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. At the meeting in October last of the Prime Minister and the provincial premiers, the question of conflicting claims with regard to jurisdiction over offshore mineral rights, including oil and minerals off the coast of British Columbia, was raised and discussed. This was the first occasion in which this question was raised formally as a subject for discussion at a federal-provincial conference and it was not expected that any decisions would be reached

at that time. At the conclusion of the discussion of this matter the Prime Minister indicated that the federal government would shortly be in touch with the provinces so that steps might be taken to move to an early definition of the respective positions of the federal government and the provincial governments.

2. At the federal-provincial conference the federal government proposed to the provinces that a reference be taken to the Supreme Court of Canada so that the question of jurisdiction could be settled. It was also proposed that the terms of the reference to the supreme court should be on an agreed basis with the provinces if possible and that some arrangements be entered into between the federal government and the provincial governments to ensure that there would be no interference with resource development while consideration by the Supreme Court of Canada takes place.

REPRESENTATIONS BY FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

Question No. 2,213—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Has the government received representations from the Canadian federation of the blind requesting a royal commission to study the problems of the blind in Canada, and requesting national unemployment insurance coverage for the blind and, if so, what has been their reply?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Re royal commission: a request was received but not agreed to.

Re unemployment insurance coverage: no.

*DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY STAFF

Question No. 2,215—**Mr. Irvine:**

1. What is the total number of employees, as of October 30, 1964, in the newly formed Department of Industry?
2. What is the total payroll of this department?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. 328.

2. The total payroll for salaries for the employees on strength from April 1 to October 30 was $1,330,708.41.

GROWTH RATE OF CANADIAN CITIES

Question No. 2,217—**Mr. Mather:**

What was the percentage rate of growth, for Canadian cities with more than 100,000 population, during 1963, or in the most recent recorded period?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The estimated rates of growth between 1962 and 1963 of Canadian cities of 100,000 population and over are shown in the following statement. For purposes of comparison these population estimates relate to standardized metropolitan boundaries established for the 1961 census.

Estimated population of major[1] metropolitan areas

June 1, 1963 and 1962

Metropolitan area[2]	Estimated population June 1, 1963	June 1, 1962	Percentage increase
Total	7,712,000	7,535,000	2.3
Calgary	300,000	290,000	3.4
Edmonton	362,000	349,000	3.7
Hamilton	408,000	399,000	2.3
London	188,000	185,000	1.6
Montreal	2,205,000	2,156,000	2.3
Ottawa	458,000	446,000	2.7
Quebec	376,000	366,000	2.7
Toronto	1,925,000	1,869,000	3.0
Vancouver	809,000	798,000	1.4
Windsor	196,000	194,000	1.0
Winnipeg	485,000	483,000	0.4

[1]With 100,000 population or over in the city proper at the 1961 census.

[2]Areas as of the 1961 census.

DEFENCE DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURES

Question No. 2,218—**Mr. Mather:**

What is the total amount in dollars of the Department of National Defence expenditures in the period 1946 to 1963?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of of National Defence): The total amount of expenditures for the period 1946 up to and including the fiscal year 1963-64 is $23,309,133,726.

CORN IMPORTS AND PRICES

Question No. 2,224—**Mr. McCutcheon:**

1. How much corn was imported by Canada from the U.S.A. in 1961, 1962 and 1963?
2. How much corn was imported by Canada from other countries in each of these years?
3. What was the lowest price reported at country elevators in each of the years mentioned?
4. What was the highest price reported at country elevators in each of the years mentioned?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1 and 2. Imports of corn by countries for the years 1961-1963 were as follows:

Questions

Class 167— Indian corn (maize) shelled	1961 Bushels '000	1961 Dollars '000	1962 Bushels '000	1962 Dollars '000	1963 Bushels '000	1963 Dollars '000
United States	22,697	27,403	34,777	43,505	22,957	32,266
Other countries (Argentina)	1	3	—	—	—	—

3.

Calendar year	Cash prices of Ontario corn No. 2 Yellow[1] lowest price —dollars per bushel —	
1961	October 30-November 3, 1961	1.10
1962	October 15-October 19, 1962	1.15
1963	October 21-October 25, 1963	1.25

[1]F.o.b. Chatham basis 15.5 per cent moisture.

4.

Calendar year	Cash prices of Ontario corn No. 2 Yellow[1] highest price —dollars per bushel —	
1961	August 8-September 22, 1961	1.30
1962	July 3-July 6, 1962	1.45
1963	August 12-September 6 and September 16-20, 1963	1.60

[1]F.o.b. Chatham basis 15.5 per cent moisture.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATION RESPECTING POSTAGE STAMPS

Question No. 2,229—**Mr. Howard:**

1. Has the queen's printer recently published a book entitled "Some Canadian Postage Stamps" or some similar title and, if so, how many such books were published, at what cost for (a) printing, and (b) purchase of stamps from the Post Office Department, and what was the selling price thereof?

2. Has the government any knowledge, based upon the number of such books which were published, of the value such books now have to collectors and whether or not the Coin Centre of Canada, 535 Sussex street, Ottawa, obtained a quantity of these books and, if so, how many?

3. Does the queen's printer have any plans to produce a follow-up type of book containing stamps succeeding in issue those contained in the book referred to in part 1, and, if so, how many such books are to be published, what is the estimated cost for (a) printing, and (b) purchase of stamps from the Post Office Department and what will be the selling price?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. The queen's printer has recently published a book entitled "Some Canadian Postage Stamps"; 793 copies have been printed so far and 203 copies are still in production; (a) cost of printing: $3,096; (b) purchase of stamps from Post Office Department: $3,680; selling price of publication $12.50.

2. The government as such has no knowledge of the value of such books to collectors; the Coin Centre of Canada, 535 Sussex street, Ottawa, obtained 350 copies.

3. The queen's printer is negotiating at present with the Post Office Department for the preparation of a new edition of the book on Canadian stamps, but no decision has been arrived at, or arrangements made, as to quantity to be published, cost involved and selling price.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, motion 182 is acceptable to the government subject to the usual reservations concerning privileged documents. Will Your Honour please call motions 170 and 181.

SALE OF JACQUES CARTIER BARRACKS RESERVE LAND

Motion No. 182—**Mr. Knowles:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all correspondence, dated since January 1, 1964, between the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources and any persons, organizations or public bodies, regarding the sale of any portion of the Jacques Cartier barracks reserve land, or regarding any proposals to sell such land.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONSULTATIVE MACHINERY

Motion No. 170—**Mr. Grafftey:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents, prepared by the office for federal-provincial relations in privy council since the creation of said office for federal-provincial relations, relating to federal government suggestions and proposals for the improvement of permanent consultative machinery between the federal government and the provinces.

Mr. Jack Davis (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, motion No. 170, made by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi and dated October 14, 1964, is probably out of order because these documents are of the nature of privilege documents. I am informed further as follows. There was no exchange of correspondence on proposals for the establishment of permanent federal-provincial consultative machinery as such. However, this question was placed on the agenda of the federal-provincial conference held in Ottawa in November, 1963. It was raised again in Quebec city in March, 1964.

At the latter conference the Prime Minister informed his provincial colleagues of the decision of the federal government to establish a provincial relations secretariat in the privy council office. The terms of reference of this secretariat were outlined to the house on May 12, 1964. This arrangement is working well, and as it appears to be meeting the needs of the federal government and the provinces, no further changes are contemplated at this time.

In view of this information perhaps the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi will wish to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I certainly will withdraw the motion at the present time. The hon. gentleman's answer confirms my suspicion that no practical steps have been taken in this important area of government.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY

Motion No. 181—**Mr. Grafftey:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all charts and documents prepared by the Department of Industry relating to the administrative organization and jurisdictional organization of the said department.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, with respect to charts and documents prepared by the Department of Industry relating to the administration and organization of the department, in general one might say two types of documents of this character have been prepared. One is for internal use only, and under the rules of the house they are not normally producible. The others are of a character intended for publication and there will be no objection on the part of the government to the production of these charts which were prepared and intended for publication.

Mr. Grafftey: That is acceptable.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE

MR. MOREAU—INTERPRETATION OF MEMORANDUM ON CONSTITUTION BY FORMER JUSTICE MINISTER

Mr. M. J. Moreau (York-Scarborough): I rise on a question of privilege affecting all members of the house and concerning a matter of national importance. My question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, arises out of a press report by Arthur Blakely in this morning's Montreal *Gazette*. This report refers to a memorandum sent last month to former cabinet and party colleagues by the former minister of justice, Mr. Fulton.

Last Friday the hon. member for Bow River, during the debate on interim supply, quoted from this document in an attempt to show that, and I quote the hon. member's words appearing on page 9632 of *Hansard*:

That is the point I was trying to make when I first rose in my place this afternoon, that this new policy is placing a brand new interpretation on the meaning of the delegated powers and residuary powers—

It is my contention that the hon. member quoted from the Fulton memorandum in such a way—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Moreau: —as to not fully and accurately represent the views contained therein—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Moreau: —a fact clearly revealed by this morning's press report in which extracts of the memorandum appear. I quote from the press report—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Moreau: I quote:

—that these provisions—

Mr. Balcer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Question of Privilege

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would like to hear the end of this short statement before I decide on the matter.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Balcer: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Moreau:

—do not confer any new jurisdiction or power on the provinces nor do they have the effect of diminishing the federal jurisdiction or power in the slightest.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would request that the hon. member for Bow River be asked to table the document from which he was quoting, so the house may be fully informed of all the facts.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I respectfully ask your ruling as to whether this was a point of privilege. It appears to me to be just a flagrant abuse of the rules, and is the type of thing that should be struck out of the record entirely.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): On a point—

Mr. Churchill: I asked a legitimate question of Your Honour. Is this a legitimate matter of privilege?

Mr. Pickersgill: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a legitimate matter of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Pickersgill: I had not intended to raise it at all, but the hon. member for Bow River quoted what he alleged was an extract from this document in order to refute the argument I had made in the house earlier that day. The fact is that I have the whole document here in front of me, and the interpretation which Mr. Fulton puts on it is the exact opposite of the interpretation which the hon. member for Bow River tried to foist on the house on Friday. I would be glad to table this document, if hon. members agree, and have it printed in *Hansard.*

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear. Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Having taken advice I am glad to say my own opinion is confirmed that this is a matter of debate and not a question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Balcer.]

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Prud'Homme (St. Denis): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice if he is acquainted with the statement made by the former minister of justice, Mr. Davie Fulton, concerning the "domiciliation" of what is known as the British North America Act and which, we hope, will soon be known as the Canadian constitution?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I read about it in an article published in this morning's *Gazette* and, in so far as the facts as reported by the *Gazette* are concerned, the statement is exact, precise and true.

[*Text*]

AGRICULTURE

QUEBEC—INQUIRY AS TO APPLICATION OF ARDA PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

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

Several days ago I asked the minister of "rural displacement"—pardon me, of "rural development" the extent of implementation which had been reached concerning ARDA, in co-operation with the department of agriculture of the province of Quebec or with the various departments of that province. At that time the minister promised to make a statement in a few days. May we expect a statement before the end of the debate on the flag?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I apologize, but the hon. member for Villeneuve never asked me that question during the normal question period. Anyway, ARDA applies in its entirety in the province of Quebec and in all districts of that province. As we all know, the provinces must initiate any measure respecting ARDA, and only the provinces can propose to the federal government concrete programs and projects for the districts in which they are interested. We have no initiative in that field.

Mr. Caouette: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Inasmuch as proposals can only come from the provinces, do cases not occur where the department would suggest under exceptional

circumstances, to the provinces, including the province of Quebec, to consider designating certain so-called under-developed areas?

Mr. Sauvé: No, Mr. Speaker. The question of designating areas is entirely up to the provincial government, and that goes for Quebec as well as for the other provinces.

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question?

Could the minister tell us whether his department is responsible for the administration of the Crop Insurance Act and, if so, what have been the results of its policy in the province of Quebec until now?

Mr. Sauvé: Crop insurance comes under the Department of Agriculture. Since there is no provincial crop insurance legislation in Quebec, federal legislation cannot apply there.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry. It stems from a speech the minister delivered before the Canadian federation of agriculture, where he stated that $11,500,000 were granted to the four western provinces under ARDA, and $6,000,000 to the central provinces of Quebec and Ontario.

Can the minister tell us if he deems that those amounts are normal, in proportion to the population of Canada?

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, in the first stages of the ARDA program, grants had been provided for every province, and evidently, some provinces, for reasons of their own, refused to take advantage of all the benefits provided under ARDA. This explains the difference between the amounts provided for and the amounts they received.

[*Text*]

QUEBEC—ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS DURING COMING WINTER

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Labour.

In view of representations received from several farmers of my area, who are wondering whether the government can help them to find some work during the winter, since they are not entitled to unemployment benefits, have no income, have large families and many obligations to meet, could the minister tell me what I should answer in such cases?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: It does seem to me that this is such a wide question it would be almost impossible to give an answer, and therefore is not in order.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

QUEBEC—CHANGES IN UNIVERSITY NAVAL TRAINING DIVISIONS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Léon Balcer (Three Rivers): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of National Defence.

Has the minister received representations from the student association of Sherbrooke and Bishop Universities protesting against the abolition of the U.N.T.D. in Sherbrooke?

If so, could he tell us whether he intends to reconsider his decision, so that those two university groups may enjoy the same advantages as the other Canadian university students?

[*Text*]

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Representations were received from the association as well as from a number of interested members of parliament on both sides of the house by both the associate minister and myself following the detailed statement I made here on September 16 with regard to the over-all university training plan sponsored by the Department of National Defence.

In reply to these representations it was pointed out that the naval training unit at the Université de Sherbrooke and Bishop's University was one of eight to be closed down in universities across the country due to the reduction and reorganization of the Royal Canadian naval reserve. It was further explained that the decisions were based on the number of cadets being absorbed into the active lists, the nearness of units to the associated reserve divisions and to the enrolment patterns.

In so far as the decision to close the U.N.T.D. at the Université de Sherbrooke and Bishop's University is concerned, this decision was based on the fact that the parent division, H.M.C.S. *Donnacona,* received an adequate supply of U.N.T.D. graduates from the universities located in Montreal; that it was located some 120 miles from the parent division, and that some difficulty was being

experienced in providing adequate instructional staff in Sherbrooke. Up to the present time only four graduates from the U.N.T.D. units at the Université de Sherbrooke and Bishop's University have been absorbed into the R.C.N./R active list. In view of these circumstances it is not intended to alter the decision.

REQUEST FOR POLICY STATEMENT ON NAVAL SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): I should like to direct a question to the Associate Minister of National Defence. In view of press reports in regard to announcements of policy concerning a naval shipbuilding program which he is reported to have made, will the hon. gentleman inform the house as to the statements he actually did make and what policy, if any, has been decided upon with regard to a naval shipbuilding program?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): The occasion on which these questions were asked, and on which I gave answers, was Exercise "Yeoman" in Argentia. During the course of the interrogation I was asked whether I thought a sealift capacity in our navy was a good thing. I for one think a sealift capacity would be extremely useful to the navy, and I said as much. I also stated that no decision had yet been taken as far as a naval shipbuilding program was concerned, but that some decision might be expected within a month or three weeks.

REPORTED AGREEMENT ON PRODUCTION OF NEW TACTICAL AIRCRAFT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. Is the minister able to tell us whether there is in fact an informal agreement with respect to the joint production with Great Britain and the United States of the McDonnell Phantom tactical aircraft, and if all that is waiting is a formal ratification by the respective governments?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): The answer, Mr. Speaker, is in the negative.

POSSIBLE PHASING OUT OF SECTIONS OF MID-CANADA LINE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Can the minister inform the house whether the government are now planning any further phasing out of sections of the mid-Canada line?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker; there are no plans in that direction at the present time.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

INQUIRY AS TO COMMITTEES TO CONSIDER PENOLOGICAL MATTERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I wonder if I could ask the Minister of Justice whether he has reached a decision with regard to the setting up of the commissions or committees he plans with respect to penological matters.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): I have already answered that question in the house. I told the house that for the immediate future two committees are planned, one a parliamentary committee to deal with the physical institutions of detention, and the other a committee composed of experts which will deal with the broader field of correction in Canada.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY—SOLITARY CONFINEMENT OF PRISONER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice. It deals with a question I put to the Prime Minister a week ago last Monday. This referred to an interview with the warden of St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary concerning a French Canadian prisoner who had been sentenced to 14 years because of his participation in a riot two years ago and who has been kept in solitary confinement, his letters not getting to his family or to others, and other matters. I asked the Prime Minister to request the Minister of Justice to give an explanation to the house of these circumstances and say whether these charges are true.

Mr. Favreau: I will be in a position to report on this matter at the beginning of next week.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUGGESTED EXTENSION OF REMEMBRANCE DAY HOLIDAY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister but, in his absence, I shall put it to the Acting Prime Minister or to the President of the Privy Council.

Considering that next Wednesday, members of parliament will have a holiday under the new standing order of the house and that members did not have any holidays or any free time to discuss future legislation with their constituents, does the government intend to consult the leaders of the various parties in order to grant us a long holiday, that is, on the 11th, 12th and 13th?

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this suggestion is not without merit. I shall take it up tomorrow with the Prime Minister who will then be in a position no doubt to advise the house.

[*Text*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.—ALTERNATIVE EMPLOYMENT FOR MEN TO BE LAID OFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry based on his reply to a similar question yesterday and my mystification arising therefrom. Is the minister able to report any success in his efforts to find alternative employment for the workers at the Enamel and Heating plant in Charlottetown?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I regret that yesterday in connection with the hon. member's question I heard the reference to Enamel and Heating rather than the reference to Charlottetown. While my answer yesterday related to the general affairs of the company, in response to the hon. member's specific question I regret very much to say that in spite of the most diligent and intensive efforts we have been unable to find alternative work for the plant of Enamel and Heating in Charlottetown.

TORONTO—REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING TRAINING OF UNEMPLOYED

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Labour, asking him whether he has received a report from the metropolitan Toronto advisory committee on the training and retraining of unemployed workers, which has been approved and adopted by the metropolitan council. If so, has a date been set for conferring with these people on this very important subject?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received this very interesting and helpful brief. At the present time it is under consideration. If a date has not yet been set it will be set in the near future.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

BILINGUAL PRODUCTION CONTROL SYSTEM IN POINTE ST. CHARLES SHOPS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean Chrétien (St. Maurice-Laflèche): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport.

Could the minister tell us what are the reasons that prevented the setting up of bilingual systems as regards the control of production in the C.N.R.'s workshops, at Pointe St. Charles, before the railway company was forced to do so following pressures on the part of the general public?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This surely is a question for the order paper.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REPORTED COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF FRENCH NETWORK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Justice, and its urgency is based on the fact that a very serious charge has been made against a federal crown corporation which is meant to unite this country. Has the attorney general of the province of Quebec, or have any other officials of the Quebec government including Mr. Arsenault himself, offered to the R.C.M.P. or to anybody in the minister's office any definite names or definite facts relating to the allegation by Mr. Arsenault of communist activities in the C.B.C.?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I will be meeting the attorney

general of Quebec tomorrow, and this is a matter which I will be taking up with him.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, would the minister meet at the same time with Hon. Bona Arsenault?

Hon. Léon Balcer (Three Rivers): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a supplementary question to the minister.

Is it his intention to discuss also accusations of communist infiltration into the Quebec Liberal federation?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, we shall discuss those accusations which may be in the public interest.

[*Text*]

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Will the minister make a report to the house following his meeting with the appropriate authorities in Quebec regarding this serious charge against a crown corporation which is meant to unite this country?

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OFFICIAL STATUS OF MEMBER FOR RED DEER ON AFRICAN TOUR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Battle River-Camrose): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister in the absence of the Prime Minister, arising out of a report which appeared in the Montreal *Gazette* to the effect that Mr. Thompson is touring Africa on behalf of the Canadian government. I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether that represents the facts, and the hon. member for Red Deer is presently touring Africa on behalf of the Canadian government. If so, has an order in council been passed to authorize such an appointment and the payment of his expenses?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is a question for the order paper. I do not see any particular urgency, inasmuch as that gentleman will be touring for some time.

Hon. George C. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): Mr. Speaker, when someone is reported in the press as representing the Canadian government, surely that is a matter of some importance. The house is surely entitled to an answer as to whether he was appointed by order in council or became a member of the cabinet recently in some surreptitious fashion.

Mr. Speaker: There is no doubt that the question is of interest, but I have serious doubt as to whether it is in order. My instructions from the house are that questions should not inquire as to whether statements appearing in the press are correct.

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Any expenses in this regard must be paid by the Canadian taxpayer, and if we are going to spend money sending people around the world I think we should know about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is making allegations rather than asking questions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. My question is quite simple. Is the hon. member for Red Deer representing in any way the Canadian government during his tour in Africa?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in view of your ruling concerning the question put by the hon. member for Battle River-Camrose, I think I should respect your ruling and therefore I could not answer the hon. member's question.

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think that having been in this house for so long the Acting Prime Minister should know the procedure well enough to know that the question asked by the hon. member for Battle River-Camrose was out of order, but that the one asked by the hon. member for Villeneuve did not refer to any newspaper report. On the contrary, it was asked in accordance with our standing orders and the instructions given to the Speaker, and therefore I do not think it is up to the Acting Prime Minister to decide whether the question is in order or not.

If it is in order, I think he should give an answer.

[*Text*]

[*Later:*]

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who is Acting Prime Minister. I should like to ask him in his capacity as Acting Prime Minister whether the hon. member for Red Deer is touring Africa by appointment on behalf of the Canadian government.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The point in suggesting that this was a question which should be put on the order paper was that there was not that desperate urgency that it had to be answered this afternoon. If the hon. member is not satisfied with this suggestion he always has the privilege of debating it at ten o'clock by giving notice.

Mr. Smallwood: That does not give us an answer as to what they are doing with public money, so we will give up.

CANADIAN COASTGUARD

POSSIBLE APPOINTMENT OF RETIRED NAVAL OFFICER AS ADMINISTRATOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Does the Department of National Defence receive the full co-operation of other government departments in placing qualified personnel who are being prematurely retired.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have received excellent co-operation from other government departments in this matter.

Mr. MacInnis: I have a supplementary question. Will the minister then indicate why some qualified officer has not been appointed as a planning officer for the new coastguard college? Mr. Speaker, I think I have posed a very fair question to the Minister of National Defence. As I indicated before, if he does not choose to answer it I will accept that refusal—

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman will send me the specifics of his question I will be glad to refer them to the appropriate department for consideration.

Mr. MacInnis: I have a further supplementary question. If the Minister of National Defence had been following the affairs of his department he would realize that there is not full co-operation—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Is the hon. member asking a question or making a charge?

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, the minister has informed me that there is full co-operation between his department and other government departments, and has now requested me to send him the particulars of something of which he has said he is already aware.

SHIPPING

REPORTED LACK OF SERVICE TO CARIBBEAN AREA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. My question arises out of a report in this afternoon's Ottawa *Journal*—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Regan: —to the effect that the Canadian commercial counsellor in Guatemala, Mr. Lemieux, said that Canadian exporters are missing the boat because of the lack of adequate shipping services to the Caribbean. Will the minister investigate the desirability of providing some form of government assistance to promote frequent sailings to this important area?

Mr. Speaker: That is a question for the order paper.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Speaker, I intend to debate the matter at ten o'clock tomorrow evening.

FISHERIES

NORTH PACIFIC COMMISSION—INQUIRY AS TO RESUMPTION OF NEGOTIATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a non-controversial question to the Minister of Fisheries. Can the minister state where and when the next meeting of the parties to the international fisheries convention for the north Pacific is to reconvene and where it will be held?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, as I stated in my report to the house on October 1 at the conclusion of the negotiations which took place here in Ottawa among Canada, Japan and the United States, and in answer to a question addressed to me by the hon. member for Queens, I then said, I am not now in a position to say definitely when the meeting will be reconvened. The United States delegation has expressed the hope of its government that the next meeting will be held in the United States at a time and place to be determined by the three governments concerned. Following the events which took place yesterday in that country I express my sincere hope that the negotiations will take

place without undue delay, after a determination of the date and place of the next meeting.

INDUSTRY

NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING MANUFACTURE IN CANADA OF JAPANESE AUTOMOBILES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George C. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I should direct my question to the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Industry. I am sure the Minister of Finance must approve agreements, but probably the Minister of Industry negotiates them. I should like one of the ministers to inform the house whether reports are correct to the effect that negotiations have been completed between representatives of a Japanese motor car company and the Canadian government, and that these motor cars will be built in Canada. Presumably an announcement will be made within the next few hours in this regard. Is it also correct that if these negotiations have been completed, the industry is going to be established in Nova Scotia?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, the report that negotiations have been completed for the manufacture of Japanese designed motor cars in Nova Scotia is incorrect. A Canadian company proposes to hold a press conference this afternoon at which time an announcement will be made regarding its future intentions. I can say that these intentions do not include an announcement in respect of completed negotiations with a Canadian company for the manufacture of motor cars in Canada.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

ESTABLISHMENT OF PROVINCIAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. On Monday in response to a series of questions the minister gave some information to the house about the results arising from the dominion-provincial conference on Indian affairs. Would the minister be kind enough at some time in the near future to outline to the house the mechanics and details with regard to how the various provincial consultative committees are going to be established, the manner of their selection and the way in which they are going to operate?

[Mr. Robichaud.]

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think this is an ideal question for the order paper. It would give us an opportunity to provide more details.

[*Text*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

MARITIME UNION TRUSTEES—APPEARANCE BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I put a question to the Minister of Labour in respect to the progress being made in having the maritime union trustees appear before a parliamentary committee. The snakes are out again, Mr. Speaker. I should like a little order, if you don't mind. At that time the minister answered to the effect that a motion was under discussion with the other parties which would refer this matter to the industrial relations committee. I wonder whether the minister would care to amend that statement today.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): No, Mr. Speaker. It is expected to have this motion on the order paper as soon as possible, and my intention in that regard has been conveyed to the representatives of the various other parties. Maybe my words were construed by my hon. friend to mean that the terms of the motion were under discussion. If that was his interpretation I apologize to him, but I did indicate to the other parties what my intention was.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, in answering the question yesterday the minister said:

> Mr. Speaker, there has been under discussion with representatives of other parties a motion which would refer this matter to the industrial relations committee—

I have made further inquiries to try to find out to what persons in the other parties the minister had spoken, and that is why I put the question.

HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS

FORT WALSH, SASK.—INQUIRY AS TO SUGGESTED RESTORATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, some time ago I directed a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources in regard to Fort Walsh in Saskatchewan. Is he now prepared

to give the house some information with regard to that historic site?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I think the house is aware that when my estimates were under consideration the hon. member advanced the idea that Fort Walsh should be commemorated, and I think most people are aware of its importance in the history of western Canada. We have had some discussions with the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan with respect to the establishment of a national park in the area in which Fort Walsh is situated.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-135, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1965.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, before the house deals with the second reading of this bill, there is certainly a two twelfths portion provided for the Department of External Affairs. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) is gone, but we should have liked to know, whether part of that two twelfths portion under his department is provided for payment of the expenses incurred by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) while travelling through Africa. We could have found out thus whether, in his tour of Africa, the hon. member for Red Deer is an official delegate of the Canadian government. Maybe another minister could answer this question instead of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, because before voting we should like to know the purpose of these expenditures. Maybe the acting minister, namely the Minister of Transport, could answer that question?

[*Text*]

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs perhaps the hon. member would be satisfied if I would undertake to take his question as notice, draw it to the attention of the minister and secure an answer.

Some hon. Members: No.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Batten in the chair.

On clause 1—*Short title.*

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Chairman, we are now studying the spending of money by the government—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—maybe the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre wants to raise the same point of order as I do. I believe a report has been adopted by the house concerning the procedure in committee of the whole in studying a bill. It was agreed that if clause 1 was the short title it would be discussed and approved following the consideration of all other clauses of the bill. Inasmuch as clause 1 has to do only with the short title of the bill I think the correct procedure would be to proceed with clause 2 now and return to clause 1 later.

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Lapointe is quite right. Clause 2.

On clause 2—*$740,710,974.77 granted for 1964-65.*

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Chairman, I understand I can make a few brief remarks on clause 2, which deals with the spending of money by the government. I was unable to get certain information today. I have before me a press report that the hon. member for Red Deer is touring Africa on behalf of the Canadian government. This article appeared in the Montreal *Gazette*. If I can get this information I will not hold up this supply bill. I should like to know from the government if it is a fact that the hon. member for Red Deer is touring Africa on behalf of the Canadian government. I should like to know if an order in council has been passed covering his appointment and the payment of his travel expenses.

How much is it going to cost the Canadian people to have this member touring Africa on behalf of the dominion government? What good are we going to get from it? Did he go over there to give more information on the space program? If hon. members over there will give me this information I will resume my seat.

Mr. McIlraith: I regret that I do not have the information the hon. member seeks.

Mr. Smallwood: Yes or no?

Mr. McIlraith: The minister for external affairs is otherwise committed at the moment.

An hon. Member: He disappeared in a hurry.

Mr. McIlraith: I think you will agree that there is important and urgent work for him. His estimates will be before the committee shortly—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIlraith: —and he will be able to give the information in detail. I will be glad to see that those estimates are brought forward at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Lambert: Perhaps the President of the Privy Council would agree that amongst his colleagues there would be the chairman of the committee that deals with orders in council, and if the appropriate order in council has been passed the minister responsible would certainly be able to give us that information. It would be rather singular to find that such an order in council had been lost in the usual routine. Perhaps the minister could help us in this regard.

Mr. McIlraith: I will be glad to help the hon. member. I do have a good deal to do with orders in council. I have no recollection of one being passed, but it is the sort of thing on which I shall have to get information and provide it later, as I said when I was asked about the matter in the first instance by the hon. member for Battle River-Camrose.

Mr. Churchill: I think we should have the information right now. A question was asked earlier today and it was ignored by the minister for external affairs. Then we had the Minister of Industry saying that he would take the question as notice. Now we have the President of the Privy Council saying he will look into the matter and let us have the information. Let us have the information right now. Is the hon. member for Red Deer travelling in Africa at the expense of the Canadian people? Is he acting on behalf of the government of this country, or what is he doing over there? Surely the government can tell us. Either they say he has been sent on government authority and therefore his expenses are being paid out of the estimates with which we are now dealing, or he is travelling on his own.

I think the house is entitled to an explanation. We have had a press report here indicating that he is representing the Canadian government. Surely the members of the cabinet know something about this. They do not have to take the question as notice; they can give us a definite answer.

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. gentleman is quite right when he says the house is entitled to the information he requests, but the question is at what point does one give that information.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIlraith: I repeat that I have no knowledge of it myself at all. I do not know whether there was any such order in council. I have already given an undertaking to get the information. I will try to have the estimates of the Department of External Affairs brought before the house within a reasonably short time so that hon. members might ask this type of question, because it is the type of question for committee of supply; but not on an appropriation bill. It should be asked when the items of estimates are before the committee.

In so far as the question asked earlier today is concerned, I must say that in my view the committee is bound by the ruling given by Mr. Speaker at that time, that it was out of order. I do not know if there is much more I can usefully say at this moment.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I suggest in all seriousness that the government is playing with the house in a manner that is quite unfair. The President of the Privy Council is correct in saying that Mr. Speaker ruled this was not a proper question to be asked on orders of the day. Whether or not I agree with Mr. Speaker's ruling does not matter. The ruling was made and we have to accept it. However, we are now in committee on a bill to appropriate money, and surely the question is now in order.

Now, further to my suggestion that the government is playing with us in a manner that is quite unfair, I point out that there are 10 or 11 members of the cabinet in the house right now. There were more of them here a few minutes ago. To suggest that there is no member of the cabinet who knows whether or not the member for Red Deer was given some kind of special credential, whether there was an order in council, is ridiculous. If the minister is not able to say that there was no order in council and that there is to be no payment of expenses, then he had better find out and let us know right away.

Whether or not it was a serious and unusual thing, Mr. Chairman, to send a private member off in this way I think is now overshadowed by the manner in which the government is treating the members of this

house. I think we are entitled to a clearcut answer on this right now.

Mr. McIlraith: We should make something very clear. A charge by the hon. member that the government is treating the house badly because of the answer I have made surely does not lie in his mouth. He has been here long enough to be familiar with the practice on these appropriation bills. I would remind him of my answers, because he apparently did not listen to them or perhaps, because of the noise, he was not able to hear them. I told him that I had a great deal to do with orders in council, or most of them, and that I had no recollection of any order in council on this matter.

I coupled with this the undertaking to find out and provide information as to whether or not there was one, and I do respectfully suggest it probably is not good practice for the committee to start insisting that every department have its staff here to answer all the detailed questions that may be asked. We should recognize that this is the committee stage of a financial bill. Although it may be technically within the rules to ask for this information, I do not think we should hold up the bill. I have already given an undertaking to call the estimates of the department, at which time the numerous questions that have been asked on this subject can be asked and answered, because the committee is entitled to have the answers.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the explanations of the President of the Privy Council to the effect that the terms used by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) may not be accurate and that we must accept his word, his statement as he made it. However, a fact remains—I see that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) is back in his seat, he will certainly inform us about the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson).

We appreciate the fact that the hon. member for Red Deer has a wide knowledge of matters respecting Africa, but we want to know whether or not the government has sent him on a mission, or whether he cooperates in any way with the government or whether the government makes a contribution to the trip of the hon. member for Red Deer in Africa. In my opinion, we are entitled to know.

We are now considering supply authorizing certain expenditures. Whether or not there were orders in council, there is certainly a part of that money which will go to pay the travelling expenses of the hon. member. When a minister refuses to answer that question, that almost implies that, in fact, the government did send the hon. member for Red Deer to Africa. We want an answer to that question, we want to be informed.

If it is necessary to make speeches during the whole afternoon to give the minister an opportunity to inquire about the facts, we will do so and we will know what we want to know.

[*Text*]

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I would not have left the chamber earlier if it were not for the fact that in Ottawa at present we have the distinguished Belgian foreign minister who came here to carry on certain conversations. He is leaving the city at 4.50 p.m. and that is why I left the chamber at 3.20. I would have answered the question but for the fact that His Honour the Speaker said the question was not in order.

The hon. member for Red Deer has gone to Africa, at the request of the government, to perform an important assignment in an area with which he is more familiar than perhaps any other living Canadian because of the fact that he lived in Africa for many years, particularly serving in Ethiopia for almost 18 years. That is why we asked him to undertake a mission, and he has done so willingly at the request of the government of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Could the minister tell us whether the hon. member for Red Deer has now been admitted in the ranks of the Liberal or government party?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am not concerned with political questions but in this matter, I know that the hon. member is familiar with the great problems concerning Canada and Africa.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Could the minister tell us whether the Department of External Affairs is now considering appointing the hon. member for Red Deer as ambassador or to some other office in the near future?

Mr. Caouette: In Africa?

Mr. Grégoire: Could the minister give us an answer?

Mr. Caouette: Is the matter under consideration?

Mr. Grégoire: Is this contemplated?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): If something concerned me in the riding of Lapointe, I might, in a limited context, ask the hon. member to represent me. That is what we did with respect to the hon. member for Red Deer, in Africa.

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, now that the Secretary of State for External Affairs has answered part of the question perhaps he could give us the rest of the information that was asked a moment ago. As a matter of fact a great deal of time could have been saved if this question had been answered earlier.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): But don't you think we should observe what the Speaker decides?

Mr. Knowles: Now that the Secretary of State for External Affairs has declared that a private member of the house has been asked to do something on behalf of the government, will he say whether the travelling expenses of this private member are being paid by the government and, if so, was there an order in council authorizing the payment of these expenses?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I do not believe there was an order in council.

Mr. Knowles: Then how are the expenses being paid?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The hon. gentleman will have to indicate what his expenses were, and they will be examined and the proper procedure will be observed.

Mr. Knowles: Is there an understanding that the expenses will be paid?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): It would be very unfair to ask an hon. gentleman to undertake such a responsibility and pay the expenses himself.

Mr. Knowles: I have just one other word to say. I suggest that the President of the Privy Council was quite out of turn in saying it did not lie in my mouth to ask the kind of questions I asked. As he must have known the facts he should have admitted them, instead of playing around with words.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, as *Hansard* will indicate, that is not the charge I made. I stated that it did not lie in the hon. member's mouth to make the charge against me that he had made, and it was to that I objected.

Mr. Nesbitt: I know the Secretary of State for External Affairs is in a hurry so I will make my question brief. In view of the fact that a private member, the leader of a group of other members, has been assigned to a mission by the government—perhaps a very important mission as the Secretary of State for External Affairs has told us—does this represent a complete change in the policy of this and previous governments, going back to 1945 when members of all parties formed the original Canadian delegation to the United Nations at San Francisco? It was later agreed among all parties, as I understand it, that this policy would be discontinued so far as the United Nations was concerned, and that other parties would send parliamentary observers so that they would not have to take responsibility for the government's actions. Now we have a private member of the house, belonging to another party, acting on behalf of the government. Does this mean that the policy established with respect to foreign affairs some years ago has been changed?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the conclusions which my hon. friend is suggesting in his question are necessarily accurate. In 1945, as my hon. friend mentions, it is true that the United Nations delegation was made up of delegates who represented all the political parties in the house. The then leader of the opposition, Mr. Bracken, leader of the Progressive Conservative party, was one of the delegates; but after that assembly meeting, in which he had rendered valuable service to Canada, he took the view that thereafter he would not want to go as a delegate but would be content to have representatives of his party attend in an observer capacity.

He took that position because he felt that having participated as a delegate he did not want in any way to be excluded from subsequent examination of government policy at the conference which he attended. That was not the position taken by the government of the day, nor is it necessarily the position I would take in similar circumstances. I have endeavoured to give as objective a character to foreign policy as can possibly be done.

In this particular situation there was a good functional reason for picking a man who knows Africa, and I have no excuse for doing that. If I thought my hon. friend could serve Canada in a particular capacity in a

special way at the United Nations I would not hesitate to ask him to do so, and I know he would not refuse to undertake the responsibility.

The responsibility undertaken by the hon. member for Red Deer would in no way preclude him from criticizing government policy generally. As the hon. member for Oxford knows, there is no more dangerous situation now developing in the world than that in certain sections of Africa. Need I say any more?

Mr. MacInnis: Was this arrangement to send the hon. member for Red Deer to Africa made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs himself?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Well, Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend who has not shared the heavy responsibilities of government perhaps does not realize these are matters one has to share with one's colleagues as a whole.

Mr. MacInnis: It is very apparent to all of us that the cabinet does not know where it is going, but to have an admission from the Secretary of State for External Affairs is something else. Thirteen of his cabinet colleagues failed to answer that question and maintained they did not have the answer.

Mr. Benidickson: That is nonsense.

Mr. MacInnis: Maybe we should apologize for waking up the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys. If we keep up the noise we may keep him awake. What I want to know from the minister for external affairs is this—maybe he or his colleagues will be able to answer this question: Who made the arrangements to send the hon. member for Red Deer to Africa, and is there no one qualified on African affairs within his own department?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I made the arrangements. I am not sorry for having done so. They were in the national interest.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Well, why did you try to hide it?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The hon. member, who is a fair member, asks "why did you try to hide it?"

An hon. Member: None of those ministers answered.

The Deputy Chairman: Order.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Let us not get excited.

The Deputy Chairman: The Chair is having some difficulty in listening to more than one member at the same time.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder if I might say a word for a moment. The Secretary of State for External Affairs has arranged to meet the foreign minister of Belgium who has come here to see him this afternoon, and the foreign minister has to leave at 4.30. I may not know everything that goes on in the cabinet but I do happen to know this is a most important discussion having to do with NATO and I wonder whether it could be agreed that the minister could return to the house after Mr. Spaak has left in order to deal with any points concerning this particular matter which have not yet been dealt with. This would enable us to extend a common courtesy to Mr. Spaak while he is here.

Mr. MacInnis: When I put this question to the minister for external affairs, when I asked him whether the arrangements had been made by himself along with the member for Red Deer or not, he informed the house that because of the rule as to cabinet responsibility, this must be something which was shared. Mr. Chairman, 13 members of the cabinet have been in this house. They were apparently concerned with this. Then the minister rises to tell us he made the arrangements.

Mr. Drury: On a question of privilege, perhaps I could just make this point. As the Secretary of State for External Affairs remarked, the hon. member has perhaps not had too much cabinet experience.

An hon. Member: Nor have you.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): You have so much to learn.

Mr. Drury: I am very glad to hear all those aspirants giving me advice. I am at least reasonable enough to admit that I have something to learn. The question was asked of me as to what the arrangements were. I think members would appreciate that a more orderly way of doing business is to allow the Secretary of State for External Affairs to formulate precise answers to the questions for which he is responsible, rather than to have one or other of his colleagues attempting to give answers off the cuff. This was the purpose of my reply to the hon. member for Villeneuve. I said I would take the question as notice and provide an answer by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. This does not mean that the Secretary of State

for External Affairs alone knows what is going on. It is an attempt on the part of the government to see that business is conducted in an orderly and reasonable fashion.

Mr. McIlraith: I have just been advised that there is no order in council to pay the expenses of the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Fisher: You would be surprised, Mr. Chairman, how I move from this topic to the controversial film "Mr. Pearson", but it has real relevance in this particular case. It may be even more germane than that. Many people will be surprised to discover that the hon. member for Red Deer is such an authority on African affairs. Yet there is no doubt that if the Pearson film had been shown, as it should have been, we would have known this. We got an insight from that film of the relationship of the hon. member for Red Deer with the Emperor of Ethiopia, and how he plays a fundamental part in the reception ceremonies of the day. At the same time we discover that the Prime Minister believes that this is the last emperor in the world, apparently forgetting about the Emperor of Japan. It does give you a bit of a feeling that the member for Red Deer is an African authority and the Prime Minister is not. Apparently the hon. member for Red Deer is a person of some stature in Africa, aside from whatever stature he may have here in relation to the Liberal party. I should like to suggest to ministers that they get together and review again that film in which they took such an interest before. If they would release it to the country it would provide an explanation of what may seem on the surface to be a baffling move.

I know all of us were aware that the Minister without Portfolio was touring the world as a roving ambassador throughout this period, and we admire the wisdom of the government for despatching him on this task. Some of us thought it would be wise if they kept him on such travels a great deal of the time. Now, just because of the ideas we have about the travels of the Minister without Portfolio, what are we to think about the member for Red Deer being absent from his place in the house at such an important time, when there are so many ideas in people's minds about co-operation or the lack of co-operation in this house It seems to me I have made a good case for the Pearson film being shown to the Canadian people, so that they can see the hon. member for Red Deer, the leader of the Social Credit party, in his true light as an expert on Africa and well worth

sending there by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Some of us have a suspicion —and perhaps we should not noise suspicions abroad unless we can prove them—that one of the main figures in seeing that the Pearson film was not shown was the Secretary of State for External Affairs who, we do know, saw the famous film. I think that in a sense he has been caught in his own trap here. He sent the hon. member for Red Deer away on a great mission to Africa. In a sense he himself defeated his purpose beforehand in getting recognition for this by acting in such a way that the film "Mr. Pearson" has not seen the light of day.

I shall say no more about this. I know there are a lot of men, wise in their own opinions, sitting over there and a word to the wise is enough.

Mr. Smallwood: I opened this subject today on the quiet basis of question and answer. The answer we have now is that the hon. member was sent over to Africa on behalf of the government. All I am wondering now is whether this open acceptance of the hon. member into a political party was just a plum for the support he has given. I will let it go at that.

Mr. Churchill: I think the government has been treating the committee in very cavalier fashion today on this particular item. We recognize that the Secretary of State for External Affairs is temporarily engaged with one of the ambassadors—

An hon. Member: The foreign minister.

Mr. Churchill: But I am not content with the answers he gave to the questions which were put to him on this particular matter. It has been suggested by the Minister of Transport that the hon. gentleman might return later on today and clear up his answers on some of these points. I want to know when he is going to return and I suggest it might be advisable to stand this appropriation bill for the time being and go on with the estimates of Atomic Energy Limited and the national research council, thus making it possible for the Secretary of State for External Affairs to come back and give us a complete answer to the questions which were put to members of the government prior to his entry into the chamber. I would ask the leader of the house what the proposal is.

Mr. McIlraith: I think the hon. gentleman has made a proper suggestion—a very good one—and I am quite willing to undertake to

have the estimates of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, brought in—

Mr. Pickersgill: As soon as he is available.

Mr. McIlraith: As soon as he is available after his present interview with the foreign minister of Belgium. We could interrupt the estimates of the Minister of Industry at that point in order that the hon. member might have all the information he wishes with regard to this particular item.

Mr. Churchill: Just so that we may be clear, the Secretary of State for External Affairs will return to the house this afternoon. When he does so, the chairman will call an appropriate item in the estimates of the Department of External Affairs so that we can found our discussion on it. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words because of the implications of this matter, which I think are very important to a great many members of this house. This is not agreeing with the suggestion made by the President of the Privy Council. I think it should be made known in this house what disposition the government intends to make with regard to future arrangements of this sort. As hon. members know—and the ministers are aware of this—members of this house are invited from time to time to participate, in their capacity as members of parliament, in meetings of international organizations or other conferences throughout the world, and sometimes members of the government and members of the opposition parties have to refuse these invitations. The invitations are made according to the status of members of parliament. If the government acknowledges that there is a precedent in the case of the hon. member for Red Deer, it becomes prejudicial to other members of this house who may be invited to participate—

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I could interrupt the hon. member for a moment. That is precisely the sort of thing we propose to bring the Secretary of State for External Affairs back to the house to answer. I wonder whether the hon. member would not agree that the question could be more directly put to that minister when we call his estimates later in the afternoon.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to quarrel with the minister, but my point is quite apart from the case involving the hon. member for Red Deer. I think the question raised was, what commitments has the Secretary of State for External Affairs made, as far as the hon. member for Red Deer is concerned, and what special mission is he involved in on behalf of the government? However, Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about this; I am talking about the precedent we are going to create in recognizing an individual member of an opposition party and giving him authority to represent the government. If we do this as a general principle; if we recognize the right of a member to go abroad in order to participate in conferences or other kinds of international meetings, the principle we are recognizing here in regard to one hon. member should also be recognized in regard to any other member of this house in the future. This is my point, and it is very important. I do not think the Secretary of State for External Affairs can make a decision on his own on this matter; I think it is a matter of government policy to be determined right now.

This does not involve the specific case of the hon. member for Red Deer; it involves the general principle or general policy being established by the precedent we are now creating in regard to the hon. member for Red Deer. I am interested to know what will happen in the future, because in the past I have been invited to participate in international conferences and felt I could not accept because I could not represent the government; but I assumed that I was invited because of my capacity as a member of parliament. If this is right, we have to know ahead of time whether the government is now defining a new kind of approach or policy in respect of this matter. I think it would be fair, personally, if the government were to recognize a member of parliament who is invited to participate in any kind of international meeting or conference. I believe it would be a good thing if the government were to recognize the right of a member of parliament to participate in such meetings in his capacity as a member of parliament.

Mr. Byrne: Wasn't the hon. member in the Place Pigalle one trip?

Mr. Valade: I did not hear the hon. member, Mr. Chairman. I wonder whether he would be good enough to stand up and ask his question.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I may be permitted to interrupt the hon. member to say that I do not think my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council had any thought of restricting the reply of the Secretary of State for External Affairs to the

question of the hon. member for Red Deer. I think the question the hon. member for St. Mary is raising is a perfectly proper one, and when the Secretary of State for External Affairs comes back I think the hon. member should state his question so that the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who is the minister responsible, may answer. All this is being said now and it will have to be said over again. If the hon. member would put his question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs later, it will avoid repetition. I hope this is agreeable to the hon. member. We are not seeking in any way to restrict, within the limits of the time available today —and we could go on tomorrow also—the Secretary of State for External Affairs being subjected to any questions that the chairman considers proper with respect to this matter. Is this agreeable to the hon. member?

Mr. Valade: This is perfectly agreeable to me, Mr. Chairman. I raised the question because I did not want the government to forget that we should discuss this whole question and not just decide one single issue, namely that of the hon. member for Red Deer. I would like to have a general statement from the government as to the policy in this regard.

Mr. Clancy: Mr. Chairman, it took us 37 minutes to get a "yes or no" from the government as to whether they paid the expenses in this regard, and the question should have been answered in 30 seconds. I will ask any minister here: Has the hon. member for Red Deer the power to commit the Canadian government to any kind of agreement?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I think I will answer that question; I am the senior minister in the house. I can say unequivocally that he has no power to commit the government. I do not think even a minister, by himself, would have power to commit the government; the government has to consider these matters. But certainly the hon. member for Red Deer has no power at all.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 1 carry?

Clause 1 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

SUPPLY

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE PRODUCTION

Emergency measures organization—

20. Administration and operation, $2,600,000.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly, I adjourned the debate when these estimates were last being considered by the committee, following the minister's brief statement. I was particularly concerned with the points that had been raised in the report of the special committee on defence with regard to an annual exercise and the suggestion that there should be a national exercise with all survival defence bodies participating. I believe the last such exercise was held in the fall of 1961. Three years have now elapsed, the personnel have changed, and I am sure that some of the practices, some of the good work that had been developed, and the thinking, may have fallen a bit by the wayside. People get out and talk with their opposite numbers. I think this is one of those things which we must study by periodic exercise, rather than just use them in the event of an emergency. Perhaps the minister or his officials could give us an assessment of the efficacy of these exercises.

What use is being made of the training college at Arnprior for the training of municipal officials, doctors and various other persons concerned with survival training? The course offered by that college has been deemed to be very effective. What is the government's intention in respect of this course?

What is the degree of co-operation being received by the authority from the various provinces in regard to these training courses? In 1959, 1960 and 1961 some of the provinces brought attention to themselves by their refusal to co-operate, or if not by refusing, by merely offering a token participation. I am interested to know whether there has been any change in this attitude. Some provinces are doing very excellent work in this regard, but unfortunately the standard is not uniform across Canada. Certain changes were made in fiscal grants to provinces in order to encourage them to participate, but it seems to me that some provincial administrations could show an ostrich how to bury its head in the sand when it comes to civil defence training and survival operations. I cannot imagine what some of these senior provincial officers have been thinking in this regard. Certainly municipalities are not going to take the lead, but must be encouraged, and I am

wondering what the government's official policy is in respect of actively encouraging the provinces and municipalities to hold various training exercises.

Mr. Chairman, we will know what further questions should be asked of the minister after he has made his reply.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, if there are no other questions, perhaps I might reply briefly to the questions raised mainly by the hon. member for Edmonton West.

In respect of the desirability of national emergency measures exercises, it is of course understood that there has not been such an exercise on a national scale for a number of years. One was projected for a couple of years ago but in fact was not carried out. Those who were responsible for the preparation of that projected exercise did in fact derive a great deal of benefit from the preparation of it, and the emergency measures organization benefited from a review of its activities in this regard. Obviously that value is something less than the value to be derived from a full scale national exercise, but such an exercise would be much more expensive.

It is the view at this time of the emergency measures organization that rather than to attempt another national exercise at this juncture it would be better—this is what we are indeed planning to do—to have a cycle of exercises, as is normal in military training, starting at the municipal level, followed by the provincial level and finally followed by a full scale exercise at the federal level, involving all levels. This is the plan under which we are now operating.

In respect of the civil defence college, I should like to advise the hon. member that the average intake now is approximately 80 students per course. The program includes a basic orientation course for federal employees, specialists courses for departments such as the Department of National Health and Welfare and the Department of Agriculture. It also includes emergency supply planning, technical courses on radiation monitoring and fallout protection, national survival organization and planning, and an operations course for provincial and municipal civil defence workers who have previously received their basic training through a local civil defence training course.

In 1963 the college trained 2,866 planners and 1,453 planners so far in this current year, making a cumulative total to date of more than 33,700. It is evident that the college facilities are normally used to maximum capacity providing courses in both the French and English languages. Recently the government approved the construction of a new single college structure to replace the complex of temporary buildings which we have found are increasingly expensive both to maintain and operate. This new building will not only improve the facilities for training, but will reduce the operating and maintenance costs of the college, it is hoped, by the sum of some $100,000 per annum.

I agree with the suggestion by the hon. member for Edmonton West that the civil defence training college at Arnprior does fulfil an important role in civil defence training and emergency measures planning. In regard to the co-operation from the provinces, I am sure the hon. member will agree that it would be highly inappropriate for me to endeavour to make a comparison between the performances of each province. I can say, however, that we are pleased with the co-operation being received at the present time from all the provinces, and are happy to take account of the fact that the degree of participation in emergency measure planning and training is increasing from year to year. I do not know that one can expect a millennium, but one can hope, as long as there is continuing improvement. I think we should take comfort in that fact.

Mr. Lambert: I have one or two further points I should like to make, Mr. Chairman. During the original planning for the national survival program the post of a federal regional commissioner was discussed. During two exercises the commissioners were appointed on an ad hoc basis and were in fact either cabinet ministers or members of parliament representing the government. As I said, these individuals occupied the positions on a fill-in basis. These two exercises were very interesting and educational. At the planning stage consideration was given to the appointment of a permanent federal regional commissioner for a certain period of time. I have heard nothing more of this projected appointment. Perhaps the minister could indicate what the government's intentions are in this regard.

The next matter with which I wish to deal is one to which reference was made in the report of the defence committee, involving the testing of the siren system. Apparently some communities test their sirens on a regular basis and people have become quite familiar with them. I am sure that other communities have not tested their sirens in the past two years. It would be very inter-

esting to know whether they function at all at this stage, or whether a comic situation would develop such as developed here in Ottawa several weeks ago when because of technical difficulties they began to sound. At that time nobody could be reached to turn them off and for a considerable period of time nobody could be reached to find out what was going on. This is the sort of thing that should not occur again and no doubt appropriate steps have been taken. Perhaps the minister could tell us about them.

Mr. Drury: In respect of the appointment of federal representatives on a permanent basis at the regional level, the hon. member is aware that at the time of the last exercise permanent arrangements had not been made. They have not yet been made, and indeed it is difficult to see, because of the changing nature of the federal representation, how one could evolve a permanent system which would always be workable. Consideration is continuing to be given by the emergency measures organization and consultations are taking place with the provinces to see whether some rather more continuous arrangement can be made for federal representation at the regional level than has been the case in the past. I must confess we have not yet found the solution.

In relation to the testing of sirens the house will be aware that the erection and maintenance, including the testing of sirens, has been put into the hands of the Department of National Defence. The emergency measures organization does recognize that tests as to operability must be carried out in order that one can be satisfied that the sirens will work when required. There is the further obvious advantage in periodic testing that the populations for whom the sirens are intended to be useful will become familiar with the conditions under which they are hearable, if I may use that term, and the conditions under which they are not hearable. In that regard it has been suggested that the practice observed in some municipalities of a periodic turning on of the sirens might be followed throughout the country so that, first, the people will acquire some degree of familiarity with these things and, second, it will be possible for the military authorities charged with their maintenance and reliability to satisfy themselves that in fact they do work. This is now under review by the Department of National Defence and I hope we will have a policy in this respect in the not too distant future.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Lambert.]

Atomic energy control board—

1. Administration expenses of the atomic energy control board, $159,000.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, this is an item which very frequently passes the house without much notice. I think this is rather unfortunate although I do not propose taking much time to discuss it today. The atomic energy control board, as I am sure the minister will confirm, performs a very important function in providing control over all the atomic energy activities that are going on in this country, so that the people are protected from the danger that can occur if something goes wrong with atomic energy research stations. Although the house frequently lets the atomic energy control board estimates go through without much consideration, I think it is important for us to recognize what the board does. It has a very important function to perform and over the years we have been singularly fortunate in Canada that we have not been unduly alarmed at any time or subjected to any danger from radioactive materials from any of our own establishments.

This good situation results from an absolutely first class piece of work on the part of the atomic energy control board. It has been chaired by various people, all of whom have carried out their duties efficiently. I thought I would draw the attention of the house to what my own experience was in working with the atomic energy control board and recommend commendation for the board for the work it is doing for the people of Canada. That is all I want to say on item 1, but perhaps the minister would like to add something to these few brief remarks. I have some questions on the next item.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, I am most appreciative of the kind remarks of the hon. member commending the work of the atomic energy control board. Needless to say, in this important field involving the regulation of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Canada we have been fortunate in the high purpose, assiduity and perspicacity of the members of the atomic energy control board.

During the past year the board has considered applications for and issued some 1,117 licences covering the use of radioisotopes in Canada. It has issued some 172 permits covering dealings in other atomic energy materials and some 62 permits covering operations with fissile material. As the hon. gentleman has just pointed out, the board is responsible for ensuring that within this country all the applications of nuclear energy are conducted in a manner which will cause a minimum of

danger and risk to the general public. I would agree with him that we have been lucky to date and, because of the soundness of the regulations and the degree of wisdom with which they are applied, I hope we will continue to have the same good fortune in the future.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask two short questions of the minister. I read in a trade journal recently that there is some danger that the whole western world will be short of uranium oxide and other fissionable substances throughout the 1970's. I was wondering whether the commission might make a survey of the situation and advise other departments of the government whether in fact Canada is facing a shortage so that we might encourage the development of the industry which was doing very well a few years ago. We heard a lot about the lack of sales of fissionable material to the United States, and if this situation can be improved it will be a tremendous source of income for Canada.

My second question is closely related. Should we not at this time make a proper survey of our mineral resources throughout Canada, even in our national parks? If commercial ventures are not going to be allowed in the national parks, at least independent government teams could look for possible sources of uranium oxide in the parks so that if a shortage does develop in the 1970's we will not lack fissionable materials for our projects at Chalk River and other such places.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, the supply of uranium oxide in Canada has been in the past primarily the responsibility of Eldorado Mining and Refining. As the committee will be aware, this organization reports to parliament through the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Consequently I should refrain from commenting on the observations of the hon. gentleman, but I will be glad to bring them to the attention of my colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who I think will in all probability, if I could express a personal view, be in agreement with the suggestion made by the hon. member.

In so far as a survey of our mining resources generally is concerned, I will be glad to draw this to the attention of my colleague the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys.

Item agreed to.

5. Grants for researches and investigations with respect to atomic energy, $1,250,000.

Mr. Churchill: On this vote, Mr. Chairman, I should like to hear from the minister with regard to grants for research and investigation by atomic energy. I recall the importance of this subject as it was discussed in years gone by when I had some responsibility in this area. I was never of the opinion that we were giving enough, granting enough money, for this important research. However, there are limitations placed on some ministers who want to spend money by the Minister of Finance, who does not. I presume my successor in this field may have had the same experience as I did. Could he tell us just how this money is being distributed and where the research is being done?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, knowing the responsibility and great interest of the hon. member in the past in this subject, I am glad to say that I share his views that these grants in aid of research are, from the point of view of the development of the national economy, important. I fully share his view in this regard, and he will be glad to note an increase of some 30 per cent in the money devoted to this purpose between 1963-64 and the current year under discussion, 1964-65. There has been an increase in this appropriation from one year to the next and I think one can look forward to some modest increase in the years ahead.

These grants for research have been designed to assist Canadian research workers to purchase and operate major items of atomic energy equipment so that they may carry out fundamental atomic energy research and train the scientists and engineers needed for future atomic energy operation in Canada. At the present time, atomic energy projects are being conducted at nine universities, namely British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, McMaster, Queen's, Montreal, McGill and Laval. These universities are being assisted in this way.

Item agreed to.

10. Current operation and maintenance, including expendable research equipment, $34,861,400.

Mr. Churchill: We are now on votes 10 and 15, Mr. Chairman, dealing with the operations of Atomic Energy of Canada. We are moving rather hurriedly. Several years ago I had the experience of this vote passing through the committee before the president of the corporation arrived in the gallery. I do not believe we need to go quite that fast today. I think the minister might favour us with a statement with regard to the activities of Atomic Energy of Canada, the operations and developments that are going on. His

statement does not have to include all the items that appear in the annual report, but could be comprehensive enough to cover the field. Perhaps he may summarize the activities for the record and for the general information of hon. members. Then, we may ask him some specific questions on some of the details.

The Deputy Chairman: Order; may I ask the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre if his remarks are directed to vote No. 10 or vote No. 15?

Mr. Churchill: I would think, Mr. Chairman, that 10 and 15 might be combined for the purposes of our discussion, and when this is over we might pass the two of them.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Drury: The hon. member will recall when last I spoke of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, I did give an extensive review of the progress up to that time of the operations of the company. Perhaps I might try to bring the committee up to date briefly.

The heavy water moderated and cooled natural uranium fueled reactor system continues to dominate the Canadian nuclear scene. The successful operation of Canada's first nuclear power station, the 20,000 kilowatt nuclear power demonstration unit, coupled with the enthusiasm for the Canadian nuclear power system shown in many quarters internationally, fully vindicates those who first urged its development.

Canada's first full scale nuclear power station of 200,000 kilowatt output with its single reactor, generally known as CANDU, now being built by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited with the co-operation of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario at Douglas Point, is expected to be completed in time for commercial operation in 1965 and at a cost that is not expected to exceed the budget figure of some $81.5 million. The preliminary design by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited of the nuclear system and by Ontario hydro of the conventional system of a one million kilowatt nuclear generating station employing two reactors has been completed and, as the committee is well aware, agreement has been reached between the government of Canada, the government of Ontario and Ontario hydro concerning the arrangements that will prevail in respect of the construction of such a station. I might emphasize that the decision to adopt this particular design and to employ Atomic Energy of Canada Limited as the designer has been made by Ontario hydro and it is Ontario hydro not Atomic Energy of Canada Limited that will build this plant. In other words, Ontario hydro is using its normal procurement methods for this plant, rather than the special arrangements worked out for Douglas Point.

Atomic Energy of Canada Limited has always enjoyed a close relationship with Canadian industry. In response to an invitation by atomic energy, individual companies are seconding staff to atomic energy research and design locations to gain first hand knowledge and experience of the Canadian nuclear power system. Now that decision has been taken to proceed with the proposed new Ontario hydro station, it is expected that this type of liaison between atomic energy and industry will be accelerated. This procedure has the advantage of releasing atomic energy facilities for new and diversified projects, while giving industry an opportunity of being more closely integrated with the Canadian program.

The design of the 200,000 kilowatt nuclear generating station for India is proceeding at full speed and in full co-operation with atomic energy's power product group acting as nuclear consultants for the Indian department of atomic energy. Montreal Engineering Company Limited has signed a contract with the department of atomic energy of India for the design of the conventional part of the station and will act as consultant to that department in the construction of the station.

Negotiations are at present under way between Canadian General Electric Company Limited and the Pakistan atomic energy commission for the sale of a 132 megawatt nuclear power station of Canadian design to be located at Karachi. Elsewhere on the international scene it is safe to say that interest in the Canadian system is keen; so also is competition from other industrialized nations. But I am sure that an aggressive Canadian industry employing a very sharp pencil, and encouraged by A.E.C.L., should be able to look to markets abroad in the nuclear power field in the years immediately ahead.

Research, of course, is the lifeblood of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. The Chalk River nuclear laboratories research team, a group with a world wide reputation for original work, continues to employ the excellent facilities located at Chalk River to their limit. While, of necessity, effort must be concentrated on research and development incidental to all aspects of the heavy water moderated and cooled reactor system in order to back up commitments made, A.E.C.L. is making the preliminary studies necessary to

the launching of a program for the development of a heavy water moderated, boiling light water cooled, natural uranium reactor system.

Construction of the Whiteshell nuclear research establishment in Manitoba is continuing on schedule. Four major buildings are now in use and some useful research work is at present under way.

Hon. members will be interested to learn that A.E.C.L. has now firm requirements for heavy water that exceed the 1,000 tons of production in the first five years of the operation of the plant in Nova Scotia being built by Deuterium of Canada Limited. A.E.C.L. has, on behalf of the government of Canada, undertaken to guarantee the sale of the first five years of production from this plant at the rate of 200 tons per year, starting July 1966.

The requirements of the Douglas Point generating station borrowed from the United States atomic energy commission, plus the requirements of the million kilowatt station recently announced for Ontario hydro, total about 1,150 tons. There are additional smaller amounts needed during this five year period to meet the Chalk River and Whiteshell research reactor requirements, which total about 35 tons. There is also a need for 150 tons for the 132 megawatt nuclear plant for Pakistan, if that project proceeds, and there are several other potential requirements that could total some hundreds of tons in the same period.

A.E.C.L. and other users will be exploring the possibility of further production in Canada, as it is now obvious that 200 tons per year will not meet Canadian requirements, and foreign sales appear to be considerable. If, during the 1970's, the heavy water moderated power reactors are developed to use boiling light water or light water steam for the coolant, the total requirements of heavy water for each plant will be reduced by about one fifth. However, at that time the rate of installation of these plants should be such that there will be an assured market for increased production, assuming of course that the price is competitive with other sources of supply.

Hon. members are familiar with the success that has been achieved by A.E.C.L.'s commercial products division in Ottawa. The products manufactured by this group find their way to purchasers in every corner of the globe. So great has been the increase in the volume of sales that A.E.C.L., in order to keep pace with the orders, has decided to construct a new building on the outskirts of this city.

I think this suffices to give a brief summary of progress to date of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, and I would recommend that these estimates be passed by the committee.

Mr. Starr: I am not going into the intricacies of atomic energy because I know nothing about them, but on at least two or three occasions I asked the minister whether a decision has been reached by the atomic energy commission on the application of Ontario hydro for a definite site for the location of its nuclear power plant, more particularly in Fairport in Ontario county. Since he has already admitted that the application was received on September 8, and since two months have passed since then, I would like to know whether this site has been approved. If not, when does the minister think the commission might be able to give approval in order to expedite the construction of the plant?

Mr. Drury: I can hardly resist the temptation to point out to the hon. member that we have passed items 1 and 5. Consequently I cannot avail myself of the advice of Dr. Lawrence, who was here a few moments ago. However, I did discuss this point with him. It is correct that an application has been made by Ontario hydro for a permit to construct a plant in Fairport, Ontario but the application, as in very complex projects of this sort, is unlikely to be complete in itself and further details are expected to be sought.

In fact further details have been sought and, in the nature of things, it is likely that when the second set of information has been obtained the scientists will ask for more. This is quite normal. It is expected by Ontario hydro and by the atomic energy control board. However, I can assure the hon. member that I understand the time being consumed in examining the facts in relation to this particular site will in no way hold back the timetable which Ontario hydro has for the construction of the station. Indeed, were atomic energy control board to grant a permit tomorrow, this would not advance the construction of the building by one day.

Mr. Starr: I must apologize to the minister for raising the matter under the wrong item. Nevertheless great interest has been created in that area and the local people would like to know whether the site has been approved.

Once we know the site has been approved that will ease the minds of a lot of people.

Mr. Drury: Well, if I may suggest so, there is no such thing as an appropriate site and an inappropriate site. It all depends on what you are going to do at any given site. What might be right and proper to do in a certain way on the shores of Hudson bay would be quite wrong to do downtown in Toronto, particularly in the nuclear field. It is not so much a question of approving the site as examining what Ontario hydro proposes to do, and how it proposes to do it in Fairport. I think I can say, without revealing anything I should not, that in relation to the initial proposals of Ontario hydro for the operation of this station the atomic energy control board made some counter-suggestions as to how it should be done. It is the interplay of suggestion and counter suggestion, looking toward the safety of the general public, which takes the time; it is not simply a case of saying yes or no to a site, but it is, rather, the making of decisions with regard to the technical aspects of what is to be done at a particular site.

Mr. Slogan: I think it is only appropriate for me to have a few words to say when the estimates of Atomic Energy of Canada are being considered, particularly since one of the research establishments is located within my riding. I must say the people of Springfield are proud of this research centre which is located there. It has done a great deal to stimulate this part of the country. I think it is a most beautiful site for a most worthwhile project.

The former government set up a special committee of the House of Commons a few years ago to deal with research, and representatives of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Eldorado, Eldorado Aviation and the national research council appeared before it. At that time some of the controversy surrounding the type of reactor which Canada should be producing was brought into the open. I think a good deal of healthy discussion came out of that committee and I believe that to a large extent the stand taken by Atomic Energy of Canada has been vindicated and that the type of reactor which Canada is producing is practical and saleable. There are a number of questions I should like to address to the minister. Perhaps he could take note of them while I am speaking and provide me with some answers.

First, I wonder whether he could explain to me the manner in which housing is financed at Whiteshell and how those houses are taken over by the residents. Are they rented, or are they bought? How much money is Atomic Energy putting into the townsite? Is Central Mortgage and Housing underwriting this expenditure?

The minister mentioned that Atomic Energy of Canada is considering the production of a different type of reactor, one which would be cooled by hot water or steam. He told the committee this would reduce the cost of some of our reactors and the amount of heavy water which would be required. There has been talk, also, of an organically cooled reactor. I should like the minister to tell us what is meant by an organically cooled reactor as well as by a hot water cooled reactor, and whether the use of such coolants would reduce the cost of the reactor. I should also like to know the effect of these developments upon the use of heavy water.

In the United States at the present time there is a great deal of talk about using nuclear reactors for the desalinization of ocean water. This is a pet project of President Johnson and, indeed, it will be brought up at the forthcoming meeting of NATO parliamentarians. As one of the leaders in the field of nuclear research, Canada should I believe be in a position to play an active part in the development of reactors which could be used for desalinization. I notice that invitations have gone out to 114 nations to attend an international symposium or saline water conversion to be held in October, 1965, and I am sure that Atomic Energy Limited must have some plan about attending this conference. Perhaps the minister could outline to us the action he intends to take in this regard. I notice also that at the present time a Montreal company has submitted a proposal for an 80 megawatt plant with a desalinization capacity of 14,000 cubic meters per day. I think this would be a combined power station and desalinization plant.

I mention this because it seems to me that the interest in desalinization among various nations of the world where there is a shortage of fresh water is such that it might provide a definite market for nuclear reactors produced in Canada. There is no doubt that United States companies will be bidding in this field and I should like to be assured that Atomic Energy of Canada is not dragging its heels in this regard but, rather, doing work which would put it in a position to tender for the supply of reactors to be used for desalinization. I realize that desaliniza-

tion is not of primary importance to Canada, because we are fortunate in having an ample supply of fresh water. But because of the limited market for these reactors and because the taxpayers of Canada are making such large amounts available for research to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, we should not miss any opportunity to capitalize on overseas markets. Perhaps the minister could give us an answer in this regard.

I just want to say that relations between the town and Atomic Energy Limited are most cordial. The people in this town are somewhat above the average. I understand that the I.Q. of school children at Deep River is considerably above the average. I know there were some problems of administration at Deep River in the early days and I hope these difficulties will be avoided in Whiteshell. I trust a certain amount of autonomy will be granted to this town so that it will not be a company town, but rather an incorporated municipality as soon as a decision to let these people govern themselves is warranted. I hope also that this community in Manitoba, one which thousands of visitors will go to see and marvel at every year, will not become isolationist. I know there is a tendency among these people to keep to themselves. But I hope the public spirit and leadership which is evident among the people will be shared by the community at large. The former government chose a site in Manitoba for this research establishment in order to decentralize the operation at Chalk River which had grown to capacity. I think this decision was a proper one. I am glad the minister is following up the work which has been done and I trust the work being done at Whiteshell and Chalk River will in the years to come contribute to the advancement of Canada and of the world at large in the nuclear field.

Mr. Stenson: The hon. gentleman said that Ontario hydro was building a new plant with the assistance of Atomic Energy Limited. I wonder whether the minister would tell us whether, as different contracts come up, private industry will be given every consideration in regard to them. Does the hon. gentleman feel that private industry today is playing a large enough part in the promotion of atomic energy and the construction of different plants in this country?

Mr. Drury: The hon. member for Springfield asked some questions about housing in connection with the Whiteshell reactor in Manitoba. These houses are financed by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, who secure the necessary money to build them from the government under the heading of loans or advances. This money is borrowed from the government at commercial rates of interest. Atomic Energy of Canada constructs the houses and then rents them to its staff at economic rents designed to pay for the cost of the house, repay the loan and provide investment. In a sense this is the same kind of arrangement which Central Mortgage and Housing has in effect elsewhere.

Mr. Slogan: What about the amortization?

Mr. Drury: I cannot give this information offhand, Mr. Chairman. I suspect it is of the order of 30 years; the same kind of criteria used by central mortgage and housing. The hon. member also asked whether I would undertake a brief dissertation on organically cooled reactors. As the hon. member knows, in a reactor there is required a medium to control the flow of neutrons, known as a moderator, and another substance is required to carry the heat generated from the interior of the reactor to a source where the heat energy can be used. In the case of the CANDU reactor, heavy water is used both as a moderator to control the flow of neutrons and also as a coolant to carry the heat generated by fission from the interior of the reactor to a spot where it can be transformed from heat energy to mechanical energy. Heavy water is an expensive item in itself—at the present time costing the Canadian government some $20.50 a pound—and using it as a coolant can be expensive, in terms of leakages and losses of one sort or another which require replacement.

As a consequence, as I outlined in my opening remarks, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited is investigating the possibility of a system employing heavy water as a moderator—that is, continuing its employment as a moderator—but using as a coolant, or the medium for the transfer of heat from the reactor to the power generating system, boiling, light water, or ordinary boiling water—that is, ordinary water under considerable pressure, which will boil. Obviously the loss of this kind of water is not nearly so expensive to make up and replace. In addition to the possibilities of using heavy water as a moderator and boiling, light water as a coolant there are also some organic substances, organic liquids, whose values, advantages and disadvantages are currently planned for investigation at Whiteshell. This will be one of its main, initial preoccupations, namely the

investigation of organic coolants, together with inorganic water. As hon. members know, the reactor there has its future ahead of it rather than behind it, so what the results of these investigations will be I of course cannot now say.

The hon. member also asked whether we would be participating in a 114-nation symposium next year on the use of nuclear energy for desalination, if I understood the question correctly. The answer to this question is yes, of course we will be. But I might say, in relation to the desalination program generally—and this is also to some degree an answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Peterborough—that Atomic Energy of Canada Limited is in the business of research in the field of nuclear energy and also in design, but is not in—and indeed in my view should not get into—the business of manufacturing and selling nuclear reactors. The function of A.E.C.L. up to the present has been—and I suggest should continue to be for the future—to produce ideas which it endeavours to farm out to manufacturing industry in Canada, and let industry make use of their capacities, their talents, to refine, to manufacture and to sell the reactors and the components of the reactors in this particular field.

We have potential manufacturers of reactors in Canada. In my opening remarks I pointed out that the government of Pakistan and Canadian General Electric were now negotiating for a contract for the manufacture and delivery, on a turnkey basis, in Karachi of a reactor. The role of Atomic Energy of Canada in this matter is to act as adviser, but the negotiator, the contractor who will manufacture, deliver and guarantee the apparatus will not be Atomic Energy of Canada; it will be Canadian General Electric. Similarly in the desalination field, the reactors required for heat generation in what is, in effect, a massive distillation process, will be their manufacture and their sale; in other words, the manufacture and sale will be the responsibility of manufacturing industry in Canada, rather than of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. Consequently our role at the conference to which the hon. member made reference will be that of technical expert or technical adviser, rather than a manufacturer interested in sales.

The hon. member also had some kind things to say about the relationship between the scientific community at Whiteshell and the local community. As the hon. member well knows, one of the reasons for choosing the site at which the Whiteshell reactor, or the Whiteshell research station is being put up is the proximity of the University of Manitoba. It was because it was intended that there should be the closest possible relationship between the scientific community of Whiteshell and the university communities, not only of Manitoba but of the other provinces as well, that this site was chosen. It is certainly the object of A.E.C.L.—as indeed it is the object of the government—that there should be no tendency to what I think the hon. gentleman referred to as isolationism, of which I do not think there has been any evidence so far.

Mr. Cantelon: Mr. Chairman, I am prompted to say what I want to say now by the fact that the minister said the product with which we are concerned—I think I quote his words correctly—has to look for markets abroad and has to find its way to purchasers in every corner of the globe. If this is true, it seems to me it is about time we began to seriously consider looking for a different system of measurement than the one we use today. Of course I mean the metric system of measurement. Dr. Howlett, who is the director of applied physics at the national research council, says that a real crisis confronts the users of the English system.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I think we will be coming in a moment or two to the estimates of the national research council, of which, as the hon. member has just mentioned, Dr. Howlett is a distinguished officer. Perhaps that might be a better time to examine the problems of our system of measurement and the possible advantages of the metric system.

Mr. Cantelon: I will be pleased to keep my comments until we reach that point, Mr. Chairman.

Item agreed to.

National research council, including the medical research council—

1. Salaries and other expenses, $26,086,600.

Mr. Cantelon: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I may be allowed to continue what I began at the wrong place a moment ago. It seems to me that this is a favourable time at which to open the issue as to whether we should seriously consider taking the first steps toward introducing a metric system in this country. As Dr. Howlett pointed out, and as I quoted

a moment ago, it is a matter of grave concern that Canada is not readying for the switch.

I think everyone in this country realizes that it will be a very difficult thing to do, and it will require a long period of time to make the proper preparations to do this with the least possible disruption to the country. Consequently I think we should begin to take these first steps.

I am prompted to say this by my experience with measurement, although purely academic, for a great many years. I know of the difficulties that students in this country have in handling our system, and I know of the lack of difficulty and the simplicity of the metric system when it is applied in the scientific field, including chemistry and physics. It seems to me that even if we begin to make preparation for this move we would not only be assisting our students, who find themselves in the world today facing extremely heavy competition in the field of science from every other country of the world, but also assisting those who are trying to capture markets outside this country.

I should like to point out that some 90 per cent of the world's population today uses the metric system and that 27 countries in Europe, the Soviet union, China, Japan and India, where we are interested in selling atomic projects, central and South America all use the metric system. In fact as the years go by Canada becomes an anachronism in this sense. We are becoming old hat when it comes to working with a modern system of measurement. This being so, are we making preparation for what I consider to be an inevitable change? We are handicapping our position in world markets if we do not make this change. We are handicapping our young people educationally if we do not make this change, and we are certainly going to handicap the consumers of this country by not making the change.

One can go into a supermarket to purchase something and find four or five different sized cans, each with a different price. If we used the metric system I am sure that many producers of goods would find it impossible to confuse the consumer as they do today. I suggest it is time that we began to consider making this change.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the hon. member would permit a question? Without disagreeing with what he has said, because it has a good deal of merit and is attractive to me, what are his comments as to whether Canada could introduce the metric system before the United Kingdom and the United States do so, in view of our trade relationship with those two countries?

Mr. Cantelon: Mr. Chairman, we would find it very difficult to introduce this system, particularly if the United States did not do so. The hon. member will recall that I said it is time we began to make preparation for the introduction of this change so as to simplify this change when we do make it. If we start preparing for this change we might be able to influence the United States and Great Britain to also prepare for the change. Great Britain is in fact changing its outmoded system of monetary measurement, and I think it would not be so stubborn as to refuse to change the other system.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Chairman, as I make my very brief remarks under this heading I should like to thank the minister for his courtesy and promptness in answering the number of questions I have placed on the order paper during the past several weeks relating to research grants.

Leading into my brief remarks this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should say that while most people of this day and age recognize that we here in Canada are privileged to live in a prosperous country, most responsible political leaders on all sides of this house recognize that we are still facing a basic challenge. I know the minister in another department of government is aware of this challenge in respect of general and regional poverty. I think we can also be thankful that in this day and age we do not meet poverty with old fashioned demagoguery, but by action. Here in the federal sphere of government, while we have not met with the provinces and planned priorities in the social action and economic fields, Canadian governmental leaders in the federal and provincial fields recognize that education stands high on our list of priorities.

I shall now come to my point. In fighting regional and general poverty the federal government has a keen leading role to play in encouraging what I have often termed individual and national excellence. The research council has a great role to play in encouraging basic research in Canada. I thought this would be an opportune time for the minister to make a very brief statement based on my general remarks.

At this particular time in our nation's history many university leaders are conducting symposiums to discuss the pros and cons of what is becoming known as the brain drain.

Some people think there is a serious brain drain of scientists from Canada. Others are not sure if there really is such a drain, while yet others recognize there is one but feel it is not as serious as it might be. In general terms there is a debate going on in the nation today relating to what people loosely and generally call a brain drain.

I know the minister will report to us at a future date on the many findings of the research secretariat, but I for one, without going into great detail, feel that if individual and national excellence is to be encouraged here in Canada, as we fight poverty with facts and not with slogans, and if we are really going to play a role in doing this, we have got to pay much more attention to encouraging basic research here in Canada, and this is going to cost the federal government a lot more money. I do not know whether these figures are correct or in exact detail, or on what they are based, but I have heard time and time again this coined expression expressed publicly, that while Canada spends $1 per scientist, the United Kingdom spends $3 and the United States spends $10 to $15. Perhaps the minister and his officials will wish to comment on these statistics I have put forward.

Prime Minister Wilson in his recently concluded campaign in the United Kingdom stressed that in his country, in order to get the economy moving forward in a realistic way, and in order to meet the basic challenge of poverty, he recognized the vital role as does President Johnson—that the government must play in increasing assistance to basic research. I should like to ask the minister to make some general statement at this time relating to his opinion about the causes of the brain drain of scientists from Canada to other countries, the extent of its seriousness and what positive policies the federal government now contemplates to encourage more Canadian scientists to stay in Canada, as we are attempting to encourage, through the federal government, individual and national excellence. This is something I feel we must do if we are going to really fight regional and general poverty.

As I said at the outset, I have put many questions relating to medical research matters on the order paper and I should like to thank the minister for his helpful answers and cooperation in this regard. It has been said over the last few months that we are about to face a critical shortage of doctors in Canada and that we must have more doctors in training if we are going to have the same standards of medical care in 1970 as we have today. We have been warned time and time again not only in the Hall report but by other responsible individuals that unless we meet the challenge immediately we are going to be faced sooner rather than later with a critical shortage of doctors and dentists in Canada.

With assistance from various departments of government I have tried to get information in this regard. The Canadian universities foundation is carrying out a pilot research project in Ontario alone to find out how many applicants to study medicine were refused admission to medical schools this year. The initial figures are misleading because one student may have made four or five applications, but has only been accepted by one medical school, and yet the three or four refusals appear in the statistics. The Canadian universities foundation is doing important work in having individuals on their staff trying to get the true picture in this regard from the universities, but no matter what their findings may be I think we are all agreed that in the future, as we have learned from the Hall report and other sources, we are going to have to build more medical schools.

I should like to get to the point we are discussing under the particular item relating to grants for medical research. It seems to me that the federal government is going to have to play a much greater role in the future if we are going to keep our medical research scientists in Canada at more properly staffed medical schools. I should like the minister to outline the problem generally as he sees it at the present time. I know that nobody, including the medical research council, can always get exactly what it asks for. However, I feel it must be emphasized that if we are going to have more medical schools we will also have to have more medical schools doing more important research projects, which is going to involve a greater degree of assistance on the part of the federal authorities.

I know it is impossible to do justice to a subject of this nature in the time at our disposal. I also recognize that the minister is going to report on the findings of the research secretariat at a future date, but I hope he will find it opportune at the present time to give the committee a general outline of government policies intended to increase assistance for medical research in particular and industrial research in general, in order that we

can keep more Canadian scientists doing their work in Canada.

Mr. Slogan: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words along the same lines with regard to medical research. In looking over the estimates for the last 10 years I notice that the budget of the national research council has increased from $14,794,367 in 1954-55 to $47,101,571 in 1963-64. This is quite a substantial increase. I think it is very well merited and perhaps reflects somewhat the interest that is being shown in research throughout Canada.

In the year 1963-64 $5,100,000 was allocated to medical research out of the over $47 million spent by the national research council. My beef, and it is one I have brought up in the house before, is that the amount of money allocated to dental research, which would be included of course in the figure I have given for medical research, bears no relationship whatsoever to the relationship of dentistry to medicine in our communities. The relationship between the amount spent on dentistry and the amount spent on medicine by the average person is far different from the relationship of the amount of money spent on dental research to that spent on medical research. I believe that only 1 to 2 per cent of the money spent on medical research is allocated to dentistry.

I am making this point for a very valid reason in that dental diseases are almost universal and yet are largely preventable. So it is a most deplorable situation when the community as a whole neglects to try to do something about dental diseases, which no doubt could be largely prevented if certain public health measures were followed and if further research were carried on.

My plea is that the national research council look into the matter to see if more money cannot be allocated to dental research. Perhaps the minister could give me an answer on that point. I know one answer is that it is pretty difficult to get anybody to do this type of research. Last year $31,953 was allocated for fellowships for dental research and $165,500, I believe, was allocated by way of grants for dental research projects, but all the money allocated in the last 10 years for dental research comes to less than $1 million, which is not even 20 per cent of the amount of money allocated for medical research last year alone.

I think there is a very great discrepancy here. I am not placing the blame solely on the minister or the national research council. I think that the bulk of the blame falls on the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the officials of that department, but I certainly should like to see the national research council allocate more of its budget for dental research and I would hope that this would be done in the future.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall vote No. 1 carry?

Mr. Slogan: Before the vote is carried, I asked the minister a question and I should like an answer.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, I was planning to wait until all the questions on the various items had been asked but if the committee would prefer me to go ahead now, I will. I think it might be more convenient for all questions to be asked and then I will answer them all at the same time.

Mr. Grafftey: That is in order.

Item agreed to.

15. Assistance toward research in industry, $2,700,000.

Mr. Lambert: With the greatest respect, Mr. Chairman, the record is not unbroken here. The minister indicated he would be prepared to answer questions and we are almost on the last item for the council.

Mr. Drury: I can give the hon. member the assurance that if the last item does carry I will still answer the questions.

Mr. Lambert: We are on the last item save one. Let the minister reply on item 15.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, this lack of confidence is somewhat distressing.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I want to correct that impression. All I was doing was trying to slow down the speed with which you were turning the sheets.

Mr. Drury: Clearly, Mr. Chairman, our research activities which are devoted to the improvement of efficiency and overcoming unnecessary slowness have now uncovered a new field for examination. Perhaps we could have a look to see if we could devise some way of stopping this slowdown.

The hon. member for Kindersley suggested that something should be done concerning the adoption of the metric system by Canada. I think the parliamentary secretary made the point fairly clearly that Canada cannot adopt the metric system unilaterally. Indeed, Canada cannot take very large steps toward the introduction of such a system as long as our largest buyer, the United States, is not taking

comparable steps in the same direction. However, preparations are being made looking toward this being achieved. As the hon. member will be well aware, in very large areas of the scientific community the metric system is the standard of measurement, not only in respect of weight and volume but also of length. This, of course, has extended into the schools now. When I was a boy, which was relatively few years ago, the metric system was unknown at the school I attended. We were satisfied with the English system of measurement. I understand now from my children, however, the metric system occupies as important a place as the English system of measurement in our schools today. This is extending, then, through the educational system some preparation for the adoption of the system.

As the pamphlet read to the committee by the hon. gentleman indicates, there is an awareness of this problem and a willingness to do something about it on the part of the national research council and its staff. I, myself, periodically in speeches exhort Canadian industry to prepare itself to meet the great markets of the world outside North America and to recognize that they are liable to have to sell their products under the metric rather than the English system of measurement. The changeover does call for a very substantial investment in both measuring equipment and manufacturing equipment. Perhaps one of the things we should be doing is giving some thought to the development or evolution of machinery which will be able to measure with equal facility in either the metric or English system. Some preliminary thought has been given to this. I believe the hon. member has raised a valid point and thought should be given to this. Preparations should be made. I should like to reassure him that thought has and is being given and preparations are being made. However, this is not something which is likely, nor indeed could, happen overnight.

The hon. member for Springfield, taking the easiest part of the task first, made the observation that in his view the amount of money devoted to dental research, as a proportion of the total amount devoted to medical research, was too small. I am not quite sure how one should divide up either the organs of the body or the ailments of the body and apportion the amount of money devoted to their investigation. I can tell him, however, that I have had representations from those interested in pediatrics who make exactly the same suggestion, that the amount of money devoted to the ailments of children is too small; that more is needed. Those who are interested in communicable diseases are of the view that too small a proportion of the total amount of money going to medical research is devoted to this series of ailments from which we suffer from time to time.

An hon. Member: What do you think?

Mr. Drury: I have no answer as to what are the right proportions. I am told by the medical research council that where they can find high quality fellows in any medical field, including dentistry, they are only too glad to support them. In fact, the big problem in this area is to find competent, high quality people to support rather than trying to deny funds to deserving research fellows. The same is equally true in connection with applications for equipment grants in respect of medical research. Where there are deserving, high quality research projects, with what appears to be a useful potential, these are supported.

The hon. member may have noted that in the period from 1959-60, to date, the funds allocated to the medical research council have risen from some $2 million at an annual rate to a figure in 1964-65 of close to $7 million. This represents a growth factor of three during that period.

The medical research council, and indeed the national research council, are fully alive to the needs for increased research effort in our research community in this country, both for the work it can produce and the support research produces for the teaching apparatus in Canada. As a consequence, they are pressing the government which, in turn, is in agreement with this philosophy, to have increases almost on an annual basis in the amount of funds allocated for fundamental research in both the field of natural science and the field of medicine.

If the hon. gentleman has any influence in the dental community, I hope he will be able to urge them to bring forward high class applicants who would be interested in undertaking research in the dental field. If this can be done, I do not think there will be a refusal on the grounds of a lack of funds.

The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi really invited me to survey the whole field of research, not only to survey it but also produce justification for it. This is a rather tall order. Perhaps I could briefly say that, in respect of medical research, what I have just said to the hon. member for Springfield has some relevance. The total amount devoted to medical research has risen by about the

same factor of three during this period 1959-60 to date. Here again the shortage, if any there be, is of qualified people rather than funds with which to support them. The hon. gentleman made some reference to the brain drain and of the investigations now being carried out to establish the real facts in connection with this situation, as distinct from what I believe to be some effort to try to extrapolate a few individual experiences and turn them into a condemnation of the whole system. The fact of the matter is that we have not too much factual data in this field. This is something I regret and something about which I hope I will be able to do something. We have got to have a great deal more in the way of background and factual information on which to base not only intelligent prognostications but also intelligent policies for the future. This, as the hon. gentleman is well aware, is one of the main reasons for the appointment of the scientific secretariat.

Mr. Fisher: Hasn't the government a policy at the present time with regard to this? I may have misunderstood some of the things that were said during the campaigning and in this chamber since then, but I understood the government had a policy in relation to all these matters. I am now left with the impression that there is not any policy except "We will do some research and find out the facts and then get a policy."

The minister is really confusing us and I suggest to him we would appreciate something a little bit more positive, or else he should explain to us why we need facts and statistics now instead of a policy.

Mr. Drury: I have not quite finished what I was going to say in reply to the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi. Surely an intelligent policy should not be elaborated in the absence of facts? There are some people who advocate the construction of a policy on emotion, rumour or intuition, but in the field of science I do not think this should be the foundation upon which a policy is built. The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi asked what we were doing about the so-called brain drain—

Mr. Fisher: I would like the minister to explain to me what the national research council has been doing all these years and why we have had ministers responsible for scientific research all these years if now, in the fall of 1964, we find the minister coming forward saying we have not got a policy, that it is emotional and intuitive to enunciate a policy, and that he is waiting for the facts. What is the justification for the N.R.C. and all these fat reports we have had if we cannot get a statement on policy now? The only justification we have had is that each year the branch is getting a little bigger and so it could not be too bad.

The minister had better come off it and give us the government's policy on this whole question of science. The point raised by the hon. member for Springfield has been known to laymen such as myself who have only a nodding acquaintance with the dental profession. Yet the minister comes in and foists off a professional with the suggestion that some people have ideas and other people have other ideas. That is no answer. When the hell are we going to get some answers from the government and from people like the minister who has the responsibility? What bothers me is the casual slackness of coming with an item such as this and really dusting us off, saying he has to get some facts and figures.

Does the minister realize how aggravating and annoying this attitude is, especially when on other occasions, particularly when speeches are made outside the house, all the honours are given to the national research council and all these various academic people working in these fields? When we are given information in this chamber it is as though we were a bunch of dunces who could not understand it. I am going around in circles but I suggest the minister is going around in circles too.

At the very least the minister should give us an undertaking that some time within the next year, if this parliament survives, he will be able to come in and tell us the government's policy in the field of science and research, and fit into the picture somewhere the point raised about dentistry. He might even mention pediatrics, and give us some indication where the government is going.

Every damned ministry I know of has some kind of research or fact finding program going. For example, the Minister of Labour says he is getting a manpower consultant service going. We want to know what the government is going to do about the Hall commission recommendations but we are told, "Just wait until we analyse and get all the facts in." There are committees by the dozen all over the place finding out things, yet here is a government which came to power on a platform that it knew what it was doing.

The minister was a t.v. star, along with the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of

Northern Affairs and National Resources, in those one minute blurbs which were broadcast again and again, in which the main theme was "We know how to get Canada going. We know the answers." I am not going to say any more. Today the minister has revealed he has not got any answers. He is just reading something off, giving details about atomic energy that his civil servants prepared for him. He shows no indication that he has a grasp of this field of science or research. I don't mind him dismissing us as though we did not know anything, but I don't see how a minister, responsible for the field the minister is responsible for, can come into this chamber and treat us so cavalierly and tell us "If you just wait until we get a few more facts and statistics everything will be fine."

I am sorry I have had to express what in effect is a bad temper, but seeing this performance I cannot help but feel we had a giant rooking in the last election campaign and in the general stance of this ministry, which seems to be all-wise and all-knowing.

Mr. Drury: I do not think I have made claims to be all-wise and all-knowing. If the hon. gentleman asked me what is the policy of the government in relation to science I would say this covers a large field indeed. I am prepared to answer specific questions, but this is a general one. I could answer that the government's policy with regard to science is an approving one; is one of assistance.

Speaking of election campaign undertakings, one of those undertakings was implemented in relation to the proposed appointment of a Canadian science council which, in the scientific field, will perform the same role as the economic council of Canada. It will be the purpose of this body to try and delineate—and I am sure it will be successful—the areas in which scientific endeavour can most usefully be undertaken and those areas in which effort might be less productive than if otherwise employed. This is a step in the organization of the development of science.

If the hon. gentleman has a specific question I would be glad to try and answer it, but to ask what is the policy of the government with relation to science covers a very wide spectrum.

Mr. Fisher: It is your responsibility.

Mr. Drury: Yes, I agree. It is currently my responsibility and I am prepared, in respect of scientific policy, to give factual answers to the extent that I am able. The hon. gentleman has suggested that the question with regard to dentistry was brushed off, but if the hon. gentleman had just listened I suggested, as the hon. member for Springfield knows, that there has not been in the dental community the interest and enthusiasm for research that there has been in other fields. Further the medical research council will sympathetically receive applications for assistance in the field of dental research. As far as the medical research council is concerned, there is no shortage of funds or of interest on its side. It is the dental community which has to develop a greater interest in research than it currently possesses.

Mr. Fisher: I wonder if I could ask the minister a question. It is not loaded. If there is a shortage of something obvious, such as librarians or teachers, provincial governments I know of follow a policy of establishing courses to deal with this shortage. In Ontario the provincial government is thinking of establishing a library school. If necessary, teachers colleges are established. In other words, the government accepts responsibility for getting specialists in these fields. But if I understand correctly what the minister is telling the committee, he is really passing the buck—he is passing the whole problem back to the profession. If this is the policy of the government, I am glad to know. The minister has made it perfectly clear. It really means the government has no policy with regard to science or specialties within the field of science; the policy is really one which must be generated within the disciplines themselves. If that is the policy of the government, it is very clear. I do not know whether the hon. member for Springfield received the same impression, but that is what I consider to be a brush-off. I took the minister's answer to be: It is up to the dentists themselves to generate a response.

I just happen to have a different conception of the role of government in the scientific field and all I can do in closing the contribution I am making to this discussion is to suggest that the minister look at some of the papers which have been prepared by the Labour party in Britain, or that he read Mr. Wilson's speech on science. I could also suggest he read a little of C. P. Snow.

Mr. Slogan: I do not wish to become involved in a long debate. However, I cannot accept the minister's proposition that all this money has always been available but there has been nobody to take it. I base this on the fact that the dental profession in Ontario was asked to contribute to a research fund and I think its members did contribute some $50,000.

I am sure they would not have done this if more than enough money was already available for research.

It seems to me that with only one half of 1 per cent of the money going into medical research generally being spent in the field of dentistry, there is an inordinate discrepancy and I believe some initiative should be taken by the national research council to see that it is rectified. The dental profession itself has taken some steps in this regard; it has contributed money to dental research. So, as I say, I cannot accept the proposition that there has been money available which has not been taken up.

Mr. Drury: I would point out that the medical research council does not support dental institutions or organizations. Its help is directed toward individuals, not toward organizations. There are a number of dental organizations across the country which either provide their own funds or which receive assistance from endowments, other bodies such as municipal governments, and so on. The moneys of which I am speaking are the sums available to help highly qualified fellows in the dental field pursue research activities. Obviously the dental associations have projects of their own, both research and performance projects, but the medical research council and, in the wider field, the national research council devote their efforts to individuals rather than to organizations and would not be a source of funds for organizational or institutional activity.

Mr. Churchill: I should like to ask the minister a question with regard to the annual report of the national research council. The distribution office of the House of Commons has furnished me with the report for the fiscal year 1962-63, the latest one in the possession of that office. Where is the annual report for 1963-64?

Mr. Drury: As on a number of occasions, there has been some difficulty in getting the current report translated, but I am told that it is now in the hands of the printer and we hope it will be available soon.

Mr. Churchill: We had the same answer from the Minister of Veterans Affairs. This makes two reports which have been very seriously delayed this year.

Mr. Grafftey: Very briefly, as we close this discussion, may I say I think the minister was going a long way toward answering our general inquiries to my satisfaction before we were slightly sidetracked. May I assume that the scientific secretariat is making a study in depth of the reasons for the so-called brain drain and will make recommendations to the minister as to how such a drain can be stopped, if it does exist? Do I understand it will recommend a policy designed to encourage more scientists to stay in Canada and carry out scientific research in Canada.

Mr. Drury: I was about to say with regard to the brain drain that it has been established that over the past six or seven years there has been a net increase of scientists in Canada. The numbers who have been lost either temporarily or permanently by emigration have been more than matched by those gained as a result of immigration. In addition, we have the natural output from our educational institutions. There has also been recently an encouraging return, particularly in a number of medical fields, of senior scientific people from the United States, either Canadians who, having carried out postgraduate work south of the border, return to Canada or of United States citizens who come up here because of the opportunities offered for research work.

It is recognized generally I think—certainly it is recognized by the government—that the scale of research work being carried out in this country is probably not as great as we would like. Consequently, whether or not there is a net brain drain it is desirable to increase the scale of research being done in Canada, and encouragement should be given to this end. The means of encouragement are provided through a number of mechanisms, one of which we have been discussing this afternoon, namely the medical research council. Its appropriations, and consequently its grants, have risen over the current year as compared with the preceding year and are expected to rise again in the coming year. The same is true of the national research council. It is recognized that there should be an increase in the amount of grants made available and we are proposing an increase with a view to lessening whatever net brain drain there may be.

As the hon. member suggested, it is hoped the scientific secretariat will be successful in gathering the basic information upon which an intelligent long range future policy can be based.

Mr. Grafftey: One last question. Can it be generally admitted, before we know the findings of the secretariat, that the salaries and remunerations of scientists and the facilities open to them need reconsideration? It seems to me that seven or eight years ago higher salaries and better research facilities per se

in the United States seemed to attract our better research brains. They felt it necessary to leave this country in order to work with better facilities in many general fields, and naturally there was talk of higher salaries to a very great extent.

Is it correct to say that in the last few years there has been a general improvement for Canada in this situation? I make these general remarks, Mr. Chairman, realizing that there is a certain amount of folly in preaching nationalism in scientific research, because we have to share our brains with the rest of the world and I do not believe we should always get very excited about our scientists crossing back and forth across the border to the south. But in the two fields I have pinpointed, namely salaries and facilities, has the situation improved considerably in the last year in order to keep Canadian scientists carrying out work in Canada?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, I think I can safely say that both situations have been improved, perhaps to the point now where salary differential is not a significant or too important factor. I am told that what most interests a research scientist are his opportunities to develop his chosen line of research, and that this to him is very much more important—namely the environment in which he works and the kind of work he is doing—than the annual remuneration. So while both have been improved over the past few years, perhaps the more significant is the environment, meaning facilities, than the salary differential.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the minister how much of the money in this vote is being extended to assisting in scientific—

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I can interrupt the hon. member for a moment. I had undertaken earlier to have the Secretary of State for External Affairs appear in the chamber to answer questions as soon as he was available from the interview he was having with the foreign minister of Belgium. The minister has now come into the chamber. I am in the hands of the committee as to what they wish to do, and I realize how very late it is.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, the only trouble is that only five minutes are available and I am not certain that the Secretary of State for External Affairs could answer our questions in that short space of time.

[Mr. Grafftey.]

Mr. Knowles: That would give him time for only one sentence.

Mr. Churchill: Could we have the minister's estimates brought forward first thing tomorrow and restricted to the questions and answers with regard to the subject we raised this afternoon?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I could not be here earlier, but I think the committee will understand that the foreign minister for Belgium was here. I have just seen him off at the airport. He came specially for a two or three hour visit on a matter of some importance; otherwise I would have been in the chamber this afternoon.

I am in the hands of the house leader. If he wishes to proceed with the estimates tomorrow, I think that is satisfactory; but I do not know that we should proceed for one purpose: I believe we should proceed to discuss the estimates. I cannot, however, be here tomorrow night. The United Nations peace keeping conference is in session here and I have to meet with them tomorrow evening. I could be here tomorrow afternoon. In the few minutes remaining I would be very glad to deal with any questions my hon. friend has in mind.

Mr. McIlraith: I made the undertaking to the committee, Mr. Chairman, and I wanted to keep it. Do hon. members wish to proceed now?

Mr. Lambert: No, there is not enough time.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering how much scientific development and research is being undertaken by the department into the problem of the development of industries in underdeveloped areas such as the one I represent; whether any research assistance has been given to this problem, how much, in what areas, and for what purposes?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, in respect of assistance to underdeveloped areas perhaps some confusion arises in that I am the minister of the Department of Industry whose responsibility it should be, whereas now we are dealing with the national research council, which reports to parliament through me. As the hon. member will recognize, the national research council is not charged with this kind of responsibility. I refer to the development of less favoured areas in Canada. Consequently—

Mr. Peters: This vote is $300 million and it is authorized for assistance toward research

in industry. I would think that some of this money must be used for the development of industry, if it is authorized; if not, we should know it is not being used.

Mr. Drury: I am not sure what vote the hon. gentleman is now talking about.

Mr. Peters: I am talking about vote 15(a).

Mr. Drury: That vote, Mr. Chairman, is related to grants made to industrial concerns to assist them in the development of research within the corporate organization. These grants are unrelated to the area in which the industry is operating, but they are made with a view to improving the quality and the quantum of research within a company. They are designed to develop within Canadian industrial organizations a greater ability and a greater talent with which to carry out effective research.

Mr. Peters: I would assume this to mean that all this money is being used for is to assist industries themselves. Is this the policy of the department? The charge has been made by people that come to my office that if we were to look into the Department of Industry very closely we would find that under the previous deputy minister an immense amount of research and studies was carried out in connection with the aircraft industry, but at the expense of all other sections of research. This may be true, and it may not be true. We are certainly not finding out today. I would think that part of the minister's responsibility should be in respect of those industries that are not as well off as some of those that are able to carry out their own research programs to a degree. I believe some of this vote should be expended in assisting them.

For instance, in my area we have the silver mining industry which has a very great problem in regard to refining. I think development of other industries should take second place to the over-all responsibility for the underdeveloped industrial areas where industrial research could produce industries that would provide employment in the area and do some of the jobs the Department of Industry has so far not been able to do in the underdeveloped areas.

If it is the policy of the department to use this money only to bolster existing industries, then personally I am opposed to it and I think we should reduce the amount. I say this because in my opinion this sum of money could do a great deal of good in areas where we have not been able to develop industries, simply because we do not know what types of industry will use the by-products of the primary industries in those areas. This is certainly true in most of the mining communities. We find, for instance, large quantities of slag left in all parts of northern Ontario. Refractory brick, with the proper treatment, could be made from this type of material. We are not capable of doing research in this field. If the national research council is not willing to do it, I ask, who is? The gold mining industry that is leaving the mine is not going to do it, even if it has the money with which to do it. The Department of Industry has to be interested in it, and I think the work has to be done under the national research council. Certainly I am not satisfied that this is being done. I am not satisfied that type of assistance is available.

May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, if hon. gentlemen are agreeable perhaps I can make a reply to the hon. member's suggestion.

In respect of his specific suggestion about the utilization of slurries, slags and slimeys, this is a field in which the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys has developed very considerable competence and a great deal of skill. It is that department rather than the national research council, which is charged with the responsibility for development in this particular field. It would be inappropriate and perhaps unwise for the national research council, whose estimates we are now considering, because the hon. member does not feel enough is being done, to duplicate or redo the work the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys is doing.

In so far as the second portion of his suggestion is concerned, namely that research money should be expanded in a way to improve the prosperity of small businesses, or in a way to get small businesses established, I should like to point out that research in any field generally calls for an expenditure of something of the order of $30,000 per year per scientist. It is not possible to have any kind of research of a significant character done by much more than a team of three scientists. If we are going to have a coherent and likely productive research effort it calls for a team involving an annual expenditure of something in the order of $90,000 per year. This means that it is very difficult to organize within very small businesses research grants which are going to have a likely and useful productive result. To this end we are trying to encourage industry and the sciences to undertake research work on behalf of all of their constituent members, and thus be

able to afford a greater load than one small firm could carry by itself.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Batten): Shall vote No. 15a carry?

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I should like to call it six o'clock.

Resolutions adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the house leader what matters will be engaging the attention of the members of this house tomorrow and Friday.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we propose to submit first the estimates of the Department of External Affairs, and then proceed to the estimates of the Department of the Secretary of State and the other agencies for which that minister answers to the house. On Friday we will be calling the estimates of the Department of National Defence.

Mr. Knowles: Can the minister yet tell us what we might be doing on Monday?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We will be proceeding with the resolution stage of the Canada pension plan.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: Can we count on that?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes. After that we will proceed with the redistribution bill.

It being eight minutes after 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 DEFENCE PRODUCTION

B—Emergency measures organization—

20. Administration and operation, $2,600,000.

25. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment including authority to make recoverable advances not exceeding in the aggregate the amounts of the shares of the governments of the provinces of the costs of joint programs, $2,096,000.

30. Grants to provinces and municipalities for civil defence and related purposes and authority to make recoverable advances in accordance with terms and conditions approved by the treasury board, $5,600,000.

C—Crown companies—

40b. Canadian Arsenals Limited—administration and operation, $1,554,000.

Atomic energy control board—

1. Administration expenses of the atomic energy control board, $159,000.

5. Grants for researches and investigations with respect to atomic energy, $1,250,000.

Atomic Energy of Canada Limited—
(Research program)—

10. Current operation and maintenance including expendable research equipment, $34,861,400.

15. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment and to authorize Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to undertake construction of works near the Whiteshell nuclear research establishment for Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, $10,306,600.

Loans, investments and advances—

Atomic Energy of Canada Limited—

L5. Advances to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited in such amounts and on such terms and conditions (including the delivery to Her Majesty, in satisfaction of the advances, of obligations or shares of the company) as the governor in council may approve, to finance the construction of the Douglas Point generating station; to finance the construction of housing and other works near the Whiteshell nuclear research establishment; and to authorize Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to undertake construction of housing and other works for Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, $12,277,000.

National research council, including the medical research council—

1. Salaries and other expenses, $26,086,600.

5. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works land and equipment, $5,722,300.

10. Scholarships and grants in aid of research, $23,352,000.

15. Assistance toward research in industry, $2,700,000.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 5, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATES TO PEACE KEEPING CONFERENCE

Mr. Speaker: May I take this opportunity of recognizing the presence in the galleries of 100 delegates from 23 countries, including Canada, who are attending the meeting of military experts to consider the technical aspects of the United Nations peace keeping operations. This important conference began on Monday, November 2, 1964 and will end tomorrow, Friday, November 6, 1964. It is a pleasure to have you with us.

STANDING ORDERS

Third report of standing committee on standing orders—Mr. Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce).

AIRPORTS

PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL FACILITIES IN HEAVILY POPULATED AREAS

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, may I make a brief statement about assistance for airports in heavily populated areas. The federal government has for many years assumed full responsibility for capital expenditures in connection with main line and other airports required to support scheduled air services in Canada. It has also provided cost sharing grants to assist in the development of local airports, and outright grants for airstrips in remote areas.

For some time it has been apparent that the policy of grants to local and remote airstrips needed review because of changes in costs and in requirements, as well as changes in technology. The Department of Transport has had this whole matter under intensive review for some months, and I hope soon to be in a position to make a general statement.

Meanwhile, because of problems at certain airports in heavily populated areas which have substantial traffic although they are not served by scheduled air lines, action has already been taken to improve local airports by provision of additional facilities. This has taken place with regard to Sherbrooke and Hamilton—Mount Hope—airports. The government has today decided to take steps at once to meet urgent situations at Sarnia; at the Niagara regional airport at St. Catharines, and at the Waterloo-Wellington airport by providing additional facilities at these air fields as well. Officials of the department will be getting in touch with local officials in the next few days.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INQUIRIES RESPECTING TELEVISION INTERVIEW BY PRIME MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the absence for good reason of the Prime Minister I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and ask whether his attention has been drawn to a television interview given by the Prime Minister in Hamilton last night. I ask, on the basis of that interview, is it to be concluded that the government has decided, even before the meeting of party leaders, on the imposition of closure on the flag committee report?

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I did not have the pleasure of listening to the Prime Minister last night on television. If I had I am sure I would have derived at least equal pleasure with the right hon. Leader of the Opposition over the masterly exposition which the Prime Minister generally displays on such occasions. I would want to see the full text of his statement before making any comment. However, I am sure the right hon. gentleman would agree with me it is desirable in the national interest that our business should not be unduly protracted.

Mr. Diefenbaker: So desirable is it that I ask the hon. gentleman, who is the greatest wholesale purveyor of the smooth speech in this house—soporific, sometimes—will he direct the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that we would be only too happy to go ahead with those important matters of legislation which have been kept in abeyance as an excuse in order to have the flag debate concluded?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I will certainly see that the question asked by the right hon. gentleman is conveyed to the Prime Minister, and I am glad he and I are now agreed it is in the national interest that there should be no undue delay in the despatch of the public business of this house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs a supplementary question.

At the same time and concerning the same game, could he determine if the leader of the official opposition really stated in Toronto, the day before yesterday—I think, while addressing the chamber of commerce —that the main function of a leader of the opposition was to oppose. The right hon. gentleman is reported to have repeated at least ten times: our role is to oppose and oppose and oppose, no matter which debate comes up, whether on the flag or some new legislation. Is it true that the Leader of the Opposition intends to oppose and keep on opposing, as he said in Toronto the night before last?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I hope not, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is a wonderful alliance between you and the Creditistes.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): A supplementary question. May I ask whether the statement of the Prime Minister, to the effect that when the Secretary of State for External Affairs says "we shall take it under consideration it means it is not likely to happen", is to be taken at its face value?

Mr. Churchill: A further supplementary question—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Before dealing with a new question may I just deal with that one. The Prime Minister has a great capacity for proper interpretation.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): I should like to ask the secretary of state this. In view of the statement just made by the hon. member for Villeneuve, has the minister promised that hon. member a trip overseas to Africa or Asia?

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I have not promised the hon. member for Villeneuve a trip such as is suggested, but I will say to the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre that I am prepared to promise him a trip.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: I would rather stay here and watch you.

OFFICIAL STATUS OF MEMBER FOR RED DEER ON AFRICAN TOUR

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. What specific mission has been assigned to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) by the government on the occasion of his trip to Africa?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I gave the reason yesterday, but I shall be ready later on today to supply a further explanation.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, if I understand correctly, the minister is saying that there are two reasons why the hon. member was sent on a mission. Would he specify which is the official one?

[*Text*]

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It is based on the appointment of the hon. member for Red Deer as a special envoy for the government of Canada. I was wondering whether the minister's attention had been brought to the fact that most of the inhabitants of the continent of Africa are of the negro race; that they have been taking a very keen interest in political developments in the United States, are well aware of the significance of Senator Goldwater's candidature and will undoubtedly take equal cognizance of the expressions of regret over Senator Goldwater's defeat by members of the party of the hon. member for Red Deer; and does he think this is likely to place the hon. member in a suitable position as Canada's representative in that continent?

Mr. Bert Leboe (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I want to emphatically deny that I ever said anything of the kind.

An hon. Member: Nobody said you did.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman would not expect me to be responsible for all the political views—if indeed these are the views held—of any particular member.

Mr. Winkler: You might wish to be.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): But I do share with my hon. friend the opportunity for saying that we in this country are pleased that the United States elections are over and, without commenting on the results of those elections, of observing that Canada will continue to collaborate with the administration of the United States.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

In view of the fact that Russia is attempting to send cosmonauts to the moon, and that the United States are doing the same, that Canada has sent the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) to Africa, and that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) is suggesting that I be sent somewhere in the world—

Mr. Valade: Or to the moon—

Mr. Caouette: —would the minister consider sending, as the first Canadian cosmonaut to the moon—

Mr. Valade: The hon. member for Villeneuve.

Mr. Caouette: —the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, who would feel perfectly at home there.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has just reached the moon.

[*Text*]

I should point out to my hon. friend, Mr. Speaker, that I was only speaking figuratively.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Before the minister appointed the hon. member for Red Deer to his present assignment, I wonder whether the minister considered sections 10 and 11 of the Senate and House of Commons Act which, unless there is an appropriate order in council, might cost the hon. member for Red Deer his seat; or was that the purpose, and is that the purpose of the invitation offered to the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and the hon. member for Villeneuve?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that in putting his question my hon. friend wanted to give me the opportunity to say that was not the intention. The Senate and House of Commons Act in my opinion does not warrant that conclusion. This morning I looked at section 16 of the act, and I have discussed the matter with others, and I am sure the conclusion that my hon. friend might want to be able to draw would not be warranted.

Mr. Knowles: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has a firm decision been made on whether or not to pay the hon. member's expenses on this trip?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes. I said that yesterday.

IMMIGRATION

REPORTED PRESENCE IN CANADA OF U.S. NAZI LEADER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and ask whether his attention has been drawn to a statement by Mr. Pat Burns, a radio station interviewer and commentator from Vancouver before a meeting of the board of broadcast governors recently, to the effect that he had received a telephone call from George Lincoln Rockwell, the leader of the nazi party in the United States, from Vancouver international airport at about the same time it was alleged Mr. Rockwell was there. If this has been drawn to the minister's attention would he care to comment on it?

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): As a result of the additional information which came to light from the news reports, immigration officials conducted an immediate investigation into this matter. It has been learned that George Lincoln Rockwell was able to gain admission to Canada as an air lines passenger on October 25 at Vancouver. He left Canada the following morning. The circumstances under which he was able to effect entry are under investigation.

Inquiries of the Ministry

DEPORTATION OF FAMILY OF FORMER DOMINICAN REPUBLIC OFFICIAL

On the orders of the day:

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, on November 3, in response to an inquiry by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, I indicated that I would be reconsidering the case of Mrs. Espaillat and her children in the light of the apparent willingness of the Portuguese government to extend the validity of her entry visa to that country. I have now received confirmation of this extension. In view of this development her stay in Canada has also been extended and it is expected that this will permit Mrs. Espaillat's children to complete the current school year.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CONGO—INQUIRY AS TO RELEASE OF MISSIONARIES HELD BY REBELS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has he received a telegram from Pastor Perry Rockwood of the People's Gospel Hour concerning what steps are being taken to release missionaries held in the Stanleyville area of the Congo; and is the minister able to bring the house up to date with any information he may have received since he informed us quite fully on this matter a little over a week ago?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend will remember that several questions about this very serious situation have already been put by the hon. member for Red Deer.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Later in the day I hope to deal with some aspects of this situation, not unrelated to the reasons for the hon. member for Red Deer now being in Africa.

CYPRUS—REPORTED INCIDENTS INVOLVING CANADIAN SOLDIERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs, seeking merely information. Have there been developments in Cyprus recently in which, according to certain press reports, a Canadian soldier has been wounded? Second, did a Canadian soldier fire a certain number of shots at one of the Greek or Turkish Cypriots who failed to halt on command?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Canadian soldier was wounded by accident within the last few days. As to the second part of the question, I do not have the facts but I shall ascertain what the situation may be and if the allegation is in fact correct. With regard to the situation in Cyprus generally, I am sure my hon. friend will agree that the relative calm in that troubled island has been made possible in part by the presence of the United Nations peace keeping force, in which Canada continues to have the largest complement.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. I would ask him if he has more information than the Secretary of State for External Affairs with regard to the reported wounding of a Canadian soldier in Cyprus. What were the circumstances under which it happened, and how serious is the casualty?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): I have nothing to add, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, surely the Minister of National Defence can answer a question with regard to the troops who come under his jurisdiction. Under what circumstances was this soldier wounded in Cyprus? The Secretary of State for External Affairs said "accidentally". Was he shot by one of the Turkish or Greek Cypriots, or was he accidentally hit by his own comrades?

Mr. Hellyer: The Secretary of State for External Affairs has indicated already that a report would be sought respecting the situation.

Mr. Churchill: You do not know anything about your troops.

AGRICULTURE

STEPS TO IMPROVE POSITION OF EASTERN FARMERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I have had this question for a number of days, and in the minister's absence would direct it to the acting minister, whoever that may be. Will the minister say whether he has any immediate statement to

make on steps to be taken that may alleviate the depressed position in which the farmers of eastern Canada find themselves?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, if this question is related to a new dairy policy, an announcement will be made in due course.

Mr. Winkler: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It is not specifically related to the dairy policy; it is related to the whole question of eastern agriculture.

Mr. Sauvé: We are working on a program that will improve considerably the situation of eastern farmers, and the announcement should come in the near future.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Well; improve considerably.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Hon. members will remember that yesterday I ruled one of these questions out of order on the ground that it was far too wide to expect an answer at this time. We seem to be proceeding along the same line this afternoon. I would hope that a vague, general question like that would not be asked at this time.

Mr. Winkler: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I will admit that your statement in this regard is absolutely correct. However, over the past few weeks I have been rising in this house to ask questions about turkey producers, beef producers, hog producers and the whole range of operations of eastern agriculture, without receiving one answer. There has always been a dodge and a hedge in reply to my questions, and that is the reason for my wide ranging question today. I will not take advantage of the opportunity to refer the matter for discussion at 10 p.m. until the Minister of Agriculture returns to this house.

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, I should like the hon. member to bring the question forward for discussion this evening at 10 o'clock, when I will be here to answer it.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Forestry? Did the government this week receive a delegation from the Catholic farmers' union, and what does he intend to do to assist agriculture in the eastern provinces and particularly the Quebec farmers?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, until 2.30 this afternoon we had not received any telegram from the Catholic farmers' union asking us to receive a delegation. On October 22 that union sent us a telegram concerning the dairy policy, but we are still expecting a telegram asking us to receive a delegation from the Catholic farmers' union.

I know that the Minister of Agriculture will be very pleased to receive such a delegation. Tuesday, the minister announced that last week we met Mr. Courcy, the minister of agriculture of the province of Quebec, together with his officials, concerning the establishment of a dairy policy, and we will soon be in a position to announce important changes which, I am sure, will satisfy the eastern farmers, especially as concerns the dairy industry. I am sure that my hon. friends will then be pleased to congratulate us.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, may I ask another supplementary question?

Does this mean that to date the federal government had no policy respecting this matter?

[*Later:*]

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Forestry a question supplementary to those which were directed to him a few minutes ago. It deals with the new government policy which will be announced in connection with the dairy industry.

Can the minister tell us whether this new policy, which the opposition has been asking for for several months, will be retroactive to May 1 last?

Mr. Sauvé: Certainly not, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

[*Later:*]

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Forestry who seems to be looking after agricultural questions in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture. Would the minister take into immediate consideration the assistance of eastern beef cattle raisers in the form of loans that could save them from disastrous losses because of the current low and unsatisfactory prices for unfinished beef at the present time, and because of their financial inability to hold these cattle?

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, I will bring this question to the attention of the minister.

Inquiries of the Ministry

FEEDER CATTLE—REQUEST FOR PRICE PROTECTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether the federal government is going to move into the market to protect the level of prices on feeder cattle in western Canada?

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Perhaps I could take the question as notice and see that it is answered tomorrow.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

INCLUSION IN WHITE PAPER OF OPINION OF FORMER JUSTICE MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice, or perhaps in his absence the President of the Privy Council would answer the following question. Whereas the Minister of Justice has stated that a white paper will be issued respecting the history of and events leading to the domiciling of the constitution, would the minister consider including in the white paper the legal opinion furnished following the federal-provincial conference by Hon. Davie Fulton, the immediate future leader of the national Conservative party?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I will take the hon. member's question as notice.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

QUEBEC—REPORTED INCREASE IN UNEMPLOYMENT

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister. Has he read a news item in this morning's *Gazette* to the effect that in the province of Quebec unemployment increased by 27 per cent from April to September, this year? Can the minister tell us whether it is his government's intention to take some action in order to curtail that unemployment increase in the province of Quebec, since the Liberals committed themselves during the last election campaign to full employment in our country?

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not read this article but I know that the hon. member is aware of the fact that the situation in our country has greatly improved under the present administration.

Mr. Valade: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the Acting Prime Minister give us some explanation as to why unemployment has increased by 27 per cent, as compared with last year? Does that mean that such conditions are of no concern to the present government, which had promised full employment during the last election campaign?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's statement is not in accordance with the facts.

[*Text*]

[*Later:*]

Perhaps I could supplement the reply given a few minutes ago to the hon. member for St. Mary. The figures he quoted in regard to unemployment in the province of Quebec were so extravagant and unrelated to the facts that I should point out that in September, 1964, the figures were 4.3 per cent; in August, 5.0 per cent and in September, 1963, 5.3 per cent. This confirms what I said, that there has been substantial improvement in this very difficult national problem.

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): May I ask a supplementary question. Can the minister tell us when he is going to implement the promise that was made during the 1963 campaign, that a Liberal government would reduce unemployment to zero?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Since my hon. friend asks me this question, may I point out to him that there was never any such statement made. What was said was that when this government assumed office it would resort to policies that would considerably improve this situation. Those have lead toward an even greater improvement than it anticipated. The results are apparent now. We have now the lowest unemployment we have had, generally speaking, for over eight years, and we have had greater improvement than we have had in 17 years.

Mr. Ricard: May I ask a supplementary question. Will the Acting Prime Minister read his speeches of 1962, where he will find that he did promise full employment all over Canada?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I have already reread those speeches many times—

Mr. Ricard: But you do not understand them.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —and every time I read them, I derive greater satisfaction.

Mr. Valade: I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister if he denies the statement that I quoted before, which was issued by Mr. J. P. Reid, who is the local general manager of the national employment service at Montreal, in which statement he says that some 38,000 persons were unemployed—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member must know, and I did not interrupt him before because it seemed to be the quickest way to get over the hurdle, that he should not inquire as to whether statements made in newspapers are correct. This also gives me an opportunity to remind hon. members of section 3 of the instructions given me by the house, that answers to questions should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate. The same thing applies when asking questions.

Mr. Valade: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The minister quoted some figures but he did not indicate the source of those figures. I think the minister should tell us from which source he took this information.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The dominion bureau of statistics.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Can the Acting Prime Minister tell us whether the figures he brings before the house include the number of unemployed receiving unemployment insurance benefits or whether they include also those who receive only social assistance benefits or receive nothing at all?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I think that I shall have to consider this question before giving an answer.

[*Text*]

Mr. Valade: I wish to give notice that we will debate this question at the earliest opportunity.

Inquiries of the Ministry

REVIEW OF FORMULA TO DETERMINE DESIGNATED AREAS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Industry.

Several times in the house I asked when the minister would announce the new designated areas. Is he now in a position to tell us when he intends to announce the new areas to be designated for the economic assistance provided?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, the annual review is still proceeding and I hope to have an announcement to make in the not too distant future.

[*Text*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister of external affairs based on a Canadian Press report datelined Detroit which appears in the *Financial Post*. It says:

> Eternal affairs minister Paul Martin reiterated yesterday that the Canadian government is determined to achieve a somewhat better balance in Canadian-U.S. trade in auto parts.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the minister's duties are wide and varied, including those of acting prime minister, which he handles with great skill, but would he advise the house when he was appointed to look after affairs in eternity?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there is growing evidence that the government is possessed of what one might call earthly eternity.

FISHERIES

INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT OF BASE LINES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Has he been able to straighten out the base lines along our coasts?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, it is not a problem of straightening the base lines along any coast. It is a matter of completing all negotiations and taking appropriate action.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Howard: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are the negotiations with the United States completed in so far as the west coast is concerned?

Mr. Robichaud: The second phase of negotiations is completed but there are still details to be negotiated.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

REPORTED DISCRIMINATION SHOWN BY PENSION COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

[Translation]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs.

Could the minister order an investigation respecting several complaints which were received concerning the allocation of pensions to veterans by the pension commission, due to the fact that they would be members of some political party or other and as it seems that there exists some discrimination against certain veterans?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to deny categorically the accusation laid by the hon. member and assure him as well as the other members that no political consideration intervenes in the allocation of pensions to veterans. Therefore, no inquiry is required.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question. Would the curiosity of the minister be satisfied if I told him about certain specific cases, either in his office or in this house?

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Speaker, I wish to tell this house that any specific case which is brought to my attention is studied immediately, and if the hon. member would be kind enough to submit to me, as soon as possible, the cases he is referring to, I would be glad to look into them.

[Text]

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a point of order arising out of the question put by the hon. member for Mégantic. The hon. member for Mégantic has taken up the answer of the minister and has said he can supply some proof that prejudice is involved in some veterans affairs cases. I think the hon. member for Mégantic should put to the house the case that he assures the minister he has in his own hands. This is my point of order.

[Mr. Robichaud.]

TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR RETURN OF RAILWAY STOCK CARS TO WESTERN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the congested conditions in some of the market places in western Canada with regard to feeder livestock, I wonder if the minister would make representations to the railway to see whether there is anything that can be done to speed up the return of livestock cars from eastern Canada.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I would be glad to do that, sir.

AIR TRANSPORT

MEDICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PRIVATE PILOT'S LICENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. John Loney (Bruce): My question is for the Minister of Transport. Will the minister inform the house when the medical requirements for a private pilot's licence will be eased?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, even though I have been under medical care recently, I would care to give an answer to that question without better advice than I have available at this moment.

SUPPLY

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

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 (part recoverable from those organizations) 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 Indo-China), secretaries and staff by the governor in council; official hospitality; relief and repatriation of distressed Canadian citizens abroad and their dependents and reimbursement of the United Kingdom for relief expenditures incurred by its diplomatic and consular posts on Canadian account (part recoverable); Canadian representation at international conferences; expenses of the third com-

monwealth education conference; a cultural relations and academic exchange program with the French community, and grants as detailed in the estimates, $10,826,300.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Chairman, the other day it was suggested that because of the importance of certain events that have transpired in the world community, I owed it to the house to make a statement on behalf of the government with regard to those events that have such implications for peace in the world and have such important implications for the United Nations and for NATO. I readily concur in the view that it is the responsibility of the Secretary of State for External Affairs to seize the first opportunity to make a statement with regard to at least two events, the changes in the top level structure of the government of the Soviet union, and the detonation of an atomic bomb on mainland China.

Mr. Churchill: You were to deal with the hon. member for Red Deer first.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No. I think I said clearly yesterday that I did not know that we should proceed for the one purpose, but I believe we should proceed to discuss the estimates. I am prepared to do this, as well as to deal with the important matter to which my hon. friend now directs my attention.

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The understanding yesterday was simply this, that the minister for external affairs, who was delayed returning to the house before six o'clock, would deal with the subject that had been under discussion yesterday afternoon, namely the representation of the government of Canada by the hon. member for Red Deer. This promise was made to us by the house leader and was agreed to by the minister for external affairs. It was on that basis that the estimates of the Department of External Affairs were to be called today. This is the subject he should deal with first instead of dodging and trying to hide behind something. He must be afraid to deal with the subject we raised yesterday. I ask him now to be fair with the House of Commons and deal with that subject first, then go on to these other important matters that he has mentioned.

Mr. Pickersgill: I should like to speak to the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I was in the house and I was the one who made the suggestion—I thank hon. members for accepting it—that because of the presence here of Mr. Spaak, the distinguished foreign minister of Belgium, the Secretary of State for External Affairs should be excused until later in the afternoon in order to complete Mr. Spaak's visit. He did come back later in the afternoon, and it is true it was about a quarter to six.

Mr. Churchill: Five minutes to six; be accurate.

Mr. Pickersgill: If the hon. gentleman opposite says five minutes to six, then it was at that moment; and an offer was made that the Minister of Industry should relinquish his estimates so the Secretary of State for External Affairs could be given an immediate opportunity to deal with the subject which it had been agreed would be dealt with at that time, but hon. gentlemen opposite said they preferred to go on with the estimates of the Department of Industry.

It was then arranged that the whole of this afternoon until five o'clock would be taken up with the estimates of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and so far as this afternoon was concerned I can recall no commitment made at that time that this particular subject would be extracted from the other matters with which the minister would wish to deal.

I just want this question of good faith to be dealt with separately. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre is not perhaps the leading authority in the chamber on good faith.

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a question of privilege. What is the imputation in that statement that I am not an authority on good faith? Is my good faith not as acceptable to the house as that of the hon. gentleman?

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Churchill: Withdraw.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

The Chairman: Order. May I have the co-operation of members of the committee. I understood the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre was rising on a question of privilege. The Minister of Transport was speaking on a point of order, and perhaps the committee would agree that we should hear him out, after which we could consider the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Mr. Pickersgill: I apologize to the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, but I must say I was betrayed into saying this because he started out his observations by questioning our good faith. I know it is wrong for us to retort in kind to hon. gentlemen opposite. I know it is contrary to the sermon on the mount, and I withdraw immediately and apologize.

I made no reflection except that I did not think the hon. gentleman should set himself up above the rest of us.

I do believe there was an engagement for yesterday afternoon, but there was no formal engagement for this afternoon except that the estimates of external affairs would be brought up. How the Secretary of State for External Affairs chooses to deal with those estimates is, of course, his concern, but I did not think it was quite fair to allow this implication of bad faith to go unanswered.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon about seven minutes to six, when the hon. gentleman and the Secretary of State for External Affairs came into the chamber, we were endeavouring to complete the estimates of the Minister of Industry. There was an effort to get through with his estimates and I, who at that time was leading the discussion for this party, indicated we would prefer to go ahead with the estimates of the Minister of Industry because at five to six there was not time to start on the other question. Then it was said that we would consider the item this afternoon. It was certainly my understanding that we would be dealing with this particular item, which in itself is relatively minor compared with other things the Secretary of State for External Affairs will want to discuss. Perhaps the Minister of Transport should have learned a lesson from the events of yesterday afternoon, when with early frankness this matter could have been dealt with in five minutes or a quarter of an hour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On the same question of privilege, I should like to refer also to a statement made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. McIlraith) as can be seen on page 9757 of *Hansard*, top of the first column:

> As soon as he is available after his present interview with the foreign minister of Belgium. We could interrupt the estimates of the Minister of Industry at that point in order that the hon. member might have all the information he wishes with regard to this particular item.

Therefore, it is clear that yesterday the minister intended to have the estimates of the Department of External Affairs discussed today, not to discuss the explosion of an atomic bomb in China or the change of government in Russia, but precisely the matter on which a commitment was made by the President of Privy Council, as stated yesterday by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill).

Therefore, I think that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill)—whom I should like to see on the moon—is right on that score but the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) should come back to the matter under discussion yesterday concerning the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson).

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I must thank the hon. member for what he just said, but I want to be fair to all hon. members.

[*Text*]

First of all may I say I had of course intended to deal with this matter, but as it had been suggested that the Secretary of State for External Affairs should deal at the earliest opportunity with two significant and important world events I readily conceded that I would do so. However, I do not think we ought to quarrel over matters of this sort, and I would be very glad to change the course that I had thought was generally desirable because of the importance of these two matters.

But before I deal with this particular question I take it my hon. friend from Winnipeg South Centre would readily acknowledge that it is my duty to go on with the other subjects, and I would like to point out what actually transpired yesterday so far as I was concerned. As has been mentioned, I was not in the chamber for most of yesterday because I was in conversation with the Belgian foreign minister, who had come here especially to see me on a matter of great importance. As he could only stay between twelve and five o'clock it was necessary that I should take advantage of his visit to Canada to see him at a time when normally I would have been in my seat in the chamber.

As recorded at page 9774 of yesterday's *Hansard* the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre asked:

> Could we have the minister's estimates brought forward first thing tomorrow and restricted to the questions and answers with regard to the subject we raised this afternoon?

I said:

> Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I could not be here earlier—

[The Chairman.]

And explained, as I have just done now, why I was not in the house. Then I went on to say:

> I am in the hands of the house leader. If he wishes to proceed with the estimates tomorrow, I think that is satisfactory; but I do not know that we should proceed for one purpose: I believe we should proceed to discuss the estimates. I cannot however be here tomorrow night. The United Nations peace keeping conference is in session here and I have to meet with them tomorrow evening. I could be here tomorrow afternoon. In the few minutes remaining I would be very glad to deal with any questions my hon. friend has in mind.

There was no comment on this observation of mine. The hon. gentleman did not say "Oh, no." The understanding was that we would deal with one item in particular and so far as the record is concerned it is clear what my intentions were for today.

I would not want my hon. friend to accuse me of bad faith in the matter, because the record is clear on what I said.

Mr. McIlraith: And the record is clear so far as I am concerned.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): And the President of the Privy Council points out that the record is clear on what he said. However, I am now prepared to deal with this particular question if my hon. friend thinks it is more important than world shaking events.

Mr. Winkler: Does the minister not feel that the integrity of any ministry, and particularly his own, is equally as important as any report from his department that he has to make to us?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I certainly agree, but I do not think I need spend much time trying to establish my integrity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, yesterday on orders of the day I gave some of the reasons why the government had asked the hon. member for Red Deer to undertake at this time a journey of some two weeks to Africa. I stated that the hon. gentleman had spent some 15 years living in Ethiopia, one of the important countries with which Canada enjoys a very close relationship, and that in addition to having spent this length of time in Africa he has had an opportunity, such as perhaps no other membe of this house has enjoyed, of getting to know personalities in many of the governments of Africa. He has followed for a long time the evolutionary events of that emerging continent.

There are a number of matters which are of concern to Canada at this time in relation to some of the situations in certain African countries. Canada has a limited number of diplomatic missions in Africa and a limited number of missions where we have non-resident heads of mission. In the light of events which are of great concern to foreign communities all over the world, in the light of some of the problems which will face us on December 1 at the United Nations, and for other reasons, we felt it was in this nation's interests that we should take advantage of the services which I believe the hon. member for Red Deer is eminently qualified to perform in this area.

It was only in this light that he was asked to undertake a task which, I think, will have useful results. He will visit, at our request, the headquarters of the economic commission for Africa in Addis Ababa, a capital which he knows very well, having lived there for 15 years. He will have meetings with certain officials there including officials of the organization for African unity. Hon. members will recall that there was a very important conference of non-aligned states held in Cairo a few weeks ago, attended by representatives of many African countries. It was not constitutionally possible for Canada and for other countries not represented at that conference to send observers, yet it is of the utmost importance that we should have the fullest information placed directly at our disposal, in addition to information from other sources, so we can take the necessary steps and prepare for some important decisions which will have to be made very shortly, at the United Nations in particular.

I should like to point out that we are taking advantage of the presence in Africa of the hon. member for Red Deer for another purpose. Hon. members will recall the question which was put to me a few moments ago by one of the members for Halifax—

Some hon. Members: Which one?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): One of the very active and useful members of this house. This question, as others have done, underlined our concern for the safety of a number of Canadians resident in the Stanleyville area of the Congo where 800 hostages are being kept by the rebel forces in circumstances such that the Red Cross and other bodies have not been able to elicit satisfactory assurances as to their safety. I may say that in this total of 800 some 26 Canadians are included. The government is using every method

it can to extricate these Canadians and, indirectly, others, from the regrettable and dangerous position in which they have been placed. I may say that the hon. member for Red Deer has a knowledge of this area and knows some of the personalities involved.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask the minister whether the hon. member for Red Deer will visit Stanleyville?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The hon. gentleman knows he cannot visit Stanleyville. Even representatives of the Red Cross cannot visit Stanleyville. But I hope there are certain contacts which can be made, in the Congo and elsewhere, which may lead to satisfactory negotiations. At any rate that is our thought, and that is what we intend to do.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask what cities and towns in the Congo it is expected the hon. member for Red Deer will visit?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am sure he will go to the capital, but it may be he will go elsewhere for the purpose of making contacts which we believe, from his acquaintance, he may be able to establish. In any event, we shall certainly resort to every effort in order to ensure as far as possible the safety of these Canadians, as the people of Canada would expect this government to do.

On October 14 a message was sent to a number of the governments which are members of the conciliation commission of the organization for African unity. This message asked these governments to use their influence to ensure that the Geneva conventions of 1949 were observed in the Congolese dispute so the lives and safety of the civilians involved, including Canadian and other nationals, who are presently held in rebel territory could be preserved. This appeal was made because it was considered that the articles of all four Geneva conventions is pertinent to the task of the conciliation commission. These articles impose on all signatory countries, even on those not parties to the conflict, an obligation to ensure respect for the convention and for the lives and safety of persons not actually involved in the dispute, such as our residents in the Congo.

The hon. member for Red Deer is due to visit Kenya next Monday and Tuesday and we are arranging for him to call on the distinguished prime minister of that country, Mr. Kenyatta, who is the chairman of the O.A.U. conciliation commission and a key figure in efforts to ensure the safety of our people in the Congo. I very much hope that in addition to other appeals which have been made to Mr. Kenyatta this personal appeal by one who, I understand, knows him, will reinforce the messages which have already been sent.

We also hope that while in Ethiopia the hon. member for Red Deer will be able to ask the government of Ethiopia, which is also a member of the conciliation commission, to support measures for the safety of our citizens in the Congo. We all recall that when the Emperor of Ethiopia, that gallant and distinguished head of state, came to Ottawa a few months ago it was apparent that the hon. member for Red Deer had a very special relationship with him. We hope that in the circumstances this relationship will help in solving the problem of these people who find their safety threatened in Stanleyville.

I should add that in addition to visiting Ethiopia and Kenya I hope the hon. member for Red Deer will be able to visit at least one other country. I believe it is proper for us from time to time to utilize the experience and ability of members of this house. We do so at the United Nations. We ask members to constitute themselves as members of the Canadian delegation at the United Nations. We send members to sessions of the United Nations as observers. We send members to other international conferences, and I believe the assignment given to the hon. member for Red Deer to visit certain key countries and key personalities in Africa is in the interests of the formulation of clear and desirable foreign policy in these particular situations. I believe the course we have followed is one which will commend itself to most reasonable people, and I have no hesitation in commending it to this committee.

Mr. Nesbitt: I listened with great attention to what the Secretary of State for External Affairs had to say on this interesting subject. I think most members of this house are aware of the previous experience of the hon. member for Red Deer in Ethiopia for some length of time in the field of education. I think hon. members, particularly those who had the pleasure of seeing the film "Mr. Pearson", realize that there is a relationship between the hon. member for Red Deer and the Emperor of Ethiopia. I believe that as the Secretary of State for External Affairs has just said, most reasonable members would go along with that. However, there are some other things which seem a little obscure in this whole situation, and I was wondering whether the minister would elaborate and elucidate a little more in respect of them.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, it is my information that at the present time the hon. member for Red Deer is visiting Ghana, in fact is just leaving that particular country, and that his next stop is the new United Republic of Tanzania, formerly Tanganyika. The minister has said he will then be visiting Kenya, and after that it is my understanding that the hon. member for Red Deer will be paying a relatively brief visit to Ethiopia and then on to Cairo, in the United Arab Republic. It is my understanding that at no time is the hon. member for Red Deer visiting the Congo or anywhere near there. The minister has just told us that he will be some place in the Congo, and I wonder whether the minister would expand on that just a little more.

There is another question that I think arises in the minds of many people. As the minister has said, naturally when the interests of Canada and Canadian problems are involved—particularly the lives of Canadian missionaries in the Congo—certainly this house would want everything possible done to protect the lives of these very courageous people. I have had some experience in this field and realize that sometimes in the field of external affairs you have to do things indirectly that you cannot do directly. Nevertheless it seems strange to me that if in fact one of the objects of the mission of the hon. member for Red Deer is to help protect the lives and security of Canadian and other missionaries in the Congo, he would not be visiting some designated place in that area or even close to it, perhaps some of the adjoining states.

Another matter that comes to mind is this. The hon. member for Red Deer has had experience in certain parts of Africa, but it is my understanding from people who are also quite knowledgeable about that continent that though you may be well received in one part of Africa it does not necessarily follow that you are going to be received with open arms in other parts of Africa. While I have no doubt the hon. member for Red Deer will be more than welcome in Ethiopia, and perhaps in certain other places in Africa, this perhaps would not apply to all the countries he is intending to visit.

I realize that in Africa, and indeed in other parts of the world, the position held opens doors to persons of influence, but the hon. member for Red Deer is a private member of this house. True, he is the leader of a small group of members here, but he is not a member of the privy council or anything of that nature. It seems odd to me that there is not some senior member of the Department of External Affairs who has perhaps a wider and greater knowledge of Africa in general, if not in particular—and even Ethiopia—than the hon. member for Red Deer. We have a great many highly experienced senior members of the Department of External Affairs who have had experience in Africa, and it seems rather odd that one of these persons was not sent as a special representative of the government of Canada, rather than a member, albeit the leader, of one of the opposition parties in the House of Commons.

The minister dealt with this matter slightly in his remarks, but I do not think he has satisfied most of us completely. I mentioned this yesterday briefly and the minister replied, also briefly. I refer to the question as to what extent members of opposition parties should take part in the formulation of government policy, because this in fact ties the hands of opposition parties and in this respect perhaps makes them an even closer ally of the government. I understand this question was settled some time ago. I believe I mentioned 1945 yesterday, but the minister of course was correct when he said it was 1946, after the initial organization meeting of the United Nations in San Francisco when members of all the political parties in this house at the time formed the Canadian delegation.

The minister mentioned Hon. Mr. Bracken, but it is my understanding that really the procedure was instigated by Hon. Mr. Coldwell, namely that it would be unwise for members, and particularly leaders, of opposition parties to take part in the formulation of government policy because it would completely tie their hands in the House of Commons on that particular subject and perhaps even on other subjects when they were being debated. As a result the institution of parliamentary observers was put into effect at the United Nations, which system has of course been copied by a great many other countries.

Now that the minister, for reasons best known to himself—he has probably told us a good many of them—has selected the hon. member for Red Deer for this job, he has certainly departed from that policy, which subsequent governments have followed ever since 1946. I have already mentioned that a policy such as this would help tie the hands not only of the member concerned but of

his party, in this regard, and I think it is a very bad precedent to set.

True, there has to be a balancing of interests in this regard. If it was very clear that the hon. member for Red Deer had a complete and unequalled knowledge of all parts of Africa, particularly the Congo—because that is apparently one of the leading items of business for the hon. gentleman—we might stretch a point; but it seems clear that the experience of the hon. member for Red Deer is largely confined to Ethiopia and not particularly to the Congo or these other parts of Africa mentioned by the minister. I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether the minister could give us a little further explanation with regard to some of the matters I have mentioned.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear, of course, that the hon. member for Red Deer is not formulating policy, any more than an observer who goes to the United Nations formulates policy. The hon. gentleman is going to make a certain assessment and undertake, as a result of discussions I had yesterday with Mr. Spaak, a particular assignment in Nairobi.

I believe my hon. friend will recognize that in this there is no departure from policy or the procedure for participation from time to time by private members of this house in assignments which are accorded to them. The formulation of policy is something that resides with the government, but that does not preclude the government from utilizing the services of individuals, either in the government service or elsewhere in special circumstances such as those presently before us.

My hon. friend is quite correct; there are in the Department of External Affairs, in some of our missions and here at home, individuals with a very wide knowledge of and an expertise in African affairs. The hon. member for Red Deer will be accompanied, when he goes to a number of these places, by an official from the Department of External Affairs. It is in part because the hon. gentleman has knowledge of the area, together with knowledge of some of the personalities there, that it was thought this was a desirable course to pursue.

Mr. Nesbitt: Would the minister permit a further question. Could the minister tell us at what point in time in the next ten days or so the hon. member will visit the Congo or nearby?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I have just said that he would be in Nairobi.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

Mr. Nesbitt: Nairobi? In the Congo?

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly correct that there are many matters in the field of external affairs more important than the one the committee is now discussing, but it is also true that a very important matter is that of the relations between the government and parliament. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the government has not been playing fair with parliament with respect to this whole question.

In the first place, yesterday there was an obvious attempt to avoid having to deal with this matter. Then when we got into committee and the government was unable to avoid dealing with the matter we were given answers which were not as completely frank and straightforward as we feel they should have been. The President of the Privy Council, who is a member of the cabinet and who was present with ten or a dozen other ministers, told us he knew nothing at all about it. Finally we managed to get the Secretary of State for External Affairs into the house and he admitted to us quite openly that the hon. member for Red Deer had been asked by the government to undertake this assignment in Africa. Then when the minister was asked whether there was an order in council in this regard and, if not, how were the hon. member's expenses being paid, the reply of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, first of all, was in this very direct sentence:

> I do not believe there was an order in council.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Nor was one necessary.

Mr. Knowles: That is not what the minister said yesterday.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): And that is what I am saying now.

Mr. Knowles: What the minister said yesterday was:

> I do not believe there was an order in council.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is right.

Mr. Knowles: Then I asked the minister:

> Then how are the expenses being paid?

The reply of the Secretary of State for External Affairs was:

> The hon. gentleman will have to indicate what his expenses were, and they will be examined and the proper procedure will be observed.

I then asked:

> Is there an understanding that the expenses will be paid?

The minister's reply was:

It would be very unfair to ask an hon. gentleman to undertake such a responsibility and pay the expenses himself.

Those exchanges, Mr. Chairman, are to be found at page 9754 of *Hansard* for yesterday, Wednesday, November 4. One can draw from that—one has to draw it; it is not there in clear language—that the expenses of the hon. member for Red Deer are being paid.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There is no doubt about that.

Mr. Knowles: The minister now says there is no doubt about it.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): And I said that yesterday clearly.

Mr. Knowles: The minister did not say that yesterday. The minister said yesterday what is reported on the pages of *Hansard*—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is right.

Mr. Knowles: —and he should stick with what the record shows and not try to distort it.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The hon. gentleman—

Mr. Knowles: I am reading the record.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member must not say that I am trying to distort things, because I am not trying to distort things. I will look at *Hansard*, but I understood that I clearly indicated this yesterday.

Mr. Knowles: That is no point of order.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I do not know why my hon. friend says I am trying to distort it, because I am not trying to distort it.

Mr. Knowles: There is no point of order. The minister is now trying to say what he indicated yesterday to the house; but I am telling the house what he actually said yesterday, and I am doing so not by way of paraphrasing it or by putting it in my own words but by reading his words.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is right.

Mr. Knowles: What the minister said was:

I do not believe there was an order in council.

Then he went on:

The hon. gentleman will have to indicate what his expenses were, and they will be examined and the proper procedure will be observed.

He did not tell us whether they would be paid or what the proper procedure would be, so I went on to ask:

Is there an understanding that the expenses will paid?

The hon. gentleman's answer was:

It would be very unfair to ask an hon. gentleman to undertake such a responsibility and pay the expenses himself.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is right.

Mr. Knowles: So I say, Mr. Chairman, that we are right back where we were before the Secretary of State for External Affairs lost his temper a moment ago; that one can draw from that exchange that the expenses are being paid, although it was not said so clearly.

When the minister answered my question in this regard on orders of the day today he said "Yes, and I said so yesterday". At any rate, Mr. Chairman, we now have it clear; the expenses of the hon. member are being paid. This whole matter could have been dealt with yesterday in a matter of two or three minutes had we had a couple of direct answers.

Now we have this situation. The minister says now in the midst of this present exchange that no order in council is necessary. Obviously, knowing the sections of the Senate and House of Commons Act to which I was referring when I asked my question on orders of the day, he would know that there is a part of the Senate and House of Commons Act which is headed "Independence of parliament". Section 10 of the act reads as follows:

Except as hereinafter specially provided:

(a) no person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the government of Canada—

It has been made very clear today that the hon. member for Red Deer is out in Africa in the service of the government of Canada.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Just in the same way as any ordinary member going to a conference is in the service of the government.

Mr. Knowles: The section goes on:

—at the nomination of the crown or at the nomination of any of the officers of the government of Canada, to which any salary, fee, wages, allowance, emolument, or profit of any kind is attached; and

(b) no sheriff, registrar of deeds, clerk of the peace, or county crown attorney in any of the provinces of Canada,

is eligible as a member of the House of Commons, or shall sit or vote therein.

Many members of this House of Commons have been on delegations of one kind or another. We all know that in order to have our expenses paid when we are on such delegations there either has to be a special vote containing some wording to make it clear that it does not violate this act, or there has to be an order in council covering the special case. Unless the minister can produce a vote in his estimates so worded as to provide for a private member of parliament to be sent on a special mission to Africa of the type the hon. member for Red Deer has been sent on, I submit there will have to be an order in council before the hon. gentleman's expenses can be paid. Otherwise he will have to forfeit his seat under the provisions of section 10 of the Senate and House of Commons Act.

Mr. Rhéaume: They do it retroactively. They have done that before.

Mr. Knowles: That is probably what they will do, yes. I do not mind their doing it so long as they tell us and are frank about it. Whether the government wants to choose a particular person to do a job for the government is for the government to decide. I am not questioning the policy. I think there are questions which could be asked about it. I think it is an awkward position in which the hon. member for Red Deer will find himself when he comes back to Canada as the leader of a party outside of the government, but that is for the government to decide.

What I am concerned about, Mr. Chairman—and let me pinpoint it—is this. The only reason I have entered this debate at all is because I think parliament cannot carry on unless there is the best of relationships between the executive and the members of the House of Commons. You do not get a good relationship when we are played with, as we were yesterday and as we have been today with respect to this matter. If it was formally decided by the minister or the cabinet before the hon. member for Red Deer went to Africa that this was going to be done, and if it is definitely the case, as it now seems to be from what the minister has said, that the hon. member was given an assignment or a job, why did the government not do it in a regular, formal way, and why did the minister not so inform the House of Commons? This is my concern, Mr. Chairman.

There are other angles. The hon. member for Oxford has raised some of them and the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands raised one and may pursue it later.

But my concern is the proper relationship that should exist between cabinet ministers and members of the House of Commons and I submit we have not had that proper relationship in this instance.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend is usually very precise and generally very fair, although sometimes he may not realize that he overstates his case. I think in the very words he has quoted from the record yesterday he will see that I clearly indicated there was no question that the expenses of the hon. gentleman were going to be borne. In fact my hon. friend quoted my own words to that effect. Yet he says that if we had said that yesterday it would have resolved the matter. My hon. friend does not think I am so naïve as to believe that that would resolve the matter. I have seen too many situations in this house, including some of the participations of my hon. friend, to fail to realize that he would not refrain from taking advantage of any occasion which would cause merriment to the treasury benches. I must say that on occasion I have enjoyed that merriment myself but I am not going to say that this is one of the occasions.

With regard to the section of the Senate and House of Commons Act to which my hon. friend has directed our attention I may say quite frankly, and I may be overly naïve in this frankness, that when the question arose of asking the hon. gentleman to undertake this assignment it certainly never dawned on my mind, or in the mind of anyone with whom this matter was discussed, that this action was one that was open to the interpretation which my hon. friend is seeking to give. It must be clear that the hon. member for Red Deer is receiving no emolument and no allowances. He is only going to get his expenses and, as I indicated yesterday, it would be unfair to expect him to undertake this particular assignment if his expenses were not paid.

I have checked with the officials of the privy council office and have been told that unless there is a contractual relationship, which would involve the payment of an emolument or of an allowance or of a consideration, there is no question of an order in council at all. The procedures advised by the treasury officers have been followed. I had no relationship with these arrangements myself except to suggest to the hon. member for Red Deer some of the things that were in our minds with respect to the reasons for which he was going to Africa.

Our authority, of course, is clear with regard to a situation of this kind. In the formulation of foreign policy or in the administration of the department I believe I have the authority under the general powers of administration to utilize those instruments, and this my hon. friend acknowledges, which will enable me and my colleagues to make the necessary policy assessments in this kind of situation. I have presumed, and I am told this is correct, that we have this authority under the departmental item which includes as well an amount for travelling expenses.

As my hon. friend knows, from time to time we engage individuals to do particular jobs in the department. We engage international law lawyers, university professors, in the summer particularly. They are, if members of parliament, clearly within the purport of the two sections to which my hon. friend has referred, but section 16 is the relevant section which calls for the payment of moneys by Canada. If I remember correctly, I do not think my hon. friend referred to this section at all. There is no public money, within the meaning of that section, to be paid to the individual in question. All he is receiving is his expenses, for which he must make a proper accounting to the department. That is the situation.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to partake at length in this debate. The question has arisen whether or not this action is a violation of the Senate and House of Commons Act and I should like to speak very briefly on that point. As has been pointed out by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, there will be no payment by the government out of public funds for any fees, wages, allowances, etc. So this puts the whole matter, in so far as the payment of expenses is concerned, into the same category as the payment of expenses to members of the House of Commons who are appointed as delegates to various interparliamentary bodies.

If the argument that has been advanced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is valid, then I suggest that almost all members of the house are in violation of section 16 of the Senate and House of Commons Act. It is not by my choice that it is necessary for me to go into this matter at this time, but we know for example that the Canadian branch of the commonwealth parliamentary association is granted approximately $20,000 or $25,000 annually and out of that grant members of the House of Commons who go to the conferences, both regional and international, are paid their expenses for travelling and accommodation, plus a certain limited amount of money for certain out of pocket expenses.

With regard to those members who go to the United Nations as observers, I believe they are paid out of the funds of the Department of External Affairs. They are paid the actual amount of their travelling expenses from Ottawa to New York. In addition, accommodation is provided during their stay in New York and they are also paid something like $13 per diem for out of pocket expenses. This is true for the United Nations observers, for the commonwealth parliamentary association delegates, for the interparliamentary union delegates, for the NATO parliamentary delegates and in a number of other special cases such as the recent trip to NORAD and also to SAC. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we must accept the statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs that only actual travelling expenses will be paid in this instance, and certainly this is completely in line with the practice that has been followed in the case of a great many members of the house.

I do not wish to deal at length with some of the other allegations that have been made. I want to say, however, to those members who have suggested that the Social Credit party is probably going to be tied to Liberal government policy—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Rhéaume: That is nothing new.

Mr. Monteith: It always has been.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, if you can hear me over the babbling of these hon. gentlemen—

Mr. Ricard: Why do you deny it so strongly?

Mr. Olson: —I should like to say that the Social Credit party has always regarded its duty to Canada and Canadians as coming first—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Olson: —and these allegations of being tied to or allied with any other party are completely unfounded. If you can hear me, Mr. Chairman, over these rumblings and mumblings that are going on to my right, I should like to point out that we were subjected to this same kind of abuse by the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the government benches when we gave our support time after time to the Progressive Conservative government when they were in office. We gave the reasons for that.

An hon. Member: When?

Mr. Olson: During the session of 1962. This policy has been followed regardless of which party the Canadian people happened to choose to occupy the government benches. I should like you to know also that the Canadian people generally have appreciated the measure of stability this party has given the last two parliaments. We do not intend to depart from that course, regardless of the insinuations or allegations that may be hurled at us.

I may say also, Mr. Chairman, that we are not impressed with these small time insinuations that are being made. As has been very well pointed out by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, there is a very critical situation in certain parts of Africa which requires not only the interest of but certain action by the government and by the parliament of this country. Surely, the purpose is quite obvious. These insinuations are to obtain some temporary political expedient and should be completely disregarded in view of the gravity of the situation. I do not want to get into all of this. I had no intention of taking part in this debate to defend anyone. However, when allegations are made that there may be a violation of the Senate and House of Commons Act to the extent that the hon. member for Red Deer has no right to sit in this house, I simply repeat that if this argument is valid then a majority of the members of this house who have at different times accepted money through one route or another from the public treasury to pay their expenses on trips to the United Nations, Europe, Africa or Asia in the course of the last 12 months, are in the same position. We do not, therefore, accept this allegation at all.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) and I have just heard those of the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) about the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson), who is now in Africa as a delegate or ambassador of the federal government.

The minister stated yesterday that no one could represent Canada so well in Africa, inasmuch as the hon. member for Red Deer had greater experience concerning Ethiopia, and perhaps a few neighbouring countries, than anybody else in Canada. Granted, the hon. member for Red Deer did spend some 15 years in Ethiopia as the man in charge of the educational system. However, I feel the minister could have found in the Canadian diplomatic corps, someone perfectly aware of what is happening in every African country.

Five or six day ago we learned that the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis) has been in Africa for one month on behalf of the Canadian government. I wonder if he is selling three maple leaf flags on stickers for automobile bumpers.

Be that as it may, the Minister without Portfolio is in Africa. Why also send the hon. member for Red Deer? Could it be that the Minister without Portfolio is a useless member within the federal cabinet? We know that he obtained his post of minister merely because he fought Social Credit during the last federal election. Today why does the secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) appoint the hon. member for Red Deer as a double to the Minister without Portfolio in Africa?

The minister tells us: We have very restricted missions in Africa, and that is why we are sending the hon. member for Red Deer, and even in the Congo, where 800 people are kept as hostages, including 26 Canadians.

It should be noted that the hon. member for Red Deer does not speak French, while the language spoken in the Congo is not English but French. If the Minister without Portfolio was there, I would say that perhaps with his convictions, his stakes in this government, he might have some influence on political doings in the Congo. But no, we were told that the hon. member for Red Deer was going there.

Mr. Chairman, in those conditions, if it is decided that because the hon. member for Red Deer lived in Ethiopia for 15 years we will send him to the Congo or to some other African country where he had never gone before, I do not see why the Secretary of State for External Affairs could not send Mr. Michel Chartrand to represent the Canadian government in Castro's Cuba? Why not send Mr. Chartrand to Russia, for instance, where he would feel perfectly at home, where he has close friends and where he might perhaps get somewhere on behalf of the present Canadian government?

Mr. Chairman, it seems childish to me to give us such explanations. They should tell us frankly that the hon. member for Red Deer just has been done the favour of going on a visit to African countries at the expense of the Canadian people, because he and his group promised to support this government

until the next general election and to keep it in office. Then, the minister would be more honest with parliament.

[*Text*]

Mr. Leboe: It is not true.

Mr. Caouette: I hear the hon. member for Cariboo say "It is not true". He knows himself that it is true, and he is the one who opened the door for that situation between the Liberals and his own group.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, we have had enough of those electoral manoeuvres. This has been going on since 1963. I am not a Conservative and I support neither the Liberal nor the Conservatives, but the Liberals are sure that thanks to the support of the Social Credit group led by the hon. member for Red Deer, they will remain in power. That is the main reason why the hon. member has been sent to African countries he has never seen in his life. He will be visiting countries whose language he does not even understand, the Congo, for instance, where French is spoken.

Moreover, I wonder why the people of Canada have to pay for the trip made by the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville. Why is a second representative being sent to Africa? What is the Minister without Portfolio doing in Africa at this time?

The Conservatives have forgotten to ask that, and so have other hon. members, but we all know that the minister has been visiting Africa for the past month. What is he doing there? If he is serving no useful purpose in Africa, he should be brought back to Canada to prevent him from being the shame of our country abroad.

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: What about the Minister without Portfolio?

Mr. Caouette: Over here he stays quiet; over there he says too much. The hon. member for Red Deer does not say anything.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the hon. member for Red Deer has some of the qualities of a diplomat. What is keeping the present government from appointing him ambassador to some country or other, in Africa if need be? But let the government ask him to resign as a member of parliament.

A while ago mention was made that members of the opposition parties had been sent to the United Nations. Yes, that is true. One member of the Social Credit party, one member of our group was sent at intervals of six months, and each time there were two or three Conservative members and some ten Liberals. But when it comes to Africa, two are sent: the Minister without Portfolio and a member of the opposition, the leader of a minority party in the house. This is a feat never before witnessed in parliament. Can the minister give us examples of the appointment of Conservative members, or members of the New Democratic party, or other parties, who were delegated, under similar circumstances, anywhere in the whole wide world? We may have sent delegates to Formosa once, but I do not know under what auspices nor for what reason. At all events, I would not criticize the government for doing so at that time, for I am not even sure of the facts.

Mr. Chairman, they should stop treating us like a bunch of gapers. They should be frank with us instead of telling us fairy tales and cock-and-bull stories.

Let the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell us what it is all about. If he intends to appoint the hon. member for Red Deer ambassador in some country or other, let him appoint him right now and there will be no more questions.

[*Text*]

Mr. Winkler: Does the hon. member consider it might be possible that the hon. member for Red Deer is there to keep an eye on the Minister without Portfolio, or vice-versa?

Mr. Caouette: That is exactly what I said a moment ago. He is over there to check the other man or they are checking each other, I don't know which.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, let them stop stringing us a line. If they wish to appoint the hon. member for Red Deer as ambassador, if he has the required qualifications—if he has lived in Ethiopia for 15 years and if he wants to go back—let the Secretary of State for External Affairs say so frankly and appoint him ambassador to Ethiopia, to Emperor Haile Selassie—for he is an emperor—and let there be an end to the whole thing. Let them stop laughing at us in the house.

On the other hand, if the Secretary of State for External Affairs thinks that to keep his government in power he must absolutely use the good services of the hon. member for Red Deer; here again I wonder whether the method is very honest.

At any rate, we should get explanations as regards, not only the presence of the hon. member for Red Deer in Africa but also that of the Minister without Portfolio.

What is the Minister without Portfolio doing there?

Assuming the hon. member for Red Deer is there to see to the goodwill between the various African states, what is the Minister without Portfolio doing in Africa at the expense of the government? It is time that we know and that the minister gives us the information we want.

Some hon. Members: Jealousy.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I hear some members to my right saying that I speak through jealousy. As usual, these people talk through their hats.

[*Text*]

Mr. Winch: I welcome the opportunity of making a few remarks on this matter but I have no intention of taking the same approach as the hon. member for Oxford, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, the hon. member for Medicine Hat or the hon. member for Villeneuve. In their own way they have all raised most important matters regarding constitutionality, irregularity, payments to members of the house on this kind of job, and implied conspiracy between one party and another.

I do not want to discuss those angles because people better qualified than myself have already done so. Personally I wish the hon. member for Red Deer well during his three weeks in Africa. With his experience and contacts I hope he is able to do what is expected of him and what was anticipated of him when he was appointed to do this job. I hope he can bring back the information which the Secretary of State for External Affairs desires, and I think I would be less than honest if I failed to say that.

However, I would like to have the reasons behind such an appointment explained to me. I find it difficult to understand what kind of African bureau must exist in the Department of External Affairs. I find it difficult to understand that in that bureau there are not those with sufficient experience and knowledge to tackle this kind of job. I am not referring to the hon. member for Red Deer on a personal basis, but I am interested in what kind of advice the minister got when making this appointment. I do not pretend to be an expert on Africa, but in 1960 I had the privilege of attending the United Nations for six weeks, and there meeting a great many African ambassadors, delegates and officials.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): And the hon. member knows something about the situation in Africa too.

Mr. Winch: Eighteen months ago I had the opportunity of being with the commonwealth parliamentary association in Africa for six or seven weeks, and one thing I noted, both at the United Nations and in Africa, is that the African people in emerging nations have something which perhaps we as whites cannot appreciate, a prestige consciousness which gives them a certain psychological attitude. You go to Washington, you go to the United Nations, and the emerging African nations have such a sense of prestige consciousness they have to rent or own the most expensive homes; they have to own the most expensive cars; they demand diplomatic immunity as no other nation ever does. Here in our Commons area I believe there is only one car with a chauffeur, and that is for the Prime Minister. I have been to one state in Africa where, attached to the prime minister's office alone, there are 64 cars and 74 chauffeurs: prestige consciousness. There is the building of skyscrapers—incomplete: prestige consciousness. As the minister must know, very serious trouble has arisen in some countries, particularly in the United States, with regard to diplomatic immunity and the major problem is not one of traffic tickets only, not one of passing through red lights or of accidents; it extends even to killing.

Prestige consciousness: we have to admit it is there, we have to understand it. I say this not only as a result of what I learned by attending meetings of the United Nations or of what I saw while in Africa; it has been confirmed by what I have read ever since then. We may not understand this attitude, but it is the product of long years when Africans were submerged by colonialism and dictatorship along with all that went with such a history. Now, as the Africans rise to independence and are able to take part throughout the world in conferences at the United Nations and so on, this feeling expresses itself. Is this not the understanding of the minister? Is this not the understanding of his African bureau?

Why then was the recommendation made that a member of the opposition, indeed a member of the smallest group represented in the opposition, should be sent to Africa in the name of the government in an attempt to find out and understand their problems,

rather than a cabinet minister or a high ranking official of the department? This question, to me, has a psychological aspect and I am afraid it is a very important one. It follows from the prestige consciousness which I have outlined. It stems from the efforts of Africans to show that they are at least the equal of the white man, if not better than the whites. I am disturbed that the man chosen for this mission is not a member of the government or a representative of parliament at top level. It is not a personal matter at all. I am surprised the man chosen should be a representative of the smallest group in this house.

I think the Secretary of State for External Affairs will appreciate the point I am making. I ask him whether my view is not shared by members of the African bureau of his department or by himself. If I am wrong, let him correct me, though may I say, Mr. Chairman, that I think I am correct. As a matter of fact I had this opinion driven home to me only two days ago at a reception here where there were a group of Nigerians. Because I dared to criticize them out of turn, they told me that if I was ever allowed in Nigeria they would put me on the next plane back. They do not like the white criticizing the black, this is the point I am making. I suggest the basis for a decision of the kind the minister has taken should be an understanding of the psychology of the African and of the prestige consciousness to which I have referred, and that the representative should have been chosen not so much on the basis of the knowledge and experience of the hon. member for Red Deer as on the acceptance and the prestige attaching to the choice.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I should like to say to the hon. gentleman, who has made a thoughtful contribution, that I have noted the points he has mentioned. I was aware of the problems he mentioned before a decision was taken in this case. Perhaps the hon. member will recall that one of the reasons in our minds was that the hon. gentleman in question, because of his long stay in Africa, had made acquaintance in a number of instances with personalities of great importance. This was the primary reason for the decision. We have in our African division and in the limited number of diplomatic missions in Africa, both resident and non-resident, very able officials and they will not regard the assignment as being in any way a reflection upon them, nor is it any reflection upon them. As the minister in charge of this department I wish to say that in the African division here in Ottawa, and in the foreign service in Africa, there are officials of the highest calibre who are doing an outstanding job.

Mr. Churchill: I realize that people on the opposition side who enter into this debate and are critical of the minister may lose an opportunity to be sent abroad as representatives of the government in the future.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): On the contrary.

Mr. Churchill: With the sole exception of myself, because the minister earlier today committed himself to sending me abroad as soon as possible. I think the hon. gentleman will now find that members on the opposition side of the house will be seeking to establish their claim to represent the government overseas by letting us know the number of years they have spent in various countries. I want to draw to the minister's attention the fact that I have spent several years abroad in England and in Europe and that I have met the heads of state of most of the countries of western Europe, and in view of the lack of experienced personnel—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Would the hon. gentleman allow me to point out that it is not so much what he did when he was in Europe as what he has done since?

Mr. Churchill: There is such a scarcity of talent among the hon. gentleman's colleagues that I thought I would just draw this to his attention.

I wonder at the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Yet, why should I wonder? In an accident prone government every one of the members of the cabinet eventually becomes infected with the virus, and the Secretary of State for External Affairs is no exception. Travelling, as he has been for a number of weeks and months, in the stratosphere, he has finally been grounded; we have got him down to earth and he is now in communication with people on the terrestrial sphere—and this is where we want to keep him.

Earlier this afternoon the minister attempted to evade this one question which we raised yesterday, and which could have been settled yesterday had he returned to the house earlier than he did and sent out to the airport with Monsieur Henri Spaak, the distinguished representative of Belgium, one of his colleagues also interested in NATO, the Minister of National Defence or the Minister of Finance. Then he might have returned to the

House of Commons yesterday and we could have had questions and answers on this matter and settled it promptly. But he did not do that; he came back to the house late in the afternoon. Then today he wanted to divert our attention to what he called much more important matters and he wanted to discuss the changes that have occurred in world affairs, in the country neighbouring us, and the atomic explosion that occurred in China. These, he said, were much more important matters than this particular one. Then when we pinned him down to discuss the problem that we raised yesterday, he came up with the story that the hon. member for Red Deer was on a mission abroad with regard to the safety of Canadians who are kept prisoner in the Congo.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is not what I said.

Mr. Churchill: I think the safety of Canadians in the Congo overrides, at the moment, some of these other international situations, important as they are. If this had been the purpose of sending the hon. member for Red Deer abroad, we would have had a statement in the house when this occurred—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is not what I said.

Mr. Churchill: —or we would have had a press release; because this minister is not reticent at all about telling us what he is doing. If you mention the word Cyprus, his breast swells like that of a pouter pigeon and he talks about the great peace keeping activities of Canada, and if action had not been taken in March there might have been serious trouble in Cyprus. You mention the United Nations and again he swells with pride and gives us a long discourse about his experience at the United Nations.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: But here, when the safety of Canadians in the Congo is concerned, it is an afterthought; he said nothing about it yesterday or the day before, and there was no press release. If the safety of Canadians in the Congo is uppermost in the mind of the minister—and I think it should be—why has he not some permanent official in Africa carrying on the negotiations on which he has now sent the hon. member for Red Deer?

The hon. member for Red Deer cannot go to Stanleyville, the minister told us this afternoon. He cannot even go anywhere in the Congo, I presume; he has to go to neighbouring countries. What does he know about these countries neighbouring the Congo, except Ethiopia? The minister raised this in order to cover up what he has been doing. I thought he would give us an exact itinerary of the peregrinations of the modern Marco Polo from Red Deer. Why doesn't he tell us exactly where he is and where he is going? He dropped out some of the points which were brought to our attention by others. Why didn't he say something about Ghana? Is the hon. member going to Ghana?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes.

Mr. Churchill: Thanks. We have that on the record now.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I said that a long time ago.

Mr. Churchill: Is he going to Cairo?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes. That was mentioned earlier in the day.

Mr. Churchill: I suggest that when he goes to Cairo he should be sent to Cyprus, which is not far away, to find out the information that is not available to the Minister of National Defence or to the Secretary of State for External Affairs with regard to a wounded Canadian soldier. Where is that wounded Canadian soldier? Is he hospitalized in Cyprus; is he on his way home; or is this just a minor matter? The hon. member for Red Deer is the particular man for the job; he has been in Ethiopia for 15 years and knows something about the troubles in that area. He is going to be in Cairo. Cyprus is not far away; send him there and he will bring back the information. Talk about carrying a message to Garcia. He is the man who will find out and let us know what the situation is there. I would like to ask the minister something else.

Mr. Knowles: Why not send him to Timbuktu?

Mr. Churchill: I would be very pleased if my colleague from Winnipeg North Centre was in Timbuktu to give him a welcome. Those two together would not only astonish the Africans—

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I assure my hon. friend that I am not jealous of the offer that was made to him earlier today. He can go; I won't.

Mr. Churchill: Let me ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who has already been asked the question: Was there nobody within the government circle who could go on this very important mission? This is what the Canadian people wonder about. We who

sit here in the House of Commons realize the lack of ability on the benches opposite, but the people of Canada have not had this brought to their attention by the government members. I bring it to the attention of the people of Canada now that the people who have the skill and ability are sitting on this side of the house, and one of them is the hon. member for Red Deer who now represents the government abroad.

I ask the minister, what credentials is this hon. member carrying with him? To whom does he present those credentials? When he meets the head of state in Ghana—where I understand they keep the opposition out of the house and in prison—and says he is a member of the opposition in the Canadian House of Commons, will he be treated in the way they treat members of the opposition in that country now? How does he represent the government when he goes to these other countries? What credentials does he carry?

Mr. Rhéaume: He will say he is a Liberal.

Mr. Churchill: My final question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs is this: How do we get a report to parliament from this hon. gentleman when he returns? Is there any way by which we may question him here in committee? I do not know. This is another problem for the committee on rules and procedure. How can the hon. member for Red Deer, representing the government abroad, be questioned here in the House of Commons with regard to the policy statements he has made on behalf of the government?

Mr. Jorgenson: He will be a parliamentary secretary by then.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question? I wonder if he would look into the matter and see whether possibly he could move the adjournment of the house under standing order 26 the day the hon. member gets back, and we could spend the day getting a report.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Don't put the idea into his head.

Mr. Churchill: That and other ideas may occur to us. But if we cannot get a report from the hon. member for Red Deer, will we get it from the Secretary of State for External Affairs; and will we then have to check with the hon. member for Red Deer, I would not say with regard to the accuracy of the report but with regard to the completeness of the report? These are questions which arise in the minds of hon. members, and I hope the Secretary of State for External Affairs, now he is back on earth with us, will give us satisfactory answers.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I listened with very great interest to my hon. friend. He will not misunderstand me if I say that there are occasions in this house when he does not provoke the kind of benevolent interest which attended his remarks during the last ten minutes or so. He has asked a number of questions and I would simply remind him that he himself, I think perhaps on several occasions—on one occasion, certainly, that I know—undertook one of these journeys. Perhaps it was not exactly in the same circumstances, warranting the attribution of being an expert in or knowing exceptionally well the area he was going to visit, but he will remember the report he made to this house on that occasion. We shall profit, I am sure, from the experience of the member for Red Deer in the same way we did when the hon. gentleman on that occasion reported to the house on his peregrinations. I am sorry if my remark on orders of the day today got under my hon. friend's hide when I said he had already arrived on the moon. As I indicated later in a qualification I just was speaking figuratively.

Mr. Churchill: I thank the minister. I did not hear that remark earlier this afternoon but I am glad to have it now. So it did not get under my skin at all. I am very thick skinned anyway.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend should not tell me he is thick skinned.

Mr. Churchill: But not thick headed.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No, not thick headed; I would never accuse my friend of that. However, I do not draw any conclusion from that remark either, because I do want to keep this debate on a very high plane. When the member for Red Deer comes back he will of course make a report. In the light of the report which he makes it will have to be determined whether it is possible at that particular moment for the government to make public some of his findings. I am sure that he himself will take the opportunity, as he does from time to time, to make a report on some of the things he has seen and some of the people with whom he has spoken.

My hon. friend did ask me one important question and that is the reason for which I rose. I am not saying that was the only

important question, but as I recall now I do not think there were any other important ones.

Mr. Nugent: This is the only one you can answer, Paul.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That may be true; but I have a suspicion that I do not have much difficulty in answering some of the questions put, particularly from one quarter of the house. He asked: Did we have anyone in the department who could undertake a mission like this? I have already dealt with that question. My hon. friend has served in the executive arm of the government and he knows that in the Department of External Affairs there is a body of men and women who, by training, have a special qualification for the work assigned to them. This also applies, as I have already indicated, to the African division of the Department of External Affairs.

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question. The minister is a little muddled here. I did not say anything about members of the Department of External Affairs. Please do not confuse me with the hon. member for Villeneuve.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I know my hon. friend did not; but I am, and that is the important part of my intervention which apparently the hon. gentleman has not understood. There were good reasons for the decision which was taken. One of the reasons for the decision was that the hon. gentleman had an acquaintanceship with the area in a special way because of his long period of residence there and because he knew certain personalities.

Mr. Churchill: Was there no one else who could go?

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Would the hon. gentleman permit a question. What particular experience has the hon. member for Red Deer had in those parts of Africa which have been listed this afternoon as the places he is visiting? Does he speak the Bantu languages?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I do not think that would necessarily be a disability. It would, of course, be helpful if the hon. gentleman could speak the language. I know my hon. friend went to Cairo the other day and had a very useful visit. He was able to draw some conclusions which were very valuable and was kind enough to give me some of them.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

But I do not think, unless I am wrong, that he speaks the language spoken there.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I would not expect to be appointed representative of the government of Canada when I do not speak Arabic and have very little experience of the area. However, I should still like to know what experience the hon. member for Red Deer has of the Congo, of Ghana and of some other areas like Kenya, for instance? Has he a close association with Jomo Kenyatta?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I dealt with that earlier. He will be seeing Mr. Kenyatta, who is head of the organization which Canada, the United States, Belgium and several other countries are counting on for assistance in connection with the situation in Stanleyville. But that was not the only reason for which the hon. gentleman was sent there. In fact it was not even the primary reason. It was because of our conversations with Mr. Spaak that this became a very useful thing for us to do, and it was done with the knowledge of that distinguished gentleman.

Now, my hon. friend asked me whether there was no other person who could have been sent. For my hon. friend's benefit—and I was not too anxious to say this—we have sent another person in connection with the particular situation in Leopoldville and Stanleyville. That person has gone to Brussels for purposes of trying, before he goes to Leopoldville, to review in particular the situation which might be expected in the period following the visit of the hon. member for Red Deer. He is a person in the department who has had long experience, as has the hon. gentleman, in Africa and who knows some of the personalities there. I am sure hon. members will appreciate why I cannot go any further.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friends laugh. In this particular situation the lives of 26 people from Canada are involved as well as 800 others.

Mr. Rhéaume: Do not use it as a smokescreen.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am sure my hon. friend understands that it is not desirable to give away facts which would prejudice a very important mission which I hope will be a successful one.

My hon. friend asked me a question about the Canadian soldier in Cyprus. I regret that

my hon. friend has less faith in the United Nations than I have. I regret that he does not think the Cyprus operation has been a useful one. That is his judgment. I am sure it is not the judgment of this house. It is not the judgment of the people of Canada; nor is it the judgment of those 108 soldiers who are conferring today in the west block on peace keeping matters.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege, the minister knows—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Let me answer the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. Churchill: I am speaking to a question of privilege. The minister, who up to this point has been unexpectedly reasonable, is now falsifying the record. I was not finding any fault whatever with the United Nations operations.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The official reports which I have now seen indicate that the Canadian soldier suffered a flesh wound in the arm. However, I am glad to report that his condition is not serious. At the time of the shooting he was not on duty and was unarmed. He apparently failed to stop when challenged by a Greek Cypriot policeman, who did not recognize him as a Canadian soldier. When warning shots were fired he ran toward the Turkish sector. It was then the firing took place which resulted in the arm wound.

The Chairman: Order. It being five o'clock it is my duty to leave the chair in order to permit the house to proceed to private members' business.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that a communication has been received as follows:

Ottawa, November 5, 1964

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. Robert Taschereau, P.C., Chief Justice of Canada, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 5th November, at 5.45 p.m., for the purpose of giving royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
A. G. Cherrier
Assistant Secretary to the Governor General

Mr. Deputy Speaker: 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 private bills, notices of motions for papers, public bills.

PRIVATE BILLS

BANK OF WESTERN CANADA

The house resumed from Thursday, September 3, consideration of the motion of Mrs. Konantz for the second reading of Bill No. S-6, to incorporate bank of western Canada, and the motion proposed thereto by Mr. Perron.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, today, for the third or fourth time since the beginning of this session, Bill No. S-6 entitled, An act incorporating the bank of western Canada is submitted to this house. This bill originated in the Senate, and the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Perron) proposed an amendment thereto that this bill be not now read a second time but that it be read this day six months.

On several occasions during the discussion on this bill we pointed out that three bills for the incorporation of banks were introduced in the Senate and House of Commons.

Two were passed by the Senate, namely, Bill No. S-13 entitled "An act to incorporate the Laurentide bank of Canada", and the present bill incorporating the bank of western Canada.

Another group of citizens request this incorporation of a bank to be known as the bank of British Columbia. The Senate committee on banking and commerce has been studying this bill for several months; the Senate took no action respecting this third bank, and it does not seem at present that it intends to take any more action about it than it has in the past. We stated in this house, and clearly enough so our remarks could be understood by the members of the other place, that our work would be facilitated if we could examine those three bills at the same time, that is Bills S-6, S-13, and S-20, which deal with the incorporation of three banks.

The members of this house are elected by the people; they represent ridings and consequently are entitled to a minimum of consideration by the members of the other place.

Since members of the house have on several occasions expressed the wish to study the three bills at the same time, the senators should at least do something to comply with this wish.

But far from sitting and working to submit this third bill, the members of the other place are constantly taking holidays. The Senate sits two, three or four days and then takes a month's holiday. It sits again and takes another holiday. It has been adjourned for a month and today it is taking another month's holiday.

If the senators do not want to sit, they should tell us so we would refrain from sending bills for their approval, since they are not apparently willing to accept them.

What right have the senators to reject bills brought forward by the people, for the House of Commons' approval, as they are doing when they refuse to defer those bills to this house for study?

By acting this way, Mr. Speaker, I say that the other place is assuming powers which it does not have, that of blocking the passage of legislation, because those powers belong to the elected representatives of the people and not to persons who owe their appointment to the Senate to mere political partisanship.

If members of the other place want to keep on taking holidays, adjourning and not doing their work, then, in my opinion, they themselves are bringing on all the reflections cast upon their institution.

So, when members of this house express the wish to study and analyse those three bills at the same time, I feel this is a perfectly legitimate request and one which the Senate ought to take into consideration.

We have no objection to seeing the banking and commerce committee of the Senate take into serious and due consideration Bill No. S-20, an act to incorporate the bank of British Columbia, but at least let it meet for such a study.

At the rate things are now going, the Senate is not meeting and the senators are enjoying perpetual holidays. Now, how can they pass a bill if they are never in Ottawa? The House of Commons should at least remind the senators now and then that if they want the Senate to keep existing, they must fulfil their duty toward the Canadian people and toward the House of Commons.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Before the hon. member goes any further with his remarks, I take the liberty of pointing out to him the provisions of a section of the standing orders which prohibit him from criticizing the procedure of the other place. I suggest that he should refer to standing order 35 and confine his remarks to the bill now under study.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues is asking me whether we are entitled to speak of the dead. In my opinion, we should leave the dead bury their own dead; I think this would be the best solution.

At any rate, I was able to observe one thing, Mr. Speaker, without being out of order, and it is that the Canadian parliament as a whole is made up of various bodies and that in order to allow progress to be made in the business of the entire parliament, including the House of Commons and the other place, all those bodies must co-operate and do their share of the work to be carried out.

Now, it is noted—and I do not think I need name anyone in particular—that at a certain time of the week, that is, Thursday evening from five to six, the business of the house is brought to a standstill. This is a waste of time both for the House of Commons and all members of parliament. Why? Because one of the parliamentary institutions, namely the House of Commons, is not in a position to play its part entirely.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the House of Commons—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member knows that he cannot do indirectly what our standing orders forbid him to do directly. It is certainly not permissible for him to criticize indirectly the procedure of the other place, as he is trying to do now, when standing order 35 forbids him to do so directly.

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Since we are now considering an amendment to Bill No. S-6 moved by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Perron), do you not think that the hon. member for Lapointe has the right to state the purpose of the amendment, which is to refer the bill to a committee or to give it the six months' hoist?

In my opinion, the hon. member has the right to say why we seek to give the bill the six months' hoist since we would then know where we stand.

I should like you to give a ruling on this matter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair's ruling consists merely in calling the attention of the hon. member who has the floor to standing order 35.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I should like to read standing order 35, and then I suggest you will realize that my observations are not altogether irrelevant.

It says:

No member shall speak disrespectfully of Her Majesty, nor of any of the Royal Family,...

You must agree with me that this is not what I am doing at present.

...nor His Excellency or the person administering the government of Canada; nor use offensive words against either house, or against any member thereof.

I am not using offensive words. I am just saying Mr. Speaker, that the House of Commons has expressed, on several occasions, the desire to consider those three bills together and that, on the other hand, we cannot do so because one is being kept over there.

There is nothing offensive in that, Mr. Speaker. I fail to see how it could be offensive, since it is true. When I say that the members in the other place have been on holidays now for a month it is not offensive; it is the truth, and they know so. If they feel offended, then they should not go on holidays.

Mr. Caouette: When they sit, they sleep anyway.

Mr. Grégoire: When I say that they come back and sit two days and then go back on holidays for another month, under the rules you will admit that it is not offensive; it is true, they do go on holidays. If they feel offended, they should not go on holidays.

I think that I am in order and I have no intention of offending them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member has submitted his arguments and so has the hon. member for Villeneuve.

The argument of the hon. member for Lapointe, who stated that a remark cannot be offensive if it is true, is unacceptable.

I refer the hon. member to quotation 381 of Beauchesne's which provides that the debate on the second reading of a bill must deal with the principle of the bill. I think that when he speaks about the consideration given or denied to the bill at the other place, he is wandering from the principle of the bill or the motion now before the house.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I was more particularly referring to the amendment providing that the said bill should not be read a second time, but that it be postponed for a period of six months.

This is what I am talking about. Why give it the six months' hoist? It seems to me that this amendment was moved long ago and it has already received a six months' hoist. The other place had begun to delay the sending of the third bill, Bill No. S-20, to the House of Commons. We thought that six months would have been time enough to enable us to receive this bill. However, today we are surprised to learn that six months have not been enough.

Therefore, it may perhaps be necessary to ask for the second reading to be postponed for a year in order to give those who are supposed to send us the third bill I mentioned, more time for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, that is the reason—I want to make that clear—why we are asking to postpone the second reading of this bill until a later date.

We feel that we will then better fulfil our duty as members of the House of Commons, as representatives of the people—and I insist on the expression "representatives of the people"—because we will have all the facts before us.

To our minds, to have all the facts before us is to have the three bills, not one or two, but three.

We do not oppose second reading of the bill as such. We do not oppose the setting up of other banks in Canada. But we are against the fact that we are denied the opportunity of studying the three bills at the same time.

I insist on letting it be known, clearly, categorically, and unequivocally, so that the members of the other place might know that we do not want to be handicapped in our work with regard to private bills.

We express the wish, and I trust there is in this nothing offensive, that in the vicinity of this house our request be taken into serious consideration so that we may receive all bills bearing on corporations and new banks, in order that we may be able to do justice, not only to the members of the house who will study the bills in committee, but also to those who have submitted petitions with a view to obtaining a bank charter for they too suffer serious detriment as a result of what goes on in a certain branch of this parliament, and suffer losses through ensuing delays.

That should be taken into consideration. That is why I make this appeal through you, Mr. Speaker—for I know you have the opportunity of meeting the parties concerned—that the people from the other place send us Bill No. S-20 as soon as possible in order that second reading of the three bills on banks might be proceeded with and that they be studied in committee; thus we might give satisfaction to all interested parties who are entitled to such consideration.

[*Text*]

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this discussion,

I thought it might be useful first of all to put on the record a few facts about British Columbia, the province most likely to be affected by the passage or otherwise of the legislation before us. Personally, I represent the riding of New Westminster which is the most populous riding in Canada west of Toronto. It lies in the centre of the lower mainland of British Columbia, and the lower mainland of British Columbia is an area in which we have now more people concentrated per square mile than is the case in comparable areas in either Belgium or Holland.

There are very good reasons, Mr. Speaker, why British Columbia should have had long ago, and certainly now should have, a large financial institution with its head office in our province. I should like to put before you some statistics concerning British Columbia and its commercial operation. British Columbia, of course, is third in size of all the provinces and third in size with regard to population. Excluding the lakes, it is actually a larger province than Ontario but its most important financial community, Vancouver, is isolated from the centres of financial activity in Canada, namely Toronto and Montreal, by almost a continent. It is in those areas of Toronto and Montreal, of course, in which we find the head offices of our leading financial institutions.

Mr. Lloyd: May I raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Halifax on a point of order.

Mr. Lloyd: My point is that the bill before us has to do with the incorporation of the bank of western Canada. I believe, generally speaking, that under the rules of relevancy we should be considering the merits of this private bill and the matters which it contains. I do not believe we should be discussing the importance of a bank being located elsewhere or established by some other people.

Mr. Mather: In reply, may I say that I am directing my remarks to the point that several bills are on the order paper which affect western Canada, and particularly British Columbia. I was going to go on and try to prove that we cannot consider one without keeping in mind the other two bills which bear on this point.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With regard to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Halifax, I would say that the rules of the house allow us to consider only one thing at a time and the matter now before the house is Bill No. S-6, dealing with the incorporation of the bank of western Canada. Even though there are other bills which may come up and which may be affected, directly or indirectly, by this particular measure, I suggest the hon. member should confine himself as much as possible to the principle of the particular bill before us now.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, may I also point out that there is a motion which, as I recall, provides for a six months' hoist. It seems to me this has some relationship to other bills which are coming before us having to do with the incorporating of banks, and it may be an explanation why the mover of the motion suggested a six months' hoist. There is some relevancy to the other banking legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That is the interpretation of the hon. member, but the only things before the house are the bill and the amending motion, and the amending motion makes it still more restrictive and does not in any way enlarge the scope of the bill.

Mr. Mather: Keeping your view in mind, Mr. Speaker, may I say that in my opinion B.C. is a section of western Canada and anything affecting western Canada affects B.C. However, I shall try to abide by your ruling. Present business activity in B.C. was well illustrated by the brief recently presented by that province to the hon. gentlemen in the other place. It revealed that while the population of that part of western Canada which is B.C. is somewhat less than the population of the combined area of the Atlantic provinces, nevertheless it has a labour force 2.5 per cent greater, a labour income 55 per cent greater, retail sales 21 per cent greater, factory shipments 134 per cent greater and cheques cashed 238 per cent greater than the combined Atlantic provinces.

Mrs. Konantz: On a point of order, I would like to ask why the hon. gentleman is discussing the facts of B.C. and not the proposed bank of western Canada which will have its headquarters in Manitoba and will be primarily concerned with that and the other two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta?

Mr. Mather: Mr. Speaker, I tried to make it clear that in my opinion we cannot consider this bill without taking into consideration the needs of B.C., which is part of western Canada. I think that the realities of B.C.'s international and national trade position differ greatly from those of the areas in the central provinces which are served by the existing

private banks, and there is great need for the establishment of a bank in western Canada, particularly in B.C., to serve the interests of that area.

Having said that, I want to express my opposition to the passage of the bill before us and my support for the amendment, which I understand would give a six months' hoist to the bill. My contention is that this bill cannot logically be considered unless we keep in mind with it the other two bills which have been before the other place. The people in western Canada to my knowledge, particularly those in B.C., have never asked for the establishment of the bank which this bill would establish. On the other hand the people in that part of western Canada which is B.C. have overwhelmingly endorsed the idea of the establishment of a provincial bank of British Columbia.

As hon. members know, the government of B.C. and the official opposition in that province, although they differ upon many matters are united in their desire for the establishment of the bank of British Columbia, for its incorporation, and for the provision that it should have the origin of its finances in that province.

As hon. members also know, approval of the incorporation of that institution was rejected—

Mr. Lloyd: I appreciate how the hon. member may feel about the possible development of a bank in British Columbia but I think he should be required to relate his observations to reasons why this bill should or should not pass, or to reasons why the amendment should or should not be accepted. We are getting far away from the intent and purpose surrounding the introduction of a private bill during this hour.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to understand why this point of order should be raised by a member from Halifax, inasmuch as the area under discussion is rather remote from the area he represents. Perhaps he does not appreciate the points of view the hon. member for New Westminster is trying to express. It seems to me that in considering the principle of this bill the general impact of banking proposals in the region which some of us over here represent should be considered.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I suggest the hon. member is participating in the debate rather than making a contribution on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Lloyd). On that point may I say it is a basic rule that we have to be relevant at all times, but as Beauchesne says it is not very easy to determine to what extent the rule has to be applied. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Mather) knows the rule and I would ask him to try to relate the remarks he is now making to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Lloyd: I have a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Some reference was made to the fact that because I was a member for Halifax this should deter me from raising a question of order. Surely that is fantastic. I am concerned with the procedures of the house and it makes no difference whether I come from—I was going to say Red Deer—B.C. or Nova Scotia.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for Medicine Hat rising on a new point of order?

Mr. Olson: Yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before he does so may I say there was not a point of privilege in the matter raised by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Lloyd), and I suggest we forget that aspect in our discussions. I am wondering if the hon. member for Medicine Hat is rising on a new point of order, because the Chair is under the impression that the first one had been disposed of.

Mr. Olson: I merely wish to say that on two occasions the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Lloyd) raised a point of order attempting to confine or restrict the area of discussion chosen by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Mather). I heard nothing in the remarks of the hon. member for New Westminster that led me to believe he had violated the rule of relevancy. On page two of the bill before us there is a list of names of directors. I have not counted them, but there are about 20 from the province of B.C. Surely that is an indication that this bank intends to extend its operations into B.C. Everything the hon. member for New Westminster has said concerns the financial community within B.C., and therefore he is completely in order.

Mr. Mather: I would like to thank hon. members who in their wisdom support my contention that B.C. is a part of western Canada. I do not have much more to say, but I do want to affirm there can be no doubt that, in sending this bill to us, the other place has acted contrary to the wishes of

the vast majority of British Columbians, whose enthusiasm for a real provincial bank of British Columbia is so great that they are already offering to subscribe money in such volume that the province will likely have to put up only a mere 10 per cent of the share capital.

I think there is no question but that the passage of the bill before us for the creation of the bank of western Canada would mitigate against the successful establishment and growth of the proposed provincial bank of British Columbia. Speaking as a representative from British Columbia I think the action taken in the other place on the legislation before us has resulted in making more difficult the satisfaction of the aspirations of British Columbians. It seems to me to be highly questionable, to put it mildly, that some gentlemen who have no electoral responsibility and who either have had, or retain, private banking interests should sit in judgment upon the applications of three banks—two private and one public—and for them to bless two and stymie the third. I think that in doing so they have done a deep injustice to the people of British Columbia by withholding permission for the establishment of a bank capable of doing great service for British Columbia.

Mr. Basford: May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for New Westminster is clearly out of order in reflecting upon the proceedings in the other place, contrary to the terms of citation 149 of Beauchesne. It is clearly stated there that reflections upon proceedings in the other place are out of order. Moreover, the hon. member imputed motives to hon. gentlemen in the other place—

An hon. Member: They deserve it.

Mr. Basford: —and I suggest that for the sake of the record it might be well to point out two facts. First, the measure concerning the bank of western Canada received first reading in the other place on February 27 of this year. The bill concerning the Laurentide bank received first reading on March 24 and the bill having to do with the bank of British Columbia received its first reading on May 6. These three bills came into the other place at different times of the year and it would seem to me only proper that they should come out of it at different times.

The other point I wish to make is this. It is simply that the committee on banking and commerce in the other place met only yesterday to consider the bill about which the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Mather) is complaining, and that committee is prepared to meet again as soon as British Columbia produces further evidence.

Mr. Howard: I wonder if I may say a word on that part of the point of order which had to do with references to the proceedings of the Senate. Do I understand that the citation referred to by the hon. member was citation 147?

Mr. Basford: Citation 149.

Mr. Howard: In any event, the citation is an extensive one and if I were to undertake to read it now I would not be able to comment on the point of order because you, Mr. Speaker, would wish us to proceed with the debate. But it has been a long standing practice, as some hon. members know who have taken part in the marathon debates on certain private bills with which we do not now have to deal, to use as a basis for argument for or against any particular private bill, evidence given before a committee of the other place, because this is the only information in detail we have, apart from that which may be provided by the sponsor of a bill on second reading. I submit it is entirely in order to use the evidence taken before a committee of the Senate which may have heard this or any other private bill, to bolster arguments for or against the principle of the bill.

With regard to the information given by the hon. member as to what is taking place in the Senate, I am afraid some of us are not so enamoured of the other place as to pay a great deal of attention to what is going on there. But it is a fact that the Senate is now proceeding to deal with the bill relating to the bank of British Columbia, I think this is all the more reason why the sponsor of the bill now before us should agree to postpone or withdraw it until we can deal with all three of these measures in an orderly fashion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The point raised by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Basford) is well taken. The Chair did bring to the attention of one hon. member who participated in the debate the standing order itself, and there are, of course, various citations which also deal with the matter. Citation 147(1) says:

> Allusion to debates in the other house are out of order and there are few orders more important than this for the conduct of debate and for observing courtesy between houses.

Citation 149(b) says that a member while speaking must not—

—refer to any debate in the Senate, but he may refer to the official printed records of the upper house, though they have not been formally communicated to the lower house.

Citation 157(3) (e) says it is out of order to read extracts in the debate if they allude to debates in the other house of parliament. These citations are all fundamentally the same and I think they reflect a basic rule of debate which members with experience in this chamber would wish to recognize. In view of this, I invite the hon. member who has the floor to keep the standing order and these citations in mind and to restrict his consideration to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): On the point of order, may I point out that the reference was not to debates in the other place but to proceedings before the banking and commerce committee, the printed record of which is a public record.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I believe it is the same thing—

Some hon. Members: Oh, no.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is the suggestion of the Chair that members of the house in their speeches may not refer to proceedings in the Senate—I believe that is the rule—or "reflect on the proceedings in the Senate". Perhaps that is a better way of putting it.

Mr. Leboe: I wonder if I might point out that citation 149(b) reads:

—but he may refer to the official printed records of the upper house, though they have not been formally communicated to the lower house;

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I suggest that we move on and continue our discussion of the measure being studied by the house. The point just raised by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Leboe) is highly hypothetical. The citation says a member may refer to the printed record of the upper house, but I did not hear the hon. member who has the floor refer to the official record of the upper house. I would ask him to continue his comments.

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A point of order has been raised and the Chair has given a ruling. If there is a new point of order it can be considered but I suggest the point raised by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Basford) has been sufficiently discussed and that we should go on with the speech of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Mather).

Mr. Basford: My point of order did not refer to reading from the record of Senate committees. It referred to the hon. member for New Westminster making imputations as to the motives of senators. Had he referred to the record of the committee of the other place he would have found that the premier of British Columbia supported the incorporation of these two private banks.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on an entirely new point of order in connection with the point of order raised by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Basford).

The hon. member mentioned that the motion for first reading of Bill No. S-20 had been carried after the motion for first reading of the two other bills on May 7.

Mr. Speaker, if the motions for first reading of these bills were carried on May 7, it proves beyond a doubt that the other place did not proceed with dispatch inasmuch as seven months have elapsed since then.

[*Text*]

Mr. Mather: I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the other members of the house who have given me the benefit of their counsel.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): For using up the time.

Mr. Mather: What I have to say now will come as somewhat of an anticlimax. I will make one more reference to the subject I mentioned earlier. Although I am one who, perhaps for sentimental reasons, has some affection for the gentlemen of the other place, it is actions such as this which affect bills to incorporate banks that make me wonder whether it will not bring the gentlemen of the other place into disrepute if they are continued, because they go so contrary to the will of a great many people in this country, and certainly a great many people in western Canada.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that on every logical ground there is a need in western Canada, and particularly in British Columbia, for a bank of British Columbia with its head offices in Vancouver and its funds in or from western Canada, and particularly British Columbia. As the passage of the bill before us—disregarding for the moment the amendment—would delay the creation of this very important service for

that part of western Canada which is British Columbia, I oppose it.

Mr. J. E. Lloyd (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, it so happens that my viewpoints are not too distant from those expressed by the members who have indicated their concern about the actions of the other place.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lloyd: I feel, however, that our tactics have been completely wrong. I think it is clear that there are two companies here who have put forward their propositions to incorporate a bank and comply with all the conditions of the Bank Act. I believe that is obvious. Therefore I see no reason why in this private members' hour we should not recognize the efforts of private entrepreneurs to enter the competitive banking field of Canada when they have all the indications of being successful ventures that are well organized and can meet all the requirements that we normally impose upon banks in regard to the purposes to which they commit themselves.

If this house were to pass these two bills would we not have established a very solid criterion of legislative procedure, and would not the case be strengthened for forcing the other place, if that is required, and certainly to strengthen the arguments in this house to require anybody opposing the establishment of a bank of British Columbia to state specifically why they oppose it at this time? I suggest that the motion to defer this matter for six months defeats the very purpose of its proponents, and I earnestly suggest that we should pass this particular bill and give favourable consideration to the bill with respect to the Laurentide bank of Canada—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Lloyd: —withdraw this motion and then proceed—

Mr. Grégoire: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Lloyd: Not at the moment; when I have finished my remarks. We could then proceed and see what happens with respect to the third bill. I think hon. members would have a much stronger case if they were to allow the passage of these two bills, rather than forcing the identification of the reasons for passing these two bills and holding up the other one.

[Mr. Mather.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. P. Antoine Bélanger (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I too wish to speak against the passing of this bill.

Mr. Choquette: Why?

Mr. Bélanger: For several reasons which I shall give you in a moment if you will bear with me.

First, I want to say that I entirely agree with the statement made by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) concerning the work in the other place. I also have another very important reason for opposing the passing of this bill. As all hon. members know, the revision of the Bank Act will be proceeded with next year. So, I do not see why all those banks that are asking for new charters could not wait until we have studied the amendments to the Bank Act to get these new charters from parliament.

But my main objection to the granting of a new charter to the bank of western Canada is based, as I mentioned when the bill was brought before the house, on the methods used in the banking system itself. I have already attempted to explain that such methods are arbitrary, anti-democratic and anti-social privileges.

I have shown that, with their ability to create and suppress credit, the banks hold such great powers that they control all the people's business and even the government. This means that the country or the provinces are actually governed by the banks, that is by citizens who have not been elected by the people; and we dare call our parliamentary system a democratic system.

At any rate, the reasons which led me before to vote against this bill still prevailing, I shall, therefore, continue to oppose the passing of this bill.

Quite sincerely, I do not see why I should vote in favour of extending to some citizens certain rights which, I feel, are prejudicial to the people.

The power to withdraw or create credit should no longer be left in the hands of private interests; instead, it should be assumed by the government, which could use it with the interests of the people and of the country as its first concern. As it is, that power benefits only a few and is prejudicial to all.

That would be the only way of making it possible for the provinces to meet their increasingly heavy obligations without plunging into debt the future generations and enslaving them even before they are born.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It has just been drawn to my attention that the hon. member has already participated in this debate; if he will refer to *Hansard*, he will see that he spoke on this bill on August 6.

Mr. Bélanger: Mr. Speaker, I must say quite sincerely that I thought I had spoken on the motion for second reading of the bill, not on the amendment. I do not think I made any remarks on the amendment but I will abide by your ruling if you say I did. Personally, I feel I participated in the debate on second reading but not on the amendment.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bélanger: Mr. Speaker, I should like very much to get an answer to the question I just asked you, as to whether or not I spoke on the amendment?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the hon. member will refer to *Hansard* of August 6, on page 6491, he will find that he spoke for nine minutes.

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I have a few very brief remarks to make on this bill so that we may have time to pass it, if hon. members opposite are willing to show their goodwill.

I also wish to point out that the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Bélanger) wanted to speak a second time in order to continue the filibuster against this bill.

I also wish to point out to the house that the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) virulently denounced the Conservative filibuster on interim supply while he took the floor on four occasions himself during the discussion of those estimates.

Mr. Speaker, one wonders how sincere are those people? One wonders whether they are not playing the fool?

Mr. Bélanger: Mr. Speaker, a while ago you called the hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Mather) to order when he was speaking about British Columbia.

I suggest that the hon. member for Lotbinière is wandering far away from the subject before us, since he is dealing with the behaviour of the members in the house, and I would ask you to call him to order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That is right; the hon. member for Lotbinière knows that he must limit his remarks to the principle of the bill now before us.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to say that I regret the filibustering tactics of our friends opposite, their attitude since they have been sitting in this house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

[*Text*]

Mr. Bert Leboe (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Leboe: We are not going to have the question at this very moment. Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this bill I should like to mention one or two matters which I think are mighty important in connection with banking. The bill we have before us relates particularly to the fact that when we have what is known as a tight money policy we find this policy is instituted primarily because there are inflationary tendencies within certain areas of Canada. The areas which are considered inflationary or as having inflationary tendencies are lumped together with those places in Canada which actually have a deficiency in the money supply.

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

THE ROYAL ASSENT

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, 1965.

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 ten o'clock p.m. are as follows:

1. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan), shipping, reported lack of service to Caribbean.

[*Translation*]

And the second question: the hon. member for St. Mary, labour conditions—increase in unemployment in the province of Quebec.

[*Text*]

The house will now revert to the business which was interrupted at five o'clock.

SUPPLY

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

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

The Chairman: It is the understanding of the Chair that vote No. 1 of the Department of External Affairs stands and that we are to proceed with the Department of the Secretary of State. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

1. Departmental administration, $363,600.

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Chairman, the consideration of the estimates of the department and the agencies for which I am responsible presents unusual problems because of the reorganization which has taken place since the main estimates were tabled. The department itself has been divided into two main sections headed by two deputy ministers. The deputy registrar general is now responsible for all matters which used to be under the Department of the Secretary of State, with the exception of the translation bureau but including the administration of the Patent, Copyright and Trade Marks Acts, for which the Minister of Justice is now responsible.

With regard to that section of the department which is still under my responsibility, I have nothing in particular to report to the committee except to say that a substantial revision of the Companies Act is now being considered in the other place and will soon be ready, I hope, for study and examination by the House of Commons. The under secretary of state is responsible for the translation bureau and the national museum, which has been transferred from the department of northern affairs to my department. He advises me also on questions of administration and financial policy affecting the various agencies reporting to me. I will enumerate those agencies later on.

[*Translation*]

At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words concerning the bureau for translations. In that service, the work load has tremendously increased these last few years. I think that the development of government activities, the extension of parliamentary works and the increase in the number of royal commissions, account in great part for this situation.

The bilingualism policy adopted by the government is another important incidental factor. The simultaneous interpretation branch was also literally snowed under. Under such conditions, it is no wonder that the quality of the work has fallen down, in certain cases, in spite of the dedication of the staff to whom I must pay tribute. We are taking various steps to remedy that situation. The salaries have been increased and an office was set up in Montreal to make recruitment easier. We hope to be able to add at least 50 new employees to the staff during the next few months. In order to promote recruitment, special courses are offered to those who would like to become translators or interpreters but who do not have all the required qualifications. The purpose is not only to increase the staff, but production must be improved and also the quality of services, and that is why we intend to proceed with a reorganization where it is desirable in the bureau for translations.

As a first step, we are now setting up a terminology centre under the direction of Mr. Pierre Daviault who is leaving his position as superintendent of the bureau of translations. We are very happy to take advantage in this way of the long experience acquired by Mr. Daviault in the field of recruiting, at a time when scientific techniques change so quickly and the translation of specialized vocabularies causes difficulties. The main purpose of this new centre will be to keep up with the evolution of specialized terminology, by consulting appropriate publications and keeping in contact with similar organizations existing in other countries and on the international level as well.

It will establish a terminology filing system, as well as a catalogue and a library of technical reference works. It will also publish occasionally glossaries of which the public

will be able to take advantage, in accordance with a recommendation of the Glassco commission.

In this way the terminology centre will be in a position to render a great many services. It will save time for translators; it will help to improve the quality of translations and standardize the technical vocabulary in Canada, in both official languages.

In short, valuable improvements have been made recently within the bureau for translations. Other reforms are initiated and I shall report on them next year.

In closing that part of my remarks I want to say that the government intends to make of the bureau for translations a fully efficient agency, because it is an essential part of our bilingualism program.

[*Text*]

I now come to the agencies for which I am responsible to parliament. Members of the committee will remember that my predecessor, the present Minister of Transport, was responsible for the following agencies: The civil service commission, the chief electoral officer, the B.B.G., the C.B.C., the national film board, the national gallery, the archives and the national library. All those agencies still report to the Secretary of State. In addition I continue to be responsible for the centennial commission and the economic council, as I was as president of the privy council. The Department of Public Printing and Stationery now reports to me instead of to the Minister of Defence Production. Finally, the Canada Council reports to me and not to the Prime Minister as it used to do.

I am quite sure that all members of the committee will agree that it would become quite bothersome if I were to make separate statements on each individual agency. Therefore I propose to make only three general statements covering them all and outlining the main programs and plans which concern them individually. Such a progress report will, I think, give a much better idea of what government and its agencies are trying to do in those fields, and will provide to the members of the committee some kind of general framework which will put them in a much better position to appreciate what is being done or contemplated for the immediate future. I hasten to say that this approach is not intended in any way to restrict hon. members' right to discuss as long as they wish each individual item of those estimates.

In this first statement I intend to refer briefly to two different agencies which are quite unrelated to each other, the economic council and the civil service commission. When the estimates of my department, those of these two agencies and of the chief electoral officer, have been approved, I propose at the proper occasion to make two other general statements, one on the cultural policy of the government and on the so-called cultural or information agencies, the other on centennial preparations and the centennial commission.

The economic council of Canada held its first meeting on January 14 and 15, 1964, in Ottawa. The government is very proud to have succeeded in securing the services of Dr. John Deutsch, Louis Couillard and Arthur Smith to act respectively as chairman, vice chairman and full time director of the council. We also feel that the other 25 members of the council represent very well all the major components of the private sector of our economy. In addition I am satisfied that the council has succeeded in getting an efficient and devoted staff.

All the members of the committee who are interested in the activities of the council have already, I am sure, carefully read its annual report which was tabled on July 15. I do not have very much to add to the information contained in that report. In its first year of activities the council has concentrated its attention on the development of its internal organization, the building up of a solid research base and the establishment of liaison arrangements with similar provincial agencies and the main private sectors of the economy.

The highest priority in this program of work has been assigned to the preparation of the first of its annual reviews of Canada's medium and long term prospects and problems. This review will deal with the tasks and goals of the Canadian economy for the next five years up until 1970. It will be published in December.

Work is also under way on a number of other projects and studies. Working committees on economic growth and problems of adjustment, on labour management relations, on productivity and on industrial research and technology have been established to facilitate the development of this work. The council is sponsoring a national conference on labour management relations to be held in Ottawa next week. This conference will mark a new approach in the promotion of labour management consultation and will be based on research studies which are being specifically prepared by leading experts. In addition, the council is sponsoring a number of special studies by outside experts. All this work and

analysis will provide not only the basis of advice to the government but also valuable information to the private sectors of the economy which will help them to make their own decisions and forward plans.

The council's initial investigation and information of advice, have been given an unprecedented degree of independence. The bringing to bear of an informed, independent appraisal of the medium and long range implications of government policy may be one of the most useful consequences of the establishment of the council. This independence will not be weakened or destroyed by any action of this government.

No problem area which bears on Canada's economic future is beyond the scope of the council's inquiry. How it examines these problems is entirely within its competence. There is a provision in the act for the government formally to seek the advice of the council on specific problems or government policies having long run economic implications. In deference to the work load undertaken by the council in its initial year of operations, the government has not yet sought advice from the council on specific policies. The council's first annual review will provide a useful, over-all perspective within which future references by the government could be made.

The council has held meetings with the provincial economic and productivity councils and expects to meet again with these bodies after the publication of its first annual review. The chairman of the council has assured me that on the basis of the review every effort will be directed at developing effective and practical means of consultation with the appropriate provincial agencies in regard to all matters of common concern.

The council has met six times so far this year, and there have been numerous meetings of the various committees. The diligence with which the council, under the active chairmanship of Dr. John Deutsch, has applied itself to the task set for it, is to be commended. This is obviously a working council. The fruits of that labour will shortly be available to parliament and the Canadian public in the form of the first annual review. The government looks forward with confidence and high expectations to this first substantive publication of the council. This document and the subsequent recommendations will carry the weight of expert analysis and the collective wisdom of a body whose members, in their own right, are leaders in the private sector of the economy.

[Mr. Lamontagne.]

Thus we feel that we have a good piece of legislation and a good, dynamic council which will soon be in a position to make an essential contribution, through its research, its projections and recommendations, to the development of economic planning in Canada.

In presenting the estimates for the current fiscal year, the civil service commission wishes to report to the committee on a number of activities which should be of particular interest, either because they represent significant changes in traditional programs or are innovations designed to solve new problems encountered in providing staff and services for the departments and agencies of the civil service.

The commission has established a new salary administration plan, and a systematic appraisal program for senior officers in the civil service. It is also constructing a manpower inventory of managerial and professional resources. This inventory will be kept up to date and will provide a ready and quick means, consistent with the merit principle, for meeting the needs of all departments and agencies, at the senior levels. It is hoped that a purposeful career development program can be evolved for senior officers to ensure that there is a reservoir of competent managerial talent, available to the public service sufficient to meet the increasingly demanding requirements which rapidly changing socio-economic conditions will create.

Following a preliminary analysis of requirements for senior managerial staff, it was concluded that a much more significant development program is required for senior officers than the one-month course given annually over the past several years. The commission instituted this year a four-month senior course in public administration held in residence at Carleton Place. Some 30 officers, carefully selected from departmental nominations, were admitted to the course last spring. This course was assessed as being extremely valuable to the participating departments, and the commission has now established this program as an annual activity in response to the demands of the senior officials in government departments throughout the public service.

As a result of recommendations made by the preparatory committee on collective bargaining, the government concluded that a substantial change in the civil service classification system would be required as prerequisite to the introduction of collective bargaining and arbitration. On the request of the government, the commission has undertaken a

classification revision program intended to produce class structures based, in the main, on occupational grouping designed to apply horizontally throughout the civil service. The bureau of classification revision has been established to undertake this project. Another unit, a classification branch, has been established to meet the day-to-day requirements in relation to the present classification system; this unit will work on a diminishing scale, as the new classification system is put into effect.

With the advent of collective bargaining, the commission has been giving careful consideration to its future role in staffing the civil service. The commission, like industry and commerce, is faced with problems in recruitment created by the increasing demand for more highly trained technical and professional staff, not to mention managerial staff. Early in 1965 the commission hopes to be in a position with staff and facilities to compete effectively with other institutions, both public and private, for a fair share of available manpower resources. The commission is convinced that unless it takes an aggressive attitude in this competitive market the service will be at a serious disadvantage in meeting its commitments to the public over the next five to ten years.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, at the end of September 1963, the treasury board authorized the staff and appropriations required for the launching, early in 1964, of a central program for the teaching of the two official languages to public servants.

The commission then proceeded to the appointment of a co-ordinator and an advisory committee, the renting of premises, the installation of a language laboratory and the hiring of four teachers.

The first stage of the program was completed during the first semester of 1964, when three courses in French and one in English, the length of which varied from ten weeks in the case of part-time courses to four full-time courses, were given to 42 civil servants designated by the different departments and grouped on the basis of scientific tests.

After taking into consideration the past experience, the program was developed further and strengthened during the summer of 1964.

Before it opened in September the school was provided with an additional laboratory, the number of classrooms was increased to 10, and the personnel to eight teachers and two supervisors.

It is anticipated that in January 1965 the total staff will include 20 full time and ten part time teachers.

During the second phase of the program the school will thus be able to accommodate, during a 12-month period, approximately 700 students who will attend courses of various lengths.

The commission is basing its program on some very solid facts, one of which is that, in selecting teachers, establishing facilities and choosing programs, the commission must measure up to the standards required in this highly specialized area of teaching a second language to adults, according to the resources available in our country at this moment for this purpose.

There must be a small number of students in each classroom, because it appears that a class of eight to ten students, instead of 15 as had previously been figured, offers the best possibilities of profitable exchanges between teacher and students.

It is also important to note that no single formula can be applied universally and that the program, as a whole, must offer a diversity of courses which can benefit various classes of students.

Therefore, a complete training from the elementary and intermediate levels will produce a meagre success if it is not on a full time basis, or at least of a half-day duration, with all the equipment required during an initial phase of intensive training lasting as much as four months. This would be followed by a second phase of a duration of several months, with a less intensive on-the-job training.

That is why courses of a half-day duration will be given only, in general, to more advanced students or as an extension of the intensive training.

They will also be offered to those employees whose work only requires a very limited knowledge of both languages, as well as to senior officials who have a great ability to learn, but who really cannot stay away from their duties. If such courses were ever made available to all civil servants, it would rather be with a view to sustaining the general interest, pending the establishment of entirely satisfactory facilities.

The commission is convinced that in order to be useful, a training program must be supported by supplementary arrangements designed to provide graduates with a real

opportunity to make good use of and to improve their newly acquired knowledge. Those arrangements will include personal incentive programs to be applied at home, but also opportunities for work under bilingual conditions.

The commission will be pleased to lend a hand to such departments as wish to help in setting up such conditions. In the meantime, it is imperative that, during the training stages, each group be composed of students who have approximately the same education and aptitudes for learning.

Consequently, it is necessary to group, under a single and vast training program, the greatest possible number of students, in order to provide the required number of homogeneous classes. That is why applications for registration should be pooled, and dealt with as much as possible from a co-ordinating centre staffed with travelling teachers as well as resident teachers, rather than through a series of independent departmental programs, which would be less efficient and more costly.

A word, now, about some of the practical measures taken by the commission in the matter of selection of bilingual personnel to meet the requirements. Apart from competitions for positions where a knowledge of both languages is a necessary requirement, it has now become the practice to allow extra marks for the knowledge of both languages in the case of competitions set up to fill positions where this knowledge would be useful. However, this practice continues to allow candidates with a knowledge of only one of our two official languages, to become eligible for a position. On the other hand, since bilingualism is part and parcel of the merit principle, not only with regard to some particular positions but in the areas where there is a general shortage, the knowledge of both languages is required in the case of some competitions to recruit more than one employee. This is being done with the deliberate intention to increase the number of bilingual employees, in areas where there is a shortage of them.

All examinations have now been analysed, especially those which are used to recruit university graduates, in order to ensure that they are in conformity with the intelligence and general knowledge tests and that they are not based on learning peculiar to a particular system of culture or teaching. The commission, however, keeps in close contact with teaching and training institutions, in order to be able to assess accurately and fairly the various kinds of levels of training which exist throughout the country.

Finally, steps were taken to ensure that examining boards are composed of members who can hold a complete interview in that of the two official languages which the candidate has chosen, and who can also assess his education, his experience and his possibilities of success.

[*Text*]

I want to make it clear, however, as I have already said on several occasions, that we do not intend to impose our general program of bilingualism on the civil service. We believe that it cannot be successful without the sincere and full co-operation of the civil servants and their associations. That is why we intend to consult with the staff associations before implementing important phases of our major undertaking. Above all, we do not want to impinge upon existing rights or to create new sources of discrimination while attempting to eliminate existing unfairness.

A great number of civil servants have already understood their new challenge and in many cases they have taken special training courses on their own initiative and at their own expense. Thus we are quite sure that the civil servants will accept a government program of bilingualism, not reluctantly and as a concession but as an opportunity for their own cultural enrichment, which will enable them to better serve all Canadians.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the minister's plan is to have us, if we are going to make any remarks, make them on the agencies of his department that have been covered. For something like the C.B.C. or the national film board, which he will cover later, he would request that we touch on those matters later after he makes an introductory statement. Some of my colleagues want to make some remarks about the translation system. I wanted to place several questions on the record and perhaps the minister could answer them later.

I am very interested in knowing whether there is going to be any relationship in timing and discussion among the Department of Finance on its preparing a white paper in relationship to the budget, the Department of Trade and Commerce in the preparing of the document that it puts forward every year on private and public investment in Canada, and the major publication, I take it to be—it is an annual publication—of the Canada economic council. The reason I am

interested in this matter is to discover what kind of liaison or relationship has developed in this particular field, which I think is a delicate one. We would like to assume, in one way, that the economic council is operating on its own. It seems to me it has the personnel, the staff and the independence the minister talked of; but there is also the problem of which I am sure the government must be aware, and it would certainly be exploited in this chamber if there was a great discrepancy in the analyses and the projections. I would assume that this would be solved in the main by the fact that the economic council would be projecting into the future much more than these other agencies have done. Yet I think it is quite apparent that every time we get a budget it is the projection out of the white paper which is the analysis of current conditions, and the public and private investment in Canada also stands in the same way. I would appreciate it if the minister could fill us in a bit on how these major publishing efforts, two by government departments and one by a new agency, are going to be dovetailed.

The next question I wanted to raise is this. I did not get the early part of the minister's remarks in French, but I wondered whether he made any distinction in connection with the problem that I have heard about from some civil servants beyond Ottawa. I refer to the relative disadvantage of the outside service to the service inside, or at Ottawa, in relation to this whole question of biculturalism and training. I suppose it is very apparent that most senior civil servants, in particular, would be willing to improve their prospects by taking courses of training; but it is also apparent that anyone who is in the west is going to have much less chance to use, in practice, socially or any other way, his other language, particularly if it is the French language.

I am just wondering what plan the government has to meet this particular problem. I have had it put to me by people who are, for example, in charge of offices in Winnipeg and the lakehead and who are in the years when one could expect further promotion—perhaps promotion to Ottawa—that they are at an obvious disadvantage. I would be interested if the minister could tell us anything about plans to compensate for the disadvantage from which the outside service suffers.

The other question I want to raise—and I do not believe the minister touched on it at all—is the problem relating to the Companies Act and the fact that so many companies are behind in the annual reports required by the Companies Act. I know that before the committee of the other place the gentleman who is in charge of Companies Act registrations and the bureau in the minister's department gave evidence to the effect, it seemed to me, that the Companies Act requirements, in so far as the posting of information and keeping it up to date is concerned, was observed more in the breach than in actuality. This is a matter that has interested me for some time. I would like to know what practical steps are being taken to correct this situation, how well it is coming along, whether it is being met by some future streamlining of the department, or whether there is an attempt to get more personnel and deal with it in that particular way.

The other point I wanted to put to the minister by way of a question was to ask him about the planning function within the ministry itself. I think this is a fair question to raise since the minister is responsible for the economic council. One of the matters which confuses those of us who are in opposition is that we will read a speech which we can appreciate by, say, the Minister of Forestry dealing with economic planning or ARDA and its future. Then we will read addresses given by the Minister of Industry which indicate that he is also involved in the whole question of economic planning, the direction of investment and the development of incentives. We take for granted that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce are also operating in this field. Consequently some of us tend to feel that there may be a profusion of responsibilities in the whole area of economic planning and direction. We welcome the new agency, but what is the actual setup within the ministry to deal with this question?

I ask this question particularly because for several years there have been comments in business circles to the effect that businessmen would prefer some minister who has over-all responsibility in this matter. It seems to me that since the government gave the Minister of Forestry the particular powers which he has and developed the Department of Industry, on the surface at least there has tended to be some fragmentation.

I think it is worth while making the political observation that the Prime Minister is not filling in the gap so far as the public and this house are concerned. I think it is a fair comment to say that the present Prime Minister in general economic affairs and

economic planning has not been thus preoccupied either in the house or in the speeches which he gives across the country. There may be reasons for this, of course, but it does lead us to ask the question whether there is an inner cabinet which deals with economic matters. For example, how does it function, is there any scale of priority and what is the relationship of this group with agencies such as, for example, the Bank of Canada? It may be that bringing this matter before the minister will be fruitless because many of us are tending to forget that he is an economist and see him rather as some—I hate to use the word "cultural" figure because I am afraid that Canadians who think of culture do not think of economists. I think that is a fair comment. I think the minister might be candid enough, since he has some relationship with the economic council, to enlighten us somewhat on this particular subject.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I never thought that one day I would agree with the Secretary of State on some points. As a matter of fact, we rather knew him in the province of Quebec as what is called a conventional economist, that is, a little behind the times, in old economic systems.

I think that the Prime Minister succeeded in doing with the Secretary of State what others had failed to do. The Prime Minister has found him a job where he is much at home and well qualified, providing that he stays out of the economic field. It will be remembered that at times, the Secretary of State had somewhat queer, out of date and even obsolete theories, but since he has been Secretary of State, in view of the program he has set out, and of the achievements of his department, I must say that he deserves congratulations because at last he has found a field of endeavour which he understands, that is bilingualism and culture. I hasten to say that this is not to the disadvantage of the minister, quite the contrary, because if we consider the scale of values, in its application to man, cultural values come before economic values. Now, having been appointed as Secretary of State, he climbed a rung and found a field where he could distinguish himself.

Mr. Choquette: A little longer and he will understand what Social Credit is about.

Mr. Grégoire: If he ever does, I hope he will lend us a hand, because we will need all our resources to get the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) to understand it.

[Mr. Fisher.]

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of State mentioned that since he has assumed this high post and especially these last few years, a tremendous need for developing and increasing the facilities and possibilities of translation, whether written or simultaneous has come to the fore. It is a fact that a recruiting and training section and terminology centres are imperative. It is also a fact that for a long time, here in parliament, bilingualism was not always honoured, and that was the case even when there were bilingual members in the house. There were almost no efforts to have this translation service developed.

Many members of the house agree with me that what contributed most in calling the attention of parliament to bilingualism in the civil service, where its need was felt, was the presence in this house of a group of 26 Social Credit members from the province of Quebec. They are the ones who emphasized the French fact.

Mr. Lamontagne: You arrived at the same time.

Mr. Grégoire: I am not against this acknowledgement, because once our group sounded the clarion call, some members of parliament, such as the Secretary of State, implemented what we requested, even one year before the Secretary of State was elected to this house.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the role played here by our group since 1962. At that time, there was practically no question of simultaneous interpretation or bilingualism in the committees, and yet today there is an increasing tendency to bilingualism.

There is no doubt that the program submitted to us today by the Secretary of State deserves our commendation. The Secretary of State looked after first things first. It is obvious that if we want translators and interpreters, a terminology must first be created.

Until all those who are engaged in translation or interpretation may acquire this terminology, which will be developed through the publishing of dictionaries, as was mentioned by the Secretary of State, translation or interpretation will continue to play a secondary role.

But with a real terminology centre within the translation and interpretation sections, then our language will develop in its true clarity and precision.

I also appreciated the statement of the Secretary of State concerning the French courses given those who must learn that language, and the English courses to those who will benefit by learning the English

language. There are now modern methods, and I believe the Secretary of State has used them. In fact, these modern methods enable an individual who knows practically nothing of another language to speak it in an understandable way in a very short time. If these language laboratories and modern methods are used in these courses, I am convinced that the efforts will be crowned with success.

The minister mentioned staff recruiting also. In that field, recruitment now constitutes an important factor. For instance, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) tells us that the Canada Year Book, which is quite an important and valuable book, not only for hon. members but also for a great many businessmen, industrialists or tradesmen in Canada, has been published in French two and a half or even three months—in fact it was in June and the English version had been published in January—that is nearly five months after the English version, then one has to admit that the bureau of translations is short of translators.

Moreover, when we see that the French version of the government telephone directory was distributed about six months after the English version, then, unless this can be explained otherwise, we have to conclude that there is a shortage of translators.

Mr. Choquette: The reason is that some people do not pay their telephone bills.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I think this is the second time the hon. member for Lotbinière takes this attitude. However, he was probably one of the first to come and tell us: "Our party is in office; we can say nothing; would you ask the government to do something in that field."

I will even say that—

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, that is untrue.

Mr. Grégoire: In fact, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Lotbinière came to my office and complained that some of his colleagues from Toronto or Montreal could make direct long distance calls free of charge, and that in his office he could not avail himself of the same services as his colleagues.

The Chairman: Order. I would suggest to the hon. member for Lapointe to pursue the remarks he was making with such eloquence before the interjections.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I must say it is a fact, notwithstanding the rest, for we have realized long ago that the hon. member for Lotbinière likes to speak and that it is to our advantage to let him speak.

And as the hon. member for Roberval says—

The Chairman: I do not believe the attitude of some other member is the subject of the debate at the present time, and I would ask the hon. member for Lapointe to co-operate with the Chair and his colleagues and to revert to the estimates before us.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I am ready to co-operate with you, but when interjections come from the other side of the house, you turn toward us to call us to order. If once in a while you called to order the young greenhorns who are interrupting us constantly, I believe your admonitions would be heeded.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, you called us to order on three occasions this evening, when the interruptions came from the other side of the house.

The Chairman: I am calling to order the hon. member for Lapointe.

Mr. Grégoire: I deserved to be called to order, but at least I said what I wanted to say.

Mr. Chairman, mention is made of the terminology centre and other means that might help bilingualism throughout the country. It will be done through this terminology centre and by means of more intensive recruiting, especially in schools specialized in those fields.

Even though we commend the Secretary of State, it must be recognized all the same that what he is submitting to us at present is only a program he intends to establish. We will be looking forward to the results of the program to appreciate its worth. Once again, we must congratulate the minister for the program which he set forth and its efficiency will be judged by its application.

In connection with translation, I would like to point out the example of Belgium to the Secretary of State. It is known that Belgium is a bilingual country where Flemish and Walloon are spoken. I had the opportunity to meet members of the Belgian legislature and to discuss with them their translation system as well as the publication of reports, votes and proceedings or the official report of the Belgian legislature. I have been impressed by one point in particular, namely that in Belgium all the proceedings, all the minutes and all the reports are published in only

one booklet. Texts in both languages are printed in the same booklet in two different columns opposite one another. On one side you have the version in one language and on the other you find it in the other language.

I asked a Belgian member of parliament the reason why the publication of reports, speeches, laws, etc. was made in both languages in the same booklet, and I was told that in publishing bilingual reports in only one booklet or section of a publication, reports and records of the debates had unavoidably to be published simultaneously in both languages.

In addition, I was told that any reference in one language to a certain page of *Hansard* or of the *Votes and Proceedings* is sure to be found on the same page, in the other language, because the original and the translation are printed side by side. Since the Secretary of State wishes to improve the bureau for translations, he might consider this so as to hasten the publication of the French version of the committees' minutes and proceedings.

Let us take, for instance, the proceedings of Senate or house committees. Very often the French edition is published two to three weeks and sometimes one month after the English version.

It would be much more convenient if the two versions were published simultaneously, since that would enable us to compare both versions, because errors of translation and interpretation do occur.

Sometimes a speech is given in French and, when translated into English, it no longer has the same meaning. It should also be possible to compare other works, for all those who may wish to do so or at least are interested in learning both languages. Then, having the two versions side by side, they could become more bilingual. I think the system used in Belgium, for the publication of all committee proceedings and all speeches made in the national assembly, could be adopted in this country.

Mr. Chairman, once again, I should like to refer to the translation or interpretation system and, incidentally, to the bilingual stenographers also, about which I have a special comment to make, if the matter comes under the Secretary of State.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that the Secretary of State nods his head indicating that it does not come under him. Perhaps I could come back to that when we discuss the Speaker's estimates.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of State also referred to the Canada economic council. I listened to his remarks with interest and what struck me is that after a year of existence, the Canada economic council is now preparing a review of long and medium term projects of economic development and that it is also involved in the development of consultation facilities.

If after one year of existence, the Canada economic council is preparing a review of legislation on long and medium term economic expansion, I feel that the job that was entrusted to it will never be carried out, because when that review of projects is over and when the time comes to implement them, the economic development will have evolved so much that they will have to start another review.

Therefore, what is needed now under the present circumstances, is not long and medium term programs, but the fulfilment of the possibilities of the country and an economic advisory council which will act, not by drafting programs but by looking into the possibilities of development that exist in this country.

It is on the basis of Canada's natural resources and physical possibilities that the economic advisory council must operate, rather than on the basis of long term programs, for in this day and age evolution is so rapid, progress so advanced that if we do not keep up with the times, we will never succeed through long term planning, in catching up with progress, for we will constantly be in the process of preparing plans and programs which will never be implemented.

Since the end of the war, we heard about policies and projects planning. But, when a project has been planned and is ready for implementation, a commission of inquiry or a committee is appointed to adapt this policy planned five or six years previously.

I feel that the economic council should concentrate on the adaptation of our economic, financial, monetary and production system to our times, rather than on the planning of projects for a distant future.

Mr. Chairman, this economic council can be of tremendous service if it acts upon existing data, this country's capabilities, and not upon projections into a rather distant future, because at that time, progress will have developed to such an extent as to require a complete review of the said policy.

In conclusion, I should like to tell the Secretary of State that his speech on bilingualism within parliament and the civil service can only meet with our approval, at least

in its main lines, and we hope that he will try his best so that this program may be carried out completely.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I thought that this debate included all the estimates, but if the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) wants to speak, I will gladly yield to him.

Mr. Knowles: Thank you very much, you are most kind.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: I have just a brief general comment I want to make, Mr. Chairman, and then I want to refer to one aspect of a matter about which the Secretary of State spoke in his opening remarks. My general comment arises from the interest there was in the country, during the last election campaign, about the prospect of the Liberals, if they came to power, going in for economic planning. We have been watching for that ever since the government took office. We have found ourselves wondering which minister it was who was going to head up economic planning and do something about it.

The Department of Industry was set up, and we thought perhaps the minister of that department was to be our economic planner. We looked in vain in that direction. Some people thought it was the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but he is not the economic planner. Neither is the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Forestry makes speeches on economic planning outside the house, as do some others. It appears now, at last, we have found the head of economic planning in this government, namely the Secretary of State. I noticed the hon. member for Port Arthur was a little concerned as to which of the minister's aspects were going to come out on top, his cultural side or his economic side. It may be that we have in the Secretary of State Canada's C. P. Snow. I suppose I should find some way of putting that into French, but I will leave that to the translation bureau that comes under the minister's department.

At any rate, I hope that this minister will not disappoint us the way others have done, by just giving us a certain amount of talk about economic planning. If I may say so, I thought there was a good deal of sense in some of the things he said in his brief remarks tonight. I certainly hope that the work of the economic council of Canada, and the other agencies to which the minister referred, will be pushed ahead. I know the minister from days long since gone by. I believe his basic philosophy is sound. I just hope he will find some opportunity of putting that philosophy into practice.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I said there was one aspect of a matter about which the minister spoke which I wanted to ask him a question or two. I refer to the translation bureau which comes under the Secretary of State. I noted with interest what he told us about establishing a terminology centre and I also noted with interest the indication that it is hoped at least 50 new employees will be added to the translation bureau in the next little while. I certainly hope this latter aim will be achieved. Other members have spoken about the significance of all this in relation to the program for bilingualism. I should like to look at it from the standpoint of the problem that some of the employees of this department have to face.

I am thinking particularly of our own translators who are in these booths at the foot of this chamber and who are having to translate what we say from one language to the other all the time the house is in session. As the Secretary of State knows, I am sure, those persons are employees of his department and not employees of the House of Commons. This means, therefore, that they may be assigned to work that is being done here in the House of Commons, but they are called upon also to work in a good many other places. Accordingly if at the same time the House of Commons is sitting the other place happens to be sitting as well, and if there is a peace keeping conference or a conference on mentally retarded children—

Mr. Lamontagne: You are speaking of federal-provincial conferences.

Mr. Knowles: Some of us have been wondering just where this peace keeping conference could do the most good. Yes, perhaps it may be at the federal-provincial level, but there are times when peace keeping ought to be brought into the floor of the House of Commons. There may be times when the Liberal party or the Conservative party could use it within its own ranks.

The point I should like to make, Mr. Chairman, is that it seems inevitable that when a group of employees can be called upon to work in any one of a dozen different places, without any planner like the Secretary of State planning these various conferences so that they do not overlap each other, the problem created for the employees is impossible. The Secretary of State may say that

this problem will be solved when these 50 new employees are taken on by the translation bureau. This may be so. However, I suspect that concurrent with the employment of these 50 new employees in the translation bureau—and I take it this means increasing both the number of interpreters and the number of translators; I am using "translators" to refer to those who translate the written word into the other language and "interpreters" to refer to those in the booths who interpret orally for us—the amount of work to be done will grow and probably in the end the strain on these employees will be just as heavy. In the light of all this there is a question to be faced as to whether the people who work for the House of Commons ought to be brought directly under the House of Commons itself.

It is true that this is an unusual year when measured by the length of the session. It is now in its 184th day, far beyond anything in the past, but the likelihood is that House of Commons sessions will continue to be rather lengthy. The likelihood is that committee work will grow, and in view of all this I suggest there is a case for the interpreters—maybe this applies to the translators as well—who work for the House of Commons to be employed by the House of Commons. At present they are employed by a department outside the house and are sent all over Ottawa, indeed anywhere away from Ottawa on assignments where the government requires interpreting done.

I would like to hear the Secretary of State comment on this problem this evening. If he does not agree with my suggestion, then will he tell us why interpreters who work for the house ought not to be in a separate section attached to and under the control of the house itself?

Before sitting down may I refer to another subject in this general field. As I have already said, I am interested in the announcement that a terminology centre is to be established, with the present director of the bureau of translations as its head. I am interested in the reasons which the minister gave for the establishment of such a centre, but could he tell us whether any research is being carried on by his department, the translation bureau or any other branch of government, into automatic or electronic translating devices? I speak now of translating rather than interpreting. In some parts of the world a great deal of research is being conducted into this sort of thing, and the day may come when by using such devices translations will be produced faster than they can be done now.

[Mr. Knowles.]

In conclusion I would like the minister to tell us what hopeful word he has for the people who are in the glassed in booths at the foot of the chamber who interpret our words as we speak.

Mr. Lloyd: I appreciate the hon. member's having brought this subject before the committee. Some of us take an interest in the working conditions of house staff, and those of us who do always notice the volume of hours which the interpreting staff have to devote to the performance of their duties in this chamber. I endorse the previous speaker's observations that there is a constant conflict between their work here and assignments outside the house to committees, boards and conferences.

I suggest there should be greater engagement of freelance interpreters for such outside work. This would relieve the tremendous stress and strain on the interpreting staff of the house who, if they had an opportunity to speak on their own behalf, would certainly tell us that their hours of work this session have been extremely difficult for them to handle. They have done so without complaint and they deserve our immediate and earnest consideration.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few brief comments about the estimates of the Secretary of State.

First, I would like to congratulate the minister for the wonderful job he has done up to the present in the field of bilingualism, which is, we all agree, rather complicated and difficult. He endeavoured to increase the number of bilingual officials in parliament and in the various departments, by giving them the opportunity to study the other language of the country.

However, I feel I must make a few remarks on this matter in order to call his attention to a danger with which I am concerned.

When the various departments will give promotions in the coming months or years, when they will have to take into consideration the qualifications of the various candidates for those promotions, I feel that the people who will be in charge of this selection will need to be very careful not to consider as bilingual a person who, for all practical purposes, can understand or write only a few words of French.

However, if the intention is to play somewhat on words, and lead us to believe that in

future there will be only bilingual civil servants when the Anglo-Saxon group has had an opportunity to learn a little French to meet the requirements of the various departments, in order to prevent the promotion of perfectly bilingual French Canadians, then I think that we will have fought in this house for nothing.

We noticed that in the past, English speaking civil servants, in the house and in other departments, were promoted over the heads of fully bilingual French speaking personnel, and following criticism made on several occasions the departments decided to teach French to their officials in order to avoid criticism henceforth in matters of promotions.

I believe that this had to be said, and the minister may be assured that we will always be on the alert and ready to defend the interests of those who could be so wronged. I may give him the assurance that each time we have the opportunity—and I hope the situation will not be repeated—we shall be ready to bring to the attention of the minister these cases which may occur.

The minister has reported on the activities of the economic council of Canada. Some weeks ago, I asked him when he expected to table a report on the activities of this agency which has already been in existence for a year. I was surprised by his silence in this regard.

On the other hand, I imagined that an agency working silently had perhaps a better chance to produce something positive, but when I see the work done by the Atlantic development board, I unfortunately cannot reach this conclusion—I was going to use the phrase "unfortunately I cannot reach the conclusion"—since the board which has not worked silently and was granted some funds, has already done a good job in the Atlantic provinces and invested some money in hydro-electric developments, and also in many other projects, in conjunction with the provinces concerned. We therefore have here an agency which, besides doing planning, sees to it that all imaginable possibilities are realized in the imediate future.

I wonder if, since we decided to create it, it would not have been preferable to grant more authority to this economic council, so it could show results more quickly. I am wondering how it has been operating during the last year. Did it consult the provincial authorities without whose co-operation no planning can be established, because the provincial governments own their natural resources. I think that it is a delusion to endeavour to attain some measure of success without considering the views of the different provincial governments. Did the members of this agency visit the areas of our country? Did they hear the representations of the agencies which are responsible for the economic development of the various regions in order to ascertain the research which was carried out in those various areas and avoid a duplication of work, expenses and energy?

It would be interesting to know the answers to all those questions because when they visit those regions, those gentlemen could realize the local possibilities and also the developments we can expect from them.

Within the Department of Industry, there is of course what is called a regional development agency. Does that agency achieve a concrete job? Has it the approval of the provincial authorities for such work? Does that agency of the Department of Industry come into conflict with the projects now under consideration by the economic council of Canada? Those are some more questions to which we would like to get answers.

In any case, the minister can be assured that we will wait, I should even say with impatience, for that first report of the economic council because it will indicate whether we made a mistake in setting it up and if we can hope that the work already carried out is liable to produce concrete achievements enabling us to form an opinion on the efficiency of the decision taken on that matter.

Of course, reference was made a while ago to the need of personnel in the translation offices and also in the French language reporters division. Having been myself on several committees, I was in a position to notice the progress made in those fields, but unfortunately, on many occasions, due to the fact that several committees sat at the same time, we sometimes had to do without the services of bilingual reporters. I think that even if the minister often said that he made real efforts to hire some, we are still wondering why it is that his efforts were not successful. It is clear that it is difficult to train such a qualified personnel in a relatively short period, but I think that the problem has been pointed out to the authorities for more than two years. In my opinion the time has come to present tangible achievements in this field.

As the minister dealt with only two particular points, I shall limit myself to them. There are other subjects under his jurisdiction and in which I am interested. I shall

wait therefore till the right moment comes to discuss them.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I have only a few words to say with respect to the estimates of the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne.)

Like the previous speaker, I would like to congratulate the minister for promoting bilingualism in all the federal departments and I would also like to encourage him to do even more.

The main purpose of my intervention is to correct the impression that bilingualism started here in the house only after the arrival of the Social Credit members, a group which now calls itself the Ralliement Créditiste.

In 1957 when I was elected for the first time, my colleagues of the province of Quebec and myself endeavoured to increase the use of French on parliament hill. I for one made a list of the various signs appearing in numerous places inside the centre block as well as outside on the hill, and I asked the then responsible minister to make arrangements so that exclusively English signs be replaced by bilingual signs, which we can see today nearly everywhere.

Another example indicating the interest we took in this matter is the fact that the then minister of defence production, Hon. R. O'Hurley, was the first to publish in French the report of the Department of Defence Production.

He also appointed to a crown corporation a French speaking Canadian as president. He also took several other steps to spread the use of French in Ottawa.

In his statement the minister says that French courses and English courses were given to civil servants to enable them to familiarize themselves with either of the official languages of the country. I would like to know the number of civil servants who take full-time French or English courses.

I also ask the minister to be very explicit on the marks granted in civil service commission competitions to those who speak the two official languages of the country.

I should like him to tell us also, in the case of a vacant position in a community where French only, or vice-versa English only, is spoken, whether an application from a bilingual employee would be considered?

Before I conclude my remarks, I should like to remind the Secretary of State that during the election campaigns, the 1963 campaign especially, Liberal candidates in the province of Quebec promised a special bonus to bilingual employees. I should like to know whether this project is still in the minister's mind and if so, when does he expect to carry it out? Furthermore, if he does not intend to pay special bonus to bilingual employees, what are the reasons today for his change of policy?

[*Text*]

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I was very pleased to hear that the Secretary of State is interested in the problem of making bilingualism available to many of the senior civil servants who otherwise would not have the opportunity of becoming bilingual. There are in Ottawa a great many senior civil servants who are very much afraid of the situation that has been created by this French-English problem. The bilingual atmosphere, for which perhaps members of the Ralliement Créditiste can take some credit, has spread to the degree that to be promoted within a department you must be bilingual.

As one who cannot speak French, I know that if an elevator operator is hired and he cannot speak one word in English, very soon he becomes bilingual. It is a fact that though he is not bilingual when hired, within a few weeks he will be bilingual or he is just not going to get by and will not know when it is dinner time, in some cases. Therefore he becomes bilingual. I have found this is very true with most of the bilingual jobs with which I have been in contact. You telephone the Department of Agriculture, for instance. I presume the people you talk to are bilingual. I have often talked to three or four people before I got one to whom I could put a question and get an answer. They are bilingual all right, but it certainly must be in another language; it is not English.

The point is that because of the geographic situation in Canada those bilingual people who are going to get these jobs have to come from an area where French is taught and is the native language. It is very easy to pick up a second language by association, but it is very difficult to learn a second language through study. For this reason I am very happy that the minister has decided that courses will be made available, so that the fact we want to have, in a federal sense, a bilingual nation will not mean that those who are not raised in the province of Quebec under the French educational system will be eliminated from obtaining all types of jobs.

We may say that this will not happen, that we are not going to discriminate; but

I wonder how often we discriminate in regard to many of the jobs posted for the civil service, particularly those jobs that call for bilingualism when bilingualism is not a necessity, an advantage or even to be desired. There are many, many jobs in this country where it is no advantage, unless it is for personal satisfaction, to be bilingual. We often hear civil servants in Ottawa saying, "Oh, I cannot be promoted", or "There is no point in my trying for that job". I know an engineer who experienced this difficulty a couple of weeks ago with regard to the Department of Industry. This man had held civil service jobs in the past and has three or four degrees. He said, "Well, look at the posters". We went through them all, the bilingual requirement was the main aspect of the qualifications required, and he had no opportunity to obtain one of these jobs. He certainly would have been ill advised to apply, because he is not bilingual. It seems to me that many of the jobs in the Department of Industry did not really require a person working in most parts of Canada to be bilingual.

I think it is also a fact that this is not a bilingual nation. I believe we in this house well understand the scope of bilingualism, its advantages and the fact that the federal government is pledged to allow the use of either official language and, much better, both official languages; but it is not necessary to have two official languages. This, of course, raises another problem. I receive a considerable amount of correspondence in French because a great many of my constituents are French and write to me in that language. While I have a small knowledge of that language, my translation is very bad and very often it becomes confused and I have difficulty with this correspondence. To be fair to the Secretary of State, my most recent translations are being done by his executive secretary, who was kind enough to offer his services because there is just no service provided in the department. I think this is a service that should be provided.

While we are thinking about the translation department and the simultaneous translators here and bringing them into the staff of the House of Commons, we should realize that there must be established a branch which will handle translation. I telephone the minister's department and talk to his translation branch. The official there is either very bilingual himself and does not understand the situation, or has an odd interpretation of what are government matters. If he thinks I am sending over correspondence just because I would like to have it translated, I have news for him. This is not the purpose; it is government business that comes to me as a representative of government. I believe it is the responsibility of somebody to provide this type of translation service for members of parliament, because there is no consideration of having to be bilingual and in fact you do not have to be able to read and write to be a member of parliament—although sometimes it helps. It is not really necessary to be bilingual; but I believe your constituents—and I am very serious about this—if they write to you in either of the official languages, have a right to expect an answer in the language in which they write. But this is not possible because of the unavailability of a translation service.

The minister will have to provide us with the same type of schools that he is willing to provide for the senior civil servants, or he will have to provide us with a translation service that will translate this correspondence for us. I have gone to the messenger service, to the simultaneous interpreters here, and to the protective staff; I have cornered pretty nearly everyone who speaks both our official languages. I am very happy to say that they are most obliging people and will translate a letter for me. But when you have a thick sheaf of papers they begin to wonder whether they should undertake the job, and in most cases they do not. As members of parliament I think we have an obligation to our constituents, and if we have only one French speaking person in the riding we should be in the position where we can reply to him in his own language. This can only be done if we have a translation service.

I think we have to draw the line somewhere; I do not think we are going to be able to re-educate all the people in Canada. I am not opposed to that, and I am not really opposed to our making this a bilingual nation; but I do not think we are going to do it by the back door. We are not going to do it by forcing the civil service to be bilingual, without our having enough courage to decide to institute a national education system in this country that will provide French and English tuition to all the people of Canada.

If we offer a job requiring bilingualism we are eliminating applications on the part of people from nine of the ten provinces for that job. I think that French Canadians in the federal field are being very unreasonable in asking that everything be translated into French and that all the vacancy postings in the civil service be also put in French. I say that

because this means that only people from Quebec are able to take advantage of any civil service job.

I might say that the four or five years I spent in high school learning the French language would not give me any bilingual qualification in any shape or form—in the same way as I learned Latin and then tried to talk to Italians; that was just about as silly. The minister has a very big department with surveys taking place, and so on. I do not think our national education is in such a bad way and the minister says he believes we can progress. But if he is not prepared to do what I suggest, it seems to me that we will have to be very careful—and I hope the minister will say whether he is willing to exercise this kind of care—to see that civil service job postings are not loaded in favour of bilingual candidates when bilingualism is not a requirement for the position concerned. There are some civil servants in the gallery now who are bilingual and others who are not. I think every one of those postings which is slanted in favour of bilingual candidates is directed toward a particular person who is in mind for the job. If it cannot be open the posting might just as well not be put up at all. So we will either have to be very careful about using this bilingualism weapon in the civil service or we are going to have to go much further than that and provide equal opportunity for all Canadians.

I know some will say they would not accept that or that it cannot be done. I see several French Canadian members of parliament shaking their heads, indicating they are not in favour of that. All they are really saying is: We want an advantage over all other Canadians. They are not saying they want equality. They are saying: Give us a damned big advantage which we want to hang on to.

An hon. Member: That is not so.

Mr. Peters: Someone says no. With the exception of a person from my area, or Timmins, Sudbury and perhaps a few other ridings in eastern Ontario, a person from Ontario would have no possibility on coming out of high school of having any French to enable him to speak intelligently with a French Canadian. He could not pass any type of examination in the French language. Are these people not good enough to be in the civil service? What about the people in Saskatchewan, British Columbia, Nova Scotia or Newfoundland? Are they not going to be able to qualify for positions in the civil service? That is what it amounts to if this practice is used indiscriminately. I think the minister should give consideration to this matter.

I would also make a plea that the translation branch and other branches for which we in the House of Commons have assumed responsibilities and over which the Speaker has some limited jurisdiction be transferred to a special branch. One of these days we are not going to have any oral translation at all. If hon. members would check they would find that on many days just two people are running the House of Commons simultaneous translation system all day long. Where are the others? Perhaps one will be in Montreal, two or three at a committee meeting somewhere, another out of town. They are greatly understaffed. The international regulations of their union will not allow them to carry on this type of operation for very long. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said, if we had 50 we would only be bringing their number up to strength. Some extension must be made in the near future. I would think that the amount of translation being done in the committees branch now is four to five times as much as when I first came to parliament. I think that is also true with the federal-provincial conferences which are taking place these days; a simultaneous translation system is provided there. Therefore I suggest these people should be given some protection.

I should just like once again to commend the minister on the job he has undertaken in the retraining of senior civil servants, because I think that is important. It is something from which some benefit can flow. If the type of inequality to which I have referred is watched and the government is willing to provide bilingual training where necessary, this will lessen many of the fears of those who find they have reached a dead end street, particularly in Ottawa, as far as promotion is concerned as a result of the emphasis which is being placed on bilingualism today. I do not know whether we are smart enough or young enough to meet the other requirements, but I should like to see members of parliament given an opportunity of attending classes similar to those attended by civil servants. In my own particular case there is a small segment of my riding the people of which speak French only, and it would be of great advantage if we members of parliament were given the rudiments of the language, although it is a fact that the simultaneous translation system has elimi-

nated to quite an extent the previous motivation for learning the second language.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words following the speech made by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). When he said that in some departments he had to contact three or four officials before he found anyone who spoke English, I thought he had addressed himself to the government of the province of Quebec.

Amongst other things, he claimed that certain high officials and technicians of the Department of Industry were reluctant to seek promotions because they are not bilingual. I should like to point out to him that if there is a department in Ottawa which is not bilingual, it is surely the Department of Industry. Indeed, I think that only one out of 13 high officials is bilingual in that department. At least, the person in question has a French name. I suppose that, once again, the hon. member has no grounds to complain.

I should also like to say that if the hon. member feels that French Canadians are discriminatory when they seek to have their language recognized, he must admit that very little has been done in the past hundred years about the problem of the French language. If the consideration given to the question now is slightly annoying to some members, they must understand that the present emphasis is due to the fact that precious little was done about the recognition of French during all those years.

The present situation is quite surprising for them, but they must not be worried. If, in a few months or a few years from now, the question creates general interest—that is the great difference between the past and the present—it will be less obvious and requests such as those which are made today will pass unnoticed.

I should also like to say a word about the civil service commission. However, my remarks will not deal with the question of French, since others have made the usual authoritative representations in that respect a while ago. Consequently, there is no need for me to add anything to what they said.

However, apart from the fact that the Laurendeau-Dunton commission will certainly find out problems coming under the civil service commission in the fields of French language and bilingualism, I think it would be desirable also in certain cases to inquire into the civil service commission itself.

I know that this commission is not under political control and that its employees are all competent and render unusual services to the country. However, in certain cases, uncommon as they may be, we noticed minor irregularities and discriminations in the advertising of some competitions requiring certain qualifications, which were already known by a few, of course.

Nevertheless, I feel it would be a good thing if the minister would become interested in that problem and ask qualified persons, outside the civil service commission and completely independent in that field, to make a special investigation.

I am personally aware, for having inquired myself from certain government agencies, that it was realized that—unknowingly no doubt—there were certain discriminations, not necessarily concerning languages, but rather proficiency, residence of the candidate, his record, and finally for different reasons, it seemed to me that a little discrimination may occur in some cases.

I feel that many civil servants would be pleased to learn of an unbiased inquiry, in order to appraise, first of all, the duties and also the classification and promotional methods affecting civil servants.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, may I take only a few minutes to correct a remark made by a Liberal member, under the item now under discussion. I refer to the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) who took the liberty to make remarks about telephone bills which were not paid by members of the Ralliement Créditiste.

Just for the information of the house, I must say to the hon. member for Lotbinière that I can afford to pay my bill much more than he could himself. The hon. member for Lotbinière has no right to interfere in a discussion in order to criticize regulations or measures passed by parliament as a whole or by the committee on parliamentary procedure.

Members of the Ralliement Créditiste who refuse to pay their bills to the Bell Telephone Company of Canada adhere to a measure passed by parliament and also to the report carried unanimously by the committee on parliamentary procedure.

I would not have missed this opportunity to call to order an hon. member who attempts to play petty politics when he is not even able himself to meet his obligations while

we are in a position to do so very easily ourselves without his help.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, during the next few minutes I would like, as some of my colleagues have done, to comment on bilingualism in the civil service, in various federal departments and crown corporations.

It has been urged not very long ago that bilingualism be enforced in Canada. I would like to ask especially the ministers to reply when possible in French to any letter written in French. Very recently I wrote in French to a minister and I received a reply in English.

If the good intentions expressed this evening by the Secretary of State are to be put into practice, federal ministers should start by setting an example.

We should also like to remind the house that in Canada, as everybody knows, French Canadians make up about 30 per cent of the total population. Now, it would be interesting to learn—not to raise the cry of discrimination, but just to find out—what is the percentage of French Canadians, at present, among those holding jobs in the public administration. The thing is that, as the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) pointed out, it may be easier for French Canadians to be perfectly or simply bilingual. It would be interesting, then, to find out if, with this greater aptitude, French Canadians hold a proportion of jobs in keeping with the percentage of this country's French Canadian population.

I would also like to recall to the attention of the minister, whose estimates we are considering tonight, that last summer several delegations toured the national gallery and some other places coming under his department; on such occasions, we could meet only one bilingual employee able to answer in the language of the delegations' members.

I would therefore ask the minister concerned to kindly put into practice, as soon as possible, the good intentions he has shown us tonight. It is excellent to mean well, but we are expecting still a lot of realizations in this field.

These last years only, that is for two years now, much has been said in Canada on bilingualism. And while, during those two years progress was made in that direction, the accomplishments should at least be put into practice, not in obliging all Anglo-Saxon Canadians to learn French, but in showing respect, by using its own language, to an important section of the Canadian population, that is the French Canadian population, in order that the latter be treated fairly, and in its dealings with the departments and the various crown companies, receive replies in its own language.

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy if the minister, one year from now, could outline the accomplishments of his department in that field.

Mr. Grégoire: May I call it ten o'clock?

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether we could continue for a while. I should like to make a few comments on the remarks that have been made with regard to the translation services. If we could pass the estimates of the department, the civil service commission and the chief electoral officer I would be quite willing to delay the few remarks I should like to make on the economic council to a later time, if the committee does not want to sit beyond 10.15.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, we still had a few comments to make on that. Would we still have the opportunity to continue with the department's estimates afterwards?

Mr. Lamontagne: On what item?

Mr. Grégoire: Precisely on the estimates of the bureau for translations.

An hon. Member: And of the C.B.C.

Mr. Lamontagne: I would not mind at all. But I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if we could at least approve the estimates of the Secretary of State Department, as well as those of the chief electoral officer and the civil service commission, we could then do without the presence of those gentlemen. After that, it would give me great pleasure to hear the interesting comments of the hon. member for Lapointe on some other occasion.

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I think what the minister is asking for is a bit of a tall order. I am sure we would be happy to sit for five or six minutes to hear anything he might like to say in reply to anything that has been said tonight, but I think that to ask that items be passed is perhaps a little too much. Perhaps we might not see the clock for five or six minutes and let the minister talk.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say we were quite prepared to pass the estimates as the minister has suggested, but

of course there has been a filibuster by the Creditistes tonight.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we have a past master in the art of "filibustering" in the person of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), it is obvious that we cannot be right.

[*Text*]

Mr. Lamontagne: I should like to say a few words about some of the remarks which have been made tonight. First of all, I want to go back to what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said about interpreters. I agree fully with him that the interpreters, especially in the last year or so, have worked under very difficult conditions. I said in my opening statement that we were now reviewing the whole situation of the translation bureau, and for the time being at least I am certainly including the interpreters as a very important part of that bureau. This does not mean there will not be any change in the near future. I think it would be very helpful, Mr. Chairman, if we were allowed another few months to review the situation of the translation bureau in order to be able to provide the house with the best service possible, and these very devoted civil servants with the best working conditions possible.

So far as automatic translation devices are concerned, the hon. member may be quite sure that we are looking into all possible means of dealing with this difficult problem of translation in order to find the most effective solution for the needs of the government and parliament.

[*Translation*]

As far as the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) is concerned, I would like to tell him that my statement tonight is but a very partial report on the program on bilingualism we are considering. Last December I made a statement on these programs in general and that statement answered the questions raised by the hon. member. As soon as decisions are reached in this connection, I will be pleased to submit a new report to the committee for I do not believe that this is the last time my estimates will come up for consideration. I will then be pleased to submit to the house a new report which I am sure will show that the present government does not intend to disown the promises it made to its supporters.

[*Text*]

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say three things to the hon. member for Timiskaming. First of all, if we have a recess I am quite sure that he will be welcome at the school. Second, as I said in my opening statement we, as a government, have a program for increasing bilingualism in the whole civil service, but we do not want to impose that program on the civil servants. Finally, I think the hon. member should only begin to worry when French Canadians have more than their proper share of jobs in the civil service.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall vote No. 1 carry?

Item agreed to.

10. Translation bureau, $1,994,000.

Mr. Knowles: Just a minute until we find this item.

Mr. Peters: This was not agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, can we call it ten o'clock and continue tomorrow consideration of item 1?

An hon. Member: It has been carried.

[*Text*]

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the co-operation of the hon. member. As he knows, the estimates of the Department of National Defence will be called tomorrow at the request of hon. members. If at all possible I would like to get a few estimates passed tonight, unless of course hon. members have serious questions to raise.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, we have some important questions to ask the minister with regard to the C.B.C.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the hon. member was not in the house when I made a statement tonight to the effect that the C.B.C. estimates are not before the committee at this time but that they would be later.

I am convinced that the hon. member will be free then to comment as much as he likes about the C.B.C., and other government cultural agencies.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: Shall vote 15 carry?

Mr. Knowles: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Crouse: Filibuster.

Mr. Knowles: I suggest that item 15 carry and that be considered a good night's work.

Mr. Crouse: The N.D.P. is delaying the committee.

Progress reported.

Resolutions adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: May I ask if the business as announced for Friday holds?

Mr. MacNaught: Yes. Tomorrow we will consider the estimates of the Department of National Defence and if they should be concluded we will take up the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. Churchill: Not a hope.

Mr. Knowles: And does the business for Monday hold?

Mr. MacNaught: On Monday we will consider the resolution dealing with the Canada pension plan, and on Tuesday redistribution.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

SHIPPING—REPORTED LACK OF SERVICE TO CARIBBEAN AREA

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, my question was addressed to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and arose from a statement by a Canadian commercial counsellor in the central American area to the effect that Canadian exporters were missing the boat because of the lack of adequate shipping between Canada, the West Indies and the central Carribean area. I could not agree more with what Mr. Lemieux said.

I asked the minister whether the government would consider taking steps to encourage the expansion of shipping to that area so that more frequent sailings could lead to the development of our trade with the West Indies and Central American areas. Knowledge of and interest in these respective areas must precede the development of trade. I think that is generally conceded. In addition there must be frequent sailings, because an importer anywhere in those areas needs to know how he can get the goods he needs quickly, and if there are frequent sailings he can get them quickly.

[Mr. Crouse.]

In the general context of my remarks I also include the necessity for good air freight cargo service to and from the Caribbean area. We in the maritime provinces, and I think also in the province of Quebec, have long realized the importance of the British West Indies to Canada, and the historic trading relations within certain limits and certain products. I have always felt that I have found here in Ottawa that the rest of Canada have their heads deep in the sand with regard to the potential of the West Indies area to Canada. Here is an area, with notable exceptions, with a British tradition, an area which is come into independence and maturity, an area which inevitably will be nothing more than an appendage to the United States economy, unless we in Canada are at long last prepared to take the hand of friendship which has been proffered so often to us by those people, and to develop our commercial contacts with the West Indies.

What we must do is have some form of economic union, get as large a portion as possible of the West Indies into the Canadian dollar sphere and out of the sterling bloc, so that we can trade with them and send our winter vacationists there without affecting our balance of payments. It is in this connection that the mutual usefulness of the West Indies and Canada does exist. Mr. Lemieux does a service to Canada in pointing out the need for more frequent sailings. The Department of Trade and Commerce spends money and does a great deal of research to develop trade. I want to say that here is an area where the department should seriously consider providing some form of subsidy to private shipping to encourage more regular runs to that area. If this were done for four or five years, trade would have grown to the point when a subsidy would no longer be necessary. It is the old story of what comes first, the chicken or the egg. The shipping has to be there before the trade can grow. In that period of time, if it is to be made profitable for private enterprise, there must be assistance from the government. It is in the national interest. It helps our trade to grow and helps to improve our relationship with this important area, one which is all the more important because there has recently been a federation of these so-called outer seven, St. Kitts, Barbados and five others.

This is a country which will be looking for independence after 1965 and which will be looking to Canada for assistance in the development of national trade. I hope we will be prepared to meet them at that time. The

prime minister of the Bahamas said to me last year that he found Canada had never shown much interest in the Bahamas in the past. I hope this will not continue. I know that in Britain Mr. Gordon Walker, as well as his predecessor in the Conservative government Mr. Duncan Sandys, and Mr. Nigel Birch have expressed again and again their desire that Canada should be willing to participate on a tripartite basis in the assistance and in the administration which is given to that area by Britain as it becomes more independent. I think that in this direction lies a great future for Canada. We must not lose our opportunity to develop a type of economic union with the only area which remains as a potential warm country, not tropical, but all the year round warm country, with which we can have some form of economic union as it develops.

Mr. Knowles: What about confederation?

Mr. Regan: I know that without a doubt much can be done. Exporters in the Nova Scotia area do a good job of selling goods down there. They have to know the markets and the market is rather limited, but if exporters take the trouble to learn the market, if the department will help to provide shipping, it could be done.

I have noticed in the 1963 report of the Auditor General that on the books of the assets of this country are still some $400,000 resulting from the winding up of the Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships, which went out of existence as an active corporation in 1958. What could be more appropriate than using that money, as it comes back into the treasury, as part of the subsidy for the development of more new shipping connections with the West Indies, which is a much greater market for trade now than it was at that time. I consider this would be of great economic importance to the eastern part of Canada and indeed to Canada as a whole, and I think something should be done about it.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I join with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) in emphasizing the importance to Canada of improving our trade relationships with the West Indies, and like him I look forward to the time when there will be some federation, at least, of those islands. I had the great pleasure at Easter time of visiting Barbados and spending an hour or so with the prime minister, Mr. Barrow, when we talked about the problems that face him in the future.

The particular question that the hon. gentleman raised is as a result of some articles appearing in "Foreign Trade", a publication of the Department of Trade and Commerce, of October 31, 1964, which is devoted almost entirely to Canada's trade with Central America and Panama. I think this indicates —and I hope the hon. gentleman will accept it as such—the great interest my department is taking in the formation of trade with that area. In the course of one article in this publication Mr. Lemieux, who is the commercial counsellor in Guatemala said:

> One serious difficulty in increasing Canadian sales is the lack of adequate shipping services, especially on the Caribbean-Atlantic coast. That problem is even more acute during the Canadian winter when exports usually have to be routed at greater cost via ports like New York.

This lack of shipping of course is not general with respect to the whole area. The shipping services provided by the Canada-Jamaica Line to Guatemala and El Salvador are adequate, and so of course are the services to Panama. Problems arise in connection with our route to Nicaragua, Honduras and Costa Rica, and their trade is not sufficient to establish or sustain a scheduled cargo liner service from eastern Canadian ports. In consequence, some of the shipments have to be routed through New York and it is very difficult to develop a satisfactory volume of trade. I would just like to say to the hon. gentleman that his suggestions will be looked at very carefully. We have been very reluctant to use financial assistance for the purpose of subsidizing shipping services; but we do recognize that there is some sort of a chicken and egg relationship and we shall certainly take his proposals into very serious consideration.

[*Translation*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS—QUEBEC—REPORTED INCREASE IN UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, during the question period, I asked the Acting Prime Minister to confirm or deny the figures concerning unemployment in the Montreal region.

The minister said that the figures I put forward were inaccurate. He denied the figures I quoted from a Montreal newspaper and which were issued, more particularly by the regional manager of the unemployment insurance commission office in Montreal.

I am also amazed, Mr. Speaker, to notice that while we are discussing such a serious problem which concerns every individual, every Canadian taxpayer affected by this

plague of unemployment, this government does not seem interested. I notice that at the present time not one minister is in the house to give us information as to the exact situation of unemployment affecting the Montreal area.

I am not surprised to see that those ministers are not in the house to give us some information on the election promises they made when they sat in opposition, namely that if the Liberal party came to office, it would set up a bureau of statistics so that hon. members and members of the unemployment insurance commission could be made aware of the exact situation of employment. At that time it was said that the system used by the unemployment insurance commission and the dominion bureau of statistics provided inaccurate figures.

After two years of Liberal administration we are still waiting for that election promise to be carried out so that hon. members will know the exact situation in all regions affected by unemployment.

As I said, I am amazed to see that no minister is in his seat to confirm that increase in the unemployment affecting the province of Quebec and particularly the Montreal area or at least to give us some detailed information.

An English language newspaper of Montreal specified that the number of unemployed in the province of Quebec has increased by 27 per cent between April and September 1964.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the government authorities should immediately take an interest in those statistics and tell us what they intend to do in order to stem unemployment in the province of Quebec which is especially affected by that situation.

I have here the pamphlet which my Liberal opponent circulated in my riding in the last election campaign. It says that the Liberal party is the only one which can solve unemployment by a program for the expansion of our industrial production. It says also that the Liberal government is the only one who will bring about full employment.

After two years under the Liberal regime we are far from full employment, when we consider that almost 40,000 taxpayers in the Montreal area are unemployed.

Not long ago the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau), under the pressure of a few members of the splinter parties including the N.D.P., was upset by the fact that prisoners, especially at the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, were kept in small cells lacking elementary sanitary facilities.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if it is desirable to get more sanitary premises for prisoners, I feel that it is much more human for this government to get jobs for the unemployed who are law-abiding citizens of this country.

There are unemployed in the Montreal area and in other parts of Canada, who live in slums and old tenements. I am surprised that the Minister of Justice does not have so much regard for the families affected by unemployment who comprise honest people and law-abiding citizens of our country. The government ignores those people who ask only one thing, to earn an honest living.

Our present government is not interested in the unemployment which prevails in the Montreal district and in the province of Quebec.

Some statistics show, Mr. Speaker, that 2,000 persons were employed this year in the building industry in the metropolitan area.

I will point out that if some 2,000 persons were employed, it is due to the construction work required by the world fair which was of course initiated under the Conservative party. But without this wonderful achievement I am wondering what the employment situation would be in the province of Quebec.

In my opinion the Minister of Industry should admit that the province of Quebec and the whole of the city of Montreal constitute a depressed area. I think this would be more in conformity with the policy being preached by the Liberal party.

But the present government would not dare take the chance of taking this step because, in so doing, it would admit its utter failure with regard to employment in this country.

I am absolutely appalled by the lack of interest and concern shown the unemployed and the unemployment situation in the metropolitan area.

There are 21 electoral districts in the city of Montreal. Of these, one is Conservative, the others, Liberal. What astounds me is that no member for the city of Montreal rises, here, in the house, as it is his duty to do, to ask the government to intervene in this slump in the metropolitan region and to demand that the government take drastic measures to remedy the critical unemployment situation.

The situation scares us because we ask ourselves what will become of our families

this winter when there are already so many unemployed at a time which is favourable to construction?

I ask the government to deny the figures I have given, or else to take the necessary steps to improve this unfortunate situation.

[*Text*]

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the only statistics appearing in the article to which the hon. member referred, a copy of which I must say I have been unable to obtain, for which the national employment service takes any responsibility are those for the Montreal metropolitan area. In the metropolitan area there were 41,812 registrations, which of course are always higher than the number of unemployed, as of October 30, 1963, and 38,868 on October 30, 1964, or a reduction of 2,944 for that month. Any other figures quoted are the responsibility of the *Gazette*, a usually reliable paper, especially of late. However, the sweeping figures quoted are simply not in accordance with the facts.

According to the labour force summary for September supplied by the Department of Labour and d.b.s., the latest figure available shows a substantial decrease in unemployment in the Quebec region over last year. On September 21 last year there were 108,000 unemployed, while on September 21 this year there were no more than 84,000 unemployed, a decrease of 24,000. From August to September of this year there was a decrease of 16,000 in the unemployed in the Quebec region. The most recent unemployment figure available for all of Canada stands at 3.1 per cent of the labour force, the lowest in eight years.

I think it can be said that we have reached a new low in unemployment and in fact it was reported recently that the premier of Ontario was seeking to import many thousands of people from the Orient to work in the labour force of that province. While I am not sure what the premier of Quebec is doing in Europe, it could be he is looking for stonemasons to build the penitentiary to which the hon. member has referred. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member seems to be just as careless with facts as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) seems to have been in the last few days.

Mr. Valade: Is that the full employment you are talking about—40,000 unemployed?

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

[The following items were passed in committee of supply this day]:

DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

A—Department—

1. Departmental administration, $363,600.

1a. Departmental administration including the expenses of the advisory committee on broadcasting, $84,000.

5. Companies and corporations branch, $167,300.

10. Translation bureau, $1,994,000.

15. 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

(a) the fee payable on filing an application for patent, the fee payable on grant of a patent, and the fee payable on petition to re-issue a patent after surrender, which fees shall be deemed, for the purposes of the Patent Act, to be the fees set forth in section 75 thereof; and

(b) renewal fees, payable during the term of each patent issued on an application filed after a date to be set by order in council, such fees to be a prerequisite for the maintenance of the patent rights notwithstanding section 49 of the Patent Act, $2,810,100.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, November 6, 1964

The house met at 11 a.m.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—DISCUSSIONS RESPECTING ATTITUDE OF GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and ask whether the government has recently received representations from the government of France, or from General de Gaulle, relating to a new form or direction for the NATO alliance. I ask the question because of an article in today's issue of *Le Devoir* reporting an alleged statement made by Mr. Pompidou, the French premier, that in line with recent events in the Soviet union and China, NATO's strategic concept must be completely revamped. Has the Canadian government had any discussions in this regard?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman has raised a matter of considerable importance. There have been no direct communications from the government of France on this subject, but the attitude the government of France takes toward the military organization of NATO has been the subject of considerable discussion between Canada and France and between the government of France and the other members of NATO.

The publicly stated position of the president of France was referred to by the French foreign minister two days ago in the statement made with regard to the m.l.f. and its relation to NATO. I may say that one of the reasons I asked Mr. Paul-Henri Spaak, the foreign minister of Belgium, to come to Ottawa was in regard to this problem. Today I am having discussions with Mr. Lange, the foreign minister of Norway. Our discussions will have to do with some aspects of this situation.

I would simply like to say that NATO represents for Canada a very essential element of our foreign and military policy. We regard the participation of France in NATO as one of the most important components in the integrity and unity of that organization. We hope there will be no development on the part of any member of the organization that would in any way result in less interest in NATO or a withdrawal from it. I can assure my right hon. friend this whole question is being carefully examined.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the minister on the necessity of maintaining a strong and effective NATO organization and not permitting the cement which joins the various nations to become weakened in any way. However, the minister made a statement, referring to the attitude that France is taking toward NATO, that I think should be amplified. What are the implications of that statement? Does it in any way convey a decision on the part of France, or a fear that France may separate itself from this organization so necessary to the preservation of western defence?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): It is well known, Mr. Speaker, that the government of France has taken a position with regard to the integration of forces in NATO. Its view has been stated on many occasions. It is also known that the government of France, through its foreign minister, has recently confirmed its views about m.l.f., the multilateral nuclear force proposal which has been put forward by the United States. Beyond this I cannot go without interfering with discussions which are now under way.

No intimation has been given by the government of France as to the position it would take if its views did not prevail. I expressed the opinion strongly a moment ago, and I confirm it, that it would be a matter of the greatest regret if the government of France were to take any position, or be caused to take any position, which in our judgment would render less strong the integrity of NATO, particularly at this time in world affairs.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I ask whether the views of the government of France with respect to the m.l.f. differ very greatly from those of the Canadian government? Am I right in understanding

that the Canadian government is still refusing to commit itself to participation in the multilateral force?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I think the Prime Minister stated on several occasions that it was not the intention of the Canadian government to participate in the multilateral force.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

BRITISH COLUMBIA—COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE OF CONVICTED MURDERER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I have a question for the Minister of Justice. In his absence perhaps I could address it to the Prime Minister. It refers to the action of the governor general in council in commuting the sentence on Kingsley Lloyd Meeker from one of death to life imprisonment. As one who is opposed to capital punishment I do not raise any objection to this action. I am perturbed, however, about reports to the effect that this man could be paroled within ten years. Since he was found guilty of a particularly heinous crime I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether there is any provision in the order for commutation which would make it impossible for this man to be released unless there were adequate assurance he would no longer be a menace to the public safety.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, there is no such reference in the order of commutation, but consideration is being given to certain representations which have been made to the government with regard to this matter.

Mr. Douglas: Will the government be letting the house and the public know what decision it reaches in this regard before the matter is finalized?

Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I am interested in the statement made by the Prime Minister. Is it not customary when a commutation order is made in circumstances such as these to include therein a provision that the nature of the crime committed and the general disposition of the convicted murderer make it necessary that no action be taken at any time in the future to effect the remission of the sentence and the discharge of the prisoner?

Mr. Pearson: I appreciate the point made by the right hon. gentleman. This is one of the matters we are looking into.

[Mr. Douglas.]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

REPRESENTATIONS OF MANIWAKI BAND RESPECTING JURISDICTION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

Has the minister received confirmation from the Maniwaki Algonquin chief that he did not want his group, which comes under federal jurisdiction, to change to provincial jurisdiction?

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Not as far as I know, Mr. Speaker. However, I could check with the department to see if the matter came up.

[*Text*]

REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE PROPOSALS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. In this context with its connotation perhaps the phrase "white paper" is not the correct one to use, but I should like to ask the minister whether he would prepare a document of some sort setting out in as much detail as possible the proposals emanating from the dominion-provincial conference on Indian affairs for presentation to the house, so the house and the native Indian people in particular will know what is the government thinking on all aspects of the Indian affairs problem, both as the dominion and the provincial governments are involved?

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I shall look into the suggestion of the hon. member and tell him what I think about it later on.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REPORTED STATEMENTS RESPECTING COMPETENCE OF STAFF

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State.

Does he intend to order an investigation concerning the charges laid against the C.B.C. by Mrs. Jean Desprez, who has been employed by this corporation for the last 28 years? According to those charges, the C.B.C. would be harbouring rubbish and deadwood, incompetent, useless and good-for-nothing employees. Could the Secretary of State investigate this matter and endeavour to improve the standards of the C.B.C.?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I had the occasion to hear the two simultaneous monologues which were presented over the French network of the C.B.C. I am convinced that the C.B.C. authorities are investigating the facts or the alleged facts which were mentioned in that broadcast.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the Secretary of State. Does he refuse to order an investigation into the facts mentioned, or, in view of those serious charges, does he intend to order such an investigation and see to it that it be carried out?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the C.B.C. will promptly carry out an investigation. I would also point out to the hon. member for Lapointe that the committee on broadcasting is presently investigating problems concerning broadcasting, including the administration methods of the C.B.C.

[*Text*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST THAT PENDING LEGISLATION BE CONSIDERED BY HOUSE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the effect that Bill No. C-126 may have on the continuing operation of a large section of the Canadian mining industry, will the minister now consider sending this bill to the committee on industrial relations so that all interested parties from the mining industry, as well as other industries, can be heard?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I do not understand how this bill could have any general effect on the mining industry in Canada.

Mr. Simpson: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister not realize that the large mines at Flin Flon, Manitoba, come under the dominion labour code, and that all mining in the Northwest Territories also comes under the dominion labour code?

[*Later:*]

Mr. Simpson: A supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. Will the minister inquire into the effect that Bill No. C-126 will have on the mining industry and then consider sending this bill to the committee on industrial relations?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I have already considered the possible effect on the mining industry. That industry usually comes under provincial jurisdiction in all provinces of Canada, with the exception of the uranium mines, which have been declared to be to the general advantage of Canada. Therefore this industry comes under the bill.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, would the minister now be able to assure the house that the hours of work provision provided in the bill will not be applicable to country elevator operators?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to deal with these questions when the bill returns for discussion and is dealt with in the committee of the whole.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour, since the transport industry comes under joint jurisdiction, federal and provincial. Did the minister think of seeking the opinion of the federal legal advisers on the constitutionality of Bill No. C-126?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, this is another question which we can deal with in the committee of the whole.

Mr. Simpson: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister has stated that only the uranium mines come under federal labour jurisdiction. I have pointed out to him that all the base metal mines at Flin Flon, Manitoba, come under the dominion labour regulations. It is my belief that the mines in the Northwest Territories also come under the dominion labour code.

Mr. Nielsen: Don't forget the Yukon.

Mr. MacEachen: This is another question which can be dealt with in the committee of the whole. I think it was agreed the last time this was raised that it was irregular to deal with questions concerning a matter

which had been listed for consideration by the house at a later date.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may I put a further supplementary question?

Is the Minister of Labour considering referring this bill to the committee on industrial relations, in order to enable the members to question legal advisers on the constitutionality of this legislation, which we cannot do in committee of the whole?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the House of Commons has already referred this bill to a committee, namely the committee of the whole house.

URANIUM

CALLING OF NEW CONTRACT TENDERS FOLLOWING FORECAST OF SHORTAGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. Because of the announcement in yesterday's newspapers, the second such statement in a few weeks, by Mr. Gilchrist, president of the crown corporation, Eldorado Mining and Refining, that he foresees a shortage of uranium, would the government consider the calling of new contract tenders for uranium?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, as Eldorado Mining and Refining comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I would refer this question to him.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Webb: Mr. Speaker, my question a few minutes ago was directed to the Minister of Industry because in the statement made by the government it was said that the Department of Industry would be responsible for the people of Bancroft. That is the reason I directed the question to the Minister of Industry. I will now direct it to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Because of the recent statement, the second one in a very few weeks, made by Mr. Gilchrist, president of the crown company Eldorado, that he foresees a shortage of uranium, would the government consider calling for new tenders for uranium?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gilchrist was speaking about the general uranium situation. It is his opinion there will be a shortage in the future. It is not the government's intention to buy any more uranium at the present time.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

CONSIDERATION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE OF AMENDMENT FORMULA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Prime Minister a question. In the light of the publication of a statement promising a white paper on the question of constitutional amendment, will the house be enabled to make a detailed examination of this white paper and secure a variety of views on this vitally important question by means of a parliamentary committee that could look into this matter? I think a statement on this question was promised some time ago. I would like to know whether we are to have a parliamentary committee to look into this subject.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, members of the house will certainly have an opportunity to express their views on this very important question. The exact procedure to be adopted in this regard is, as I have said, under consideration and a statement will be made very shortly. There are reasons, which I need not go into, why it has not been possible to make it before now, but I assure my hon. friend that we hope to make that statement next week.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

TRAINING OF WEST GERMAN FORCES IN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Arnold Webster (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Is it true that members of the West German armed forces will be trained in Canada this winter? If so, how many men will be involved and where will they be stationed?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the tests which were planned to be held in Canada this winter of certain equipment under cold weather conditions have been postponed due to the timing in the series of tests being held. Therefore they will not be held as previously planned.

IMMIGRATION

REPORTED REDUCTION IN CANADIAN WORKERS ALLOWED INTO U.S.

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

Could the minister confirm or explain the fact that lately the American consulate has decided to reduce by 90 per cent the number of Canadians allowed to cross into the United States in order to work?

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, if that question were put on the order paper, I could provide more details.

[*Text*]

THE SENATE

SUGGESTED APPOINTMENT OF FORMER EXTERNAL AFFAIRS MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister, and I do so with the hope that he personally places a different connotation on the word "consideration" than that which he attributes to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

I should like to ask whether, in view of the fact that during the entire tenure of office of the previous administration no opportunity was afforded for an appointment to the Senate from the province of British Columbia, the Prime Minister has considered or will consider offering an appointment to the Senate to Hon. Howard Green.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that is a very interesting suggestion and certainly should be given consideration along with similar consideration in respect of the many other persons from British Columbia qualified for the Senate. It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Green has ambitions to return to another house of parliament.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF FOREIGN MINISTER OF NORWAY

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I call attention to the presence in the gallery of the foreign minister of Norway, Mr. Halvard Lange, one of the strongest and most constructive supporters of the Atlantic alliance over the years, and a man whom I think all parliamentarians would be delighted to honour.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

SUPPLY

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

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 $2,289,221,625 for the purposes of votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 42, 45 and 50 of this department regardless of the year in which such commitments will come in course of payment (of which it is estimated that $799,648,500 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 in respect of assistance rendered to the United Nations, any party of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or any provincial or municipal government, $3,917,825.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that during the months that have passed since last year's estimates were up for consideration by the house in December there have been numerous occasions when defence matters have been discussed in parliament, I wish to preface my remarks today by saying that I will attempt not to duplicate the information already submitted in previous debates.

In addition to the debates in the house, the special committee on defence was re-established in May on this year and has had the opportunity to study many important subjects relating to defence policy generally. On behalf of the government I should like to express our appreciation for the conscientious work of the members of the committee. Certainly the recommendations contained in the report submitted to the house on October 1 have received careful study and consideration by my colleague the associate minister and myself, and by officials of the department.

Debates in the House of Commons include the one on the establishment of the United Nations force in Cyprus in March; the one in May prior to the establishment of the special committee on defence; the one relating to the amendment of the National Defence Act incorporated in Bill No. C-90 in May and later

at the end of June; and finally the discussion which followed the acceptance of the motion of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition to adjourn the ordinary business of the house in order to discuss the Cyprus situation on August 10.

In addition, in March parliament and the Canadian people were furnished with a white paper on defence which outlined the defence policy of the present government. Since the purpose of the white paper was to project defence policy into the years ahead, I am sure the committee will agree that this paper should be the basis of the discussions we are now commencing in respect to the estimates of the Department of National Defence for the year 1964-65.

This year, as set out in the blue book, the government is asking for the approval by this committee of estimated expenditures of $1,525,000,000. This figure is a reduction of some $109 million from the estimate of $1,634,000,000 for 1963-64. Of necessity the estimates we are now considering were prepared prior to the completion of the white paper, but they do reflect to a considerable extent the studies which were carried out within the department and which were referred to in my remarks last December.

Hon. members will, I know, be interested in the progress that has been made over the year, and in particular in the steps which have been taken to implement announcement policy. Before going on to this, however, I would like to make a brief reference to the strategic situation now existing.

The real balance of power in the world has not changed materially since the white paper on defence was tabled. There have been developments, however, of some significance. There has been a change in leadership in the Soviet union. Early reports do not indicate any major change in Soviet foreign policy, and there have been what appear to be reassuring statements to this effect. It is too soon to determine for certain, however, that there will be no change in the direction established by the Khrushchev administration, and some time will be required to permit an adequate assessment. During this time of uncertainty it would be prudent for NATO forces to remain alert and for NATO governments to be ready to respond to any genuine gestures offering a prospect of easing world tensions.

Communist China has now succeeded in exploding its first nuclear device, a possibility which was forecast in the white paper. Although this test came as no particular surprise, it does show that the Chinese have sufficient technical knowledge to permit them to develop a nuclear arsenal. The immediate effect of this explosion is to increase Chinese military prestige so as to overawe their Asian neighbours. It was indicated in the white paper that it will be some years before they would have any substantial long range delivery capability even if they were to divert a consideration proportion of their resources to this end. However, the long term consequences are important and should not be minimized.

An important development during the year was the events which led to conflict on the island of Cyprus, posing as they do a threat to international peace and to the security of the eastern Mediterranean flank of NATO. The circumstances leading to this have been fully dealt with by my colleague the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but I should like to make reference to the outstanding part played by the Canadian armed forces in implementing the decision taken by the Canadian government and by parliament. I do not wish to repeat what has already been said in the debate in August, but perhaps a brief summary might give some indication of our demonstrated capability.

On the day the Canadian government approved the dispatch to Cyprus Canadian personnel, an advance party of 26 left Trenton. The actual airlifting of troops was started on March 15 and was completed by March 22. H.M.C.S. *Bonaventure* left Halifax on March 18 and arrived off Cyprus on the 30th, carrying vehicles with their drivers and some 92 tons of cargo. On April 10, in response to a request by the secretary general of the United Nations, some 156 additional personnel were sent to Cyprus to provide a brigade headquarters for the United Nations force. Finally on August 13, again in response to a request from the United Nations, Canada sent an anti-tank platoon.

Over the months that the United Nations force has been in operation in Cyprus, the Canadian element of that force has performed in a manner of which all Canadians can be proud. I was fortunate to be able to visit Cyprus in June, to have had the opportunity to meet at first hand our troops there and to be briefed by Canadian officers in the field on what exactly Canadians were being called upon to do. I was extremely impressed and extremely proud of our men.

The situation in Cyprus has been fraught with difficulty but, as the Secretary of State

for External Affairs has informed the house, within the last few weeks there has been a period of comparative quiet, and I myself believe that the presence of the United Nations force, of which Canadian personnel form a very substantial part, has been one of the most significant factors leading to the improved conditions. Certainly the government, in agreeing to extend Canada's participation for a further three months, put great dependence on this fact. The six month rotation has been completed with the same smoothness and efficiency that was evidenced last March, the whole operation being carried out in nine days.

Conflict, and the possibility of conflict, continues in many parts of the world; in South Viet Nam, on the border between Indonesia and Malaysia, in Cyprus, in Yemen, in the Congo, etc. While Canada is not directly involved in all these areas, they are all areas of concern to us as they affect the peace and stability of the world situation.

I would now like to discuss operational readiness and operational capability. A year ago none of the squadrons of the air division in Europe were operational in the strike and reconnaissance roles undertaken by Canada in 1959. In the intervening months the operational status has changed dramatically. The necessary agreements have been reached to permit the storage of the special ammunition for the strike role, and the six squadrons of CF-104's stationed in Germany are now operational. The two reconnaissance squadrons stationed at Marville in France have undergone intensive operational training for some months and are expected to reach full aircrew establishment in early 1965.

In accordance with the commitment given by the government, decisions have been taken which will permit all aircraft in the air division to have an alternate non-nuclear support role capability. Contrary to one or two articles which have appeared in the newspapers, the modifications required to permit these airplanes to carry conventional armaments are not great. We anticipate that it will be possible to proceed in an orderly fashion to give the aircraft and the aircrews this dual capability.

In the past year the operational capability of the brigade group stationed in Germany has been improved by the addition of 12 Centurion tanks to the armoured regiment and the formation of an anti-tank company which is being issued with a new anti-tank guided missile now being received from contract. Selected personnel from Canada and the brigade group have attended anti-tank guided missile instructor courses, and a missile controller course for operators was conducted in the brigade this summer. Graduates of this course are manning the anti-tank weapon systems of the Royal 22nd regiment company now in Germany.

As hon. members know, the brigade group has included an Honest John artillery battery since early 1962. Until this summer, however, the battery was unarmed. Recently, following the signing of the necessary agreements, the battery has become operational.

For several years it has been obvious that the brigade group suffered one notable deficiency in equipment, that is the absence of armoured personnel carriers. The decision taken last year to acquire the M-113 armoured personnel carrier has resulted in initial deliveries, with production quantities to be available early in the new year. By midsummer the total complement for the brigade group should be available for Europe. The availability of armoured personnel carriers will result in a marked qualitative improvement in the operational capability of the brigade group.

Mr. Churchill: May I interrupt with a question? The minister says that by midsummer the complete complement will be available. How many?

Mr. Hellyer: I believe something in excess of 400 is the approximate number required.

Another important addition will be the provision of a transport helicopter platoon. Following the delivery of heavy transport cargo helicopters now under contract and the training of crews to operational standards, the platoon will be moved to Europe to provide logistic and tactical air mobility.

To increase the fire power of the brigade group, two 105 mm. batteries of artillery are being replaced with two 155 mm. batteries.

To increase the transport capability of the Royal Canadian Air Force the decision was taken some months ago to augment the inventory of C130E Hercules aircraft. An order was placed for 16 C130E Hercules planes and the first of these will be delivered shortly, the balance to follow in the period between now and August of next year. The C130E is a remarkably good aircraft which can operate from unimproved airstrips, and its short landing and take-off characteristics are ideal for the support of the Canadian army in mobile operations.

There has been a steady improvement in the fighting efficiency and modernization of

our antisubmarine ships. Two new destroyer escorts have been added to the fleet. H.M.C.S. *Nipigon* has been commissioned and H.M.C.S. *Annapolis* will be coming into service in December. These two ships are fitted with both variable depth sonar and full facilities for operating large antisubmarine helicopters. Trials of the Canadian developed "haul down" gear to enable these helicopters to operate effectively in rough weather are proceeding satisfactorily.

Concurrently the conversion of the seven St. Laurent class destroyer escorts has been proceeding. This conversion brings these escorts up to full *Nipigon* standards. Two ships are already fully converted and back in service and the third, the *Ottawa*, is about to be recommissioned. H.M.C.S. *Assiniboine*, the first ship converted, has been making excellent progress in trials operating the latest antisubmarine helicopter, the CHSS-2 Sea King, from her own flight deck and hangar. This combination gives every promise of being completely successful and, if this is so, the combination of operating a destroyer escort with its own antisubmarine helicopter as a single weapons system will increase by several times the effective surveillance which can be furnished by our antisubmarine fleet.

The first of three new submarines of the Oberon class, the *Ojibwa*, was launched last February, and in June the keel was laid for the second, the *Onondaga*. The acquisition of these submarines will not only increase our operational capability but will also be invaluable for training purposes.

Development of the hydrofoil as a potential antisubmarine vehicle is continuing. Along with the development of a prototype ocean going craft is the development of its associated weapons system. We wish to determine the feasibility and effectiveness of a high speed hydrofoil antisubmarine vessel in conjunction with other naval forces. The design being developed is based on a concept by the defence research board which is unique and different from those being developed in other countries. The weapons system for the hydrofoil will include variable depth sonar and homing torpedoes. The target date for completion of the construction of the prototype is mid-1966. Any plans for operational use of the hydrofoil will have to await evaluation of the seagoing trials.

It is interesting to note that the British government is concentrating on the development of hovercraft ships in the same role. This will permit concurrent development of two entirely different concepts in the two countries, with full information in respect of developments being made available to the other. By concentrating its efforts on one of the two concepts each country will be making the best use of its resources, and will at the same time have access to the benefits of new knowledge derived from each. There is a full exchange of technical information in respect of these craft among the United States, Canada and Britain.

Some months ago a study was undertaken in the Department of National Defence to determine the best combination of ships and weapons systems for the antisubmarine role. This study was completed on schedule and is now being studied by the integrated defence staff. We anticipate that it will be possible to take some decisions and indicate our initial requirements for new ships within a few weeks.

Over the past several years Canada has worked in close co-operation with the United States in respect of air defence of the North American continent. The white paper pointed out certain fundamental questions which will have to be answered before it is possible to determine what role will be required in air defence in the years ahead. In particular, the deployment or non-deployment of an anti-intercontinental ballistic missile system will have a direct bearing on future plans. Until this major decision is taken there are many questions which must remain unanswered.

In the present strategic situation it is considered worth while to maintain fully operational anti-bomber defences. In this connection Canada has increased, and continues to increase, the capability of its contribution to the anti-bomber defences. The arming of the two Bomarc missile squadrons has doubled the number of vehicles available in this role. We have reduced the number of interceptor squadrons from five to three in order to reduce overhead and increase efficiency, but the acquisition of the MB1G missile expected in the new year will increase the effective operational capability of our interceptor forces by a significant order of magnitude.

Mr. Churchill: Is that a nuclear missile?

Mr. Hellyer: Yes. Canada has been playing and will continue to play its full part in the collective security of the North American continent.

In this regard it is perhaps advisable to lay at rest the newspaper speculation that the NORAD agreement would not be renewed. This report was without any foundation whatever. From a strategic standpoint the security

of the North American continent is indivisible; therefore the NORAD agreement, or a similar arrangement, is a continuing requirement. The Canadian government has no intention of withdrawing from full partnership in co-operation with the United States in the collective security of the continent.

As part of our program to increase the operational readiness of our forces and to ensure maximum co-operation both within the services and with our allies, we have participated and will be participating in a number of major exercises. Some examples of these exercises that have been held so far this year are as follows. In February, units of the army and the R.C.A.F. carried out an airborne, air transported exercise to test plans for regional defence operations. In another, the Royal Canadian Navy, R.C.A.F. and army tested the embarkation, transportation and logistic support of a company group of 3 CIBG ready force. The most recent one was Yeoman, in which the 3 CIBG ready force was moved by sea to Argentia, Newfoundland from Saint John, New Brunswick and Halifax, Nova Scotia. H.M.C.S. *Provider* and nine escorts as well as R.C.A.F. aircraft from air transport command and maritime air command participated along with United States naval personnel stationed at Argentia.

An international exercise was conducted in February and March in an area off Ceylon which included naval forces from Canada and was designed to exercise combined commonwealth forces in the conduct of war operations and to advance standards of efficiency in weapons. Other countries participating in this exercise were Britain, Australia, India, Malaysia and New Zealand. Another exercise in April included units of the R.C.N. and maritime air command along with units from the United States, Britain and the Netherlands to further the development and improve the tactics, doctrine, command and control arrangements for antisubmarine warfare barrier operations. In September, Slamex was an exercise in combined antisubmarine warfare operations to evaluate the effectiveness of available Canadian and U.S. forces in coordinated defensive operations against missile launching submarines off the east coast of this continent.

Joint Canada-U.S. exercises are continually taking place to test the effectiveness of our air defences here, while in Europe both the 4th brigade group and the air division have joined with the land and air forces of our NATO allies in training manoeuvres to ensure their maximum effectiveness.

For the immediate future, further exercises are planned which will provide cold weather winter warfare training at Fort Wainwright and, in conjunction with the United States, units of the army and air transport command will conduct cold weather operations in Alaska. Also, in December an exercise will be held in Newfoundland to gain experience in securing an air force base against ground attack with units from all three services and the U.S.A.F. co-operating. These are only a few of the many national and international exercises in which the armed forces are participating, either here at home, in Europe, or in other areas where conditions are conducive to furthering the capability of the armed forces to be prepared for any eventuality.

I have spoken at some length about our contribution to NATO and to NORAD, since the major part of our defence effort is concentrated in those areas in so far as manpower and expenditures are concerned. However, our military contribution to the United Nations peace forces, as hon. members know, plays an important part in international stability and has a not inconsiderable impact on the defence budget.

Looking in isolation at the various United Nations operations to which Canada makes a contribution does not give a true picture of our involvement in this important area. Quite apart from the Congo, from which the United Nations force was withdrawn this summer and to which Canada supplied an important element of specially trained personnel, at the present time we have 17 Canadian officers forming part of the United Nations truce supervisory organization between Israel on the one hand and the United Arab Republic, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria on the other. Over 800 army personnel and some 100 R.C.A.F. personnel are stationed in the Gaza strip to guard against border violations between Israel and the United Arab Republic. In Cyprus we have about 1,200 Canadians. Twelve Canadian officers and five other ranks form part of the United Nations military observer group whose role is to supervise the terms of the cease fire agreement between India, Pakistan and Kashmir, and some 47 officers and 35 other ranks are part of the international supervisory commissions comprising members from Canada, India and Poland in Laos and Viet Nam.

In so far as the newly independent countries are concerned, Canadian armed forces personnel are providing training assistance to Ghana and Nigeria, while training in Canada is being given to a number of service personnel

from other commonwealth countries. Military survey teams have been sent to Tanganyika and Malaysia to determine the military training and equipment assistance Canada might appropriately give them, having regard to our other military and financial commitments.

As indicated in the white paper, it was decided that the best method of ensuring the rapid and effective integration of Canada's armed forces would be to start at the top. This is the procedure being followed. Bill C-90, amending the National Defence Act, was passed by parliament after due deliberation and came into effect on August 1, 1964. On that day the positions of Chairman, chiefs of staff committee, and the chiefs of the individual services were abolished and the new organization established. The new organization consists of the chief of the defence staff, the vice chief of defence staff, the assistant chief of defence staff, and four functional chiefs—operational readiness, personnel, logistics and engineering, and comptroller general.

Since the bill was proclaimed the reorganization has been developing stage by stage. The first stage being considered is the complete integration of Canadian forces headquarters. This process has now reached the higher levels and will continue until all the positions required for the new integrated headquarters have been filled. The target figure for savings at Canadian force headquarters is approximately one third throughout all ranks, and will be possible as a result of the formation of an integrated staff and the elimination of duplication and triplication. It is anticipated that the new integrated headquarters will be largely organized on the reduced scale within a year. Some special problems pertaining to the logistics and engineering branch exist, however, and progress in this area in making the planned reductions may not be as rapid as in other branches.

Throughout the integration process new methods are being developed and new policies established. We are attempting to take the best from the several systems previously in operation and to apply them as a whole. In the case of logistics, for example, this will mean extending the automated system presently in use by the air force throughout the three services.

Now that the integration of the Canadian forces headquarters is well under way, preliminary thought is being given to the integration of commands. It is anticipated that within a few months it will be possible to evolve a careful long range plan which will permit considerable financial savings while at the same time maintaining and, hopefully, even improving the efficiency of units. Stage three will involve the integration of schools and other facilities. This will follow naturally and logically from stage two. While it is difficult to predict the time cycle required for the whole process, it is anticipated that the major elements of integration can take place, and the most important savings effected, within three years.

The special service force is being formed by modifying an existing Canadian army brigade group to provide a light mobile force smaller than our brigade groups assigned to NATO. The force is to be air transportable, with some of its equipment air droppable. The force will consist of a headquarters and three infantry battalions, light artillery, engineer and signals elements and other ancillary and support units as required to enable the force to carry out its various operational commitments. For instance, a reconnaissance squadron from the newly formed reconnaissance regiment might be assigned to this force. Similarly, if it requires heavier weapons such as tanks or anti-tank guns, these will be provided from our other conventional units. Should the force require an airborne capability, a parachute element will be assigned to it.

A number of major equipment items implicit in the white paper have been under serious study for some time. As I indicated earlier, I hope to be able to announce within a few weeks a substantial part of our shipbuilding program for the next few years. The same applies to aircraft. We have been giving detailed study to our requirements for tactical aircraft in a close ground support role, and it is hoped that a decision can be made in this respect, too, within a reasonable length of time. Also under consideration is the possibility of acquiring self propelled artillery, and reconnaissance and other vehicles for the army.

In summation I would like to say that notwithstanding the reduction in expenditures, we will have achieved within two years a significant qualitative improvement and operational capability of our armed forces. Further qualitative improvements will take place as new equipment becomes available and new tactics are developed. We are at the same time involved in an historic reorganization which will put us in the forefront of developments in the field of military organization.

We fully appreciate the problems that are inherent in any such reorganization. No improvements can be effected, whether they be the installation of new streets or lights or water systems, without some temporary inconvenience and dislocation. The same problem applies in respect to the integration of our forces. In order to effect permanent and worth-while improvements, temporary inconvenience and dislocation is inevitable. We are deeply grateful for the patient understanding of those who have been affected, and we will do our utmost to minimize the problems that we will create for others during this transitional period.

Mr. Churchill: Not a word about the militia; a shocking omission.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the minister's statement and certain points he has mentioned. Perhaps the hon. member for Rosedale would tend to matters of justice and to what he is reading, and we will get on with the discussion here rather than have him make sotto voce remarks from his seat.

Mr. Macdonald: Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege, I am interested to have the hon. member acknowledge that what he is going to say is not worth listening to and that I should read. I will take his advice.

Mr. Lambert: The minister has referred to the white paper. With the passage of time I have not revised my opinion with respect to the white paper, in that I feel it has been greatly overestimated and there has been a great deal of ballyhoo in regard to it. It has not materially changed from white papers in the past, and I think we have made our views known in this regard. There was a great deal of ballyhoo with regard to estimated savings, or what were thought to be savings or projected savings to be savings, but nowhere is there any concrete evidence as to these savings. I think we will have to depend upon experience to see whether there actually was not a real flim-flam in this regard.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be instructive to read the last October 7 report of the meeting of the Canadian air industry in Quebec city. The following is attributed to the air chief marshal, who is reported as having said:

> —the proposed integrated armed forces will provide savings for defence spending, but a speedy decision was difficult to make while the forces were working out the many problems of intergrating forces management.

He did say that he expects a saving but that this cannot be expected immediately. In the early stages, certainly, one cannot anticipate these savings of which the minister spoke and about which there was the usual publicity surrounding the issuing of this white paper. I am sure the minister, in retrospect, will agree that there was a great deal of optimism but that the actual carrying out or the implementation of some of these plans will indicate that the so-called savings are just not there. I think it was wrong too, to say there would be savings, if it was the minister's intention, as I think it was, to devote the moneys that he could take from one sector for use in another. These are not savings; this is a reallocation of funds and a redirection of spending.

There is no quarrel with the basic principles involved in this; but to talk about savings and say they were going to save perhaps a billion dollars over ten years is a lot of nonsense, unless the minister intends to reduce the role of the armed services. He tackled one portion of the over-all defence expenditures which was nothing new to his advisers; it was information that was available and was being acted on by the previous administration. It is a problem that has occurred not only in this country but in all countries, in that really the housekeeping costs were getting out of line; and not only a little out of line. They were built into the system. The minister has tackled this problem by trying to bring about integration. We will see whether that is going to work out in so far as a saving or a making of funds available for other expenditures is concerned.

I noted the remarks the minister made with regard to the progress of unification of command. I call it unification of command; I do not call it integration, because I do not think it is yet integration. It is purely unification of command. This is a desirable step all the way along. Obviously there are going to be some difficulties in this connection. Again I think a great fanfare, shall we say, was made in regard to an idea; then how to work it out came later. Already we learn of some reservations in this respect. Earlier this year the minister was indefinite about a great many things; now he tells us that it is possible that, in the main, integration or so-called integration, or unification of command, will take place within three years, and that in so far as Canadian forces headquarters is concerned, with the exception of logistics and engineering, by late next fall.

A year after August 1, 1964 or shortly thereafter, it is anticipated that the Canadian forces headquarters will be reorganized.

I am not going to say any more about this matter at the present time. We had a complete examination of it earlier this year. Again I am going to make the reservations that I made at that time. I would like to see, in the performance of this reorganization, just what has happened to the civilian counterparts in the minister's office, the alternative that was offered by the opposition with regard to the reorganization in order to eliminate some of the very real difficulties regarding the chain of command as it now exists.

The minister did say something about the replacement of ships for the navy. Well, it is still delightfully vague as to when the decision may be made. The minister will agree, I think, that over the past few months he has been very pleasant and very non-committal when he has been asked by members of the opposition when a certain decision was going to be taken. He has said it would be in a few days, shortly, or in due course; all those nice, imprecise terms. But the minister used to—if I may use a very slang phrase—blow his stack, when he sat in the opposition, if these expressions were used by his predecessors in office. I remember that his indignation used to be something to behold, but he certainly learned the lesson far better than his teachers as to imprecision and this delightful vagueness in so far as telling the house what is being planned is concerned.

Mr. Churchill: It is because of lack of knowledge.

Mr. Lambert: I think today the same thing applies with regard to the ships and what he has told us with regard to the decisions taken by him in connection with the *Assiniboine* and the *Nipigon,* as well as the Sea King helicopters were also decisions taken much earlier. The conversion of the St. Laurent class of destroyer escorts was an earlier decision. The purchase of the three submarines was also an earlier decision. The only way the minister or this administration can claim that some of these decisions may be theirs is by saying that on assuming office they suspended everything and then decided to reconfirm the decisions.

One thing they have not done, and I think it is very serious. Two years ago the hon. member for Calgary North, when minister of defence, announced a program respecting general purpose frigates. On assuming office the new minister suspended that decision, and then after several months decided not to go ahead with them. But there has been no announcement whatever as to whether there are to be any ships to replace the general purpose frigates, whether there will be a modification of the proposed general purpose frigates, or what there will be. There is that delightfully vague suggestion concerning ships. Is this suggestion along the line attributed to the associate minister the other day, that there should be ships with great troop carrying capacity; that the transport ability of the navy would be increased? If these remarks were attributed, rightly or wrongly, to the associate minister there may be some validity in the point of view that the navy requires some type of ships which will provide a greater troop carrying capacity in a combined role. I remember the minister's notorious speech in which a bold new military policy was announced. That was the one which sort of spluttered but did not get off the ground. That was a famous occasion which the minister will remember to his dying day.

Mr. Hellyer: It got off the ground too soon.

Mr. Lambert: It was a damp squib in any event. There was in that statement of policy an item in connection with greater transportability of men and equipment by the navy.

We have not heard too much about the minister's thoughts in this regard. I think that today he could have taken the house into his confidence in connection with what he conceives to be the strategy and tactical use of our Canadian armed forces, particularly the army. In addition, we have not heard about the proposed reorganization of army commands. True enough, the minister said that he is looking at this, but in the interval are our brigades marking time?

I can do nothing but underline the absolute urgency of arriving at a decision regarding replacement ships for the navy. Certainly the defence committee is of the opinion that the decision must be made soon. The committee was made aware, both by the minister's advisers and by the senior officials of those forces with which the navy is co-operating in the north Atlantic, that unless we get some of these replacement ships laid down soon there is going to be a gap by 1970, when the obsolescence of our present ships will place many of them in the category of very limited use.

It must be remembered that the minister's advisers in this regard were primarily the same men who advised the hon. member

for Calgary North and the previous administration on a ship replacement program. They foresaw over two years ago that these ships would have to be replaced, yet two years later we are still in suspense. It is obvious that there is going to be a gap, unless of course their role is going to be changed; but we have heard nothing in that regard. Therefore, assuming their role will remain as it is now, I suggest to the minister that it is high time that the qualitative and quantitative capacity of our navy be decided upon as of now. Not only is it important to our defence capability, but I am sure the minister understands that this question is seriously affecting the morale of the men in the navy, and that there is a limit to their patience in this regard.

The same comments apply to replacement aircraft. There seems to be a sort of self generated hysteria building up in connection with this matter, and I am wondering just how much of this has been sponsored by certain circles in connection with an aircraft to replace the CF-104. One article in this connection which appeared recently was entitled "The Phantom aircraft industry". Then there was a most extraordinary communiqué put out I know not by whom, but presumably by someone on behalf of the minister, on the eve of the conference of Canadian air industries, in which the air industry was told to mind its P's and Q's. As I say, I do not know who was the spokesman but certainly it appeared to be someone in authority.

The following week, namely the week of October 7, the chief of the Canadian defence staff reportedly said in Quebec city that the air defence order is still being worked out. As far as the defence committee is concerned, if the minister feels that some of his opinions should not be made public and wants to come before that committee in camera, I think the defence committee is quite a responsible body which has in the past been able to sit in camera and treat the information placed before it as confidential and for its benefit only.

According to some stories which have appeared in the press there is a tug of war going on in the defence department. There are protagonists of a very fancy and sophisticated aircraft, the McDonnell Phantom fighter, known as a $2.5 million, eight ton bomb carrier. At least that is how it is headed up.

I have also received reports concerning a number of other aircraft, or what one might term potential candidates. No doubt history is repeating itself and there is no dearth of potential candidates. I have referred to the Phantom II. I understand one other candidate is the Northrop Freedom Fighter, which is reportedly less expensive, being in the neighbourhood of $600,000 per copy. There is also the Grumman Intruder, referred to in one press report as an extraordinary ground support aircraft at an extraordinary cost, $4 million per copy. Even that cost is nothing compared to what the Arrow was going to cost. There is also the Douglas Sky Hawk, the Thunderchief and the Lougheed CL-90, which is presumably akin to the CF-104 or the model on which that aircraft was based.

Mr. Chairman, there are two aspects to the philosophy of such a choice. We must consider the glamourous side, shall we say, of the former air force. We cannot call it the air force any more because it has been taken into this integrated force, or so some people believe. In this regard one must consider the Phantom II which is reportely to be a very slick, complex aircraft. As I indicated some days ago, some individuals have suggested that an informal agreement has been reached and all that is required now is an agreement among Britain, the United States and Canada for the manufacture of airframes in Canada, some 250 I believe. The aircraft would have a British engine, which could be substituted for an engine of United States manufacture. This is all speculation, and, undoubtedly, there is uncertainty in this regard. However, the source of this report is usually reasonable and authoritative. Where there is smoke there is usually a certain amount of fire.

Mr. Chairman, it may well be that this proposition is being examined carefully. The Phantom II is reputed to be a very fast aircraft with a speed of something like 1,600 miles per hour, with a 900 mile range and an eight ton bomb carrying capacity. I think one must also consider the Northrop Freedom Fighter, which is described as a $700,000 grass field jet. It is a much more versatile aircraft for the tactical role. I understand the Phantom II requires a runway of some 5,000 feet. In any event, there are two conflicting philosophies in this regard. One is that we need a more or less workaday jeep type aircraft, and the other is that we must have an aircraft which is in the Cadillac class.

Mr. Chairman, I point out these facts because there seems to be some indication that the minister and his advisers are considering the continuation of a tactical role

for at least a good segment of our air force. We should like to know the official philosophy in regard to the utilization of our air component with our ground forces. Is the use of our air component concentrated on transportability? There are varying views in this regard. We could use our air component in such a way as to make sure our ground troops are transported to certain areas, making them highly mobile. In that event their equipment and logistics supplies would be readily transportable. This use of our forces would fit into the Canadian peace keeping role to be utilized at any place in the world where it was required. In contrast to that role is the use of a substantial part of our air component as an air arm combined with ground forces.

There are two very different principles involved and, of course, very different consequences. A tactical air arm would require tactical aircraft with necessarily shorter ranges. If we are going to use that type of aircraft in conjunction with our forces stationed some distance from Canada one must be concerned about getting the short range aircraft to a place within the limit of their range from our forces.

As I have said, I do not intend to go into detail in relation to the consequences of this philosophy, as time does not permit, but I point out these facts as fundamental differrences in respect of the potential role of the air component of Canada's defence forces. Certainly a judgment decision will have to be reached, and we should like to know the thoughts of the minister in this regard. A decision in respect of replacement aircraft in this particular range is forecast in the minister's remarks. He says he hopes to be able to arrive at a decision concerning tactical aircraft, perhaps not within a few weeks but in the near future. The two week period had reference to the shipbuilding program. In any event "the near future" is a relative term. The officials involved certainly are considering the situation.

Other remarks have been attributed to the minister to the effect that he will reply to the aircraft industry but that his decision may well be a year away, and that the industry should not push or rush him. We should have some clarification in this regard. I am pleased to note that steps are being taken toward the use of the C-130. I always felt that we were a little hesitant in buying only four of these aircraft, but there were several factors involved. Perhaps for another reason the limited purchase of this aircraft proved useful in that it has been shown that these aircraft can really deliver the goods without the necessity of obtaining an expensive air fleet. The hesitancy in this regard has resulted in the continued use of C-119's to the point where one wondered how they could still fly.

I should like to hear from the minister about the modified version of the Caribou, now called the Buffalo. What does the Canadian Department of National Defence envisage in respect of this development? Is this to be a Canadian development encouraged chiefly by the United States? I think we must realize that in so far as the Buffalo is concerned, it was not developed as a result of Canadian encouragement. It was ultimately brought into production in its refined state—or an improvement upon the Caribou—as a result of encouragement from a source other than Canadian. I was sorry that we were unable to see our way clear to follow the original concept of the Caribou and the Bobcat in a more closely related role. In any event, I am sure that we have been taught a lesson by our mistakes and I trust we will not repeat them.

The minister should make reference in his reply to a replacement for the Penhold air base. After all, Penhold was supposed to be the chief centre for advanced jet training. This plan was knocked on the head rather unceremoniously and I think improperly. True enough, the minister felt bound by certain decisions reached within the Department of Transport, but these decisions have sufficient against them to render them somewhat suspect. In any event, there it is; the minister has announced that the Penhold air base is to be closed. What is to be its replacement, we have not heard. I think there should be some indication of what the plan is in so far as training command is concerned. Is this going to await some uncertain date in the future when everything is going to be reorganized?

Now, I did hear in passing that the minister's introductory statement made no reference to the militia. I too regret that he failed to mention this. True enough he made his statement to the defence committee, but I think the militia merited as much mention publicly as did the Cyprus force. I agree with the minister that our force on Cyprus has performed very well under very trying and frustrating circumstances. I think we must give them full marks in that regard. Mind you, I cannot approve of the circumstances under which they had to perform their duties.

I think, too, the minister will agree that the organization of our peace keeping force in these international groups leaves something to be desired. I am hoping that the conference this week will be able to iron out a lot of these difficulties. These people who have been to Cyprus, and who have come back, will readily testify that such peace keeping forces have far too many chiefs and not enough men. At every level we seem to require equivalent officers from each participating nation. I believe experience will lead us to the point where these peace keeping forces can be organized on the basis of efficiency and not prestige.

With regard to the militia, I should like to read into the record paragraphs 70 and 72 of the defence committee report:

> There was considerable discussion in the committee concerning the numbers required to fulfil these roles.

The reference there is to the roles the government indicated for the militia.

> The government has indicated a requirement of 30,000 effective militiamen as follows:
>
> (a) reinforcement of field forces, 7,000-8,000 officers and men; special units for NATO commitments, 1,000 officers and men;
>
> (b) training forces to support the field force, 18,000 officers and men;
>
> (c) internal security, 2,500 officers and men;
>
> (d) national survival installations, 1,500 officers and men, for a total of approximately 30,000 officers and men.

Then the committee's remarks follow:

> Your committee cannot confirm or refute this estimate except to note that the potential requirement for internal security appears to be seriously underestimated. Your committee also recognizes the fact that those requirements will change in the future, and that regular periodic reviews should be made.

Then I quote paragraph 72:

> The government has announced that the present strength of the militia is to be cut, for budgetary reasons, from approximately 45,000 all ranks to approximately 30,000. To achieve the requirement of 30,000 referred to in paragraph 70, this would mean an approximately 100 per cent efficiency rate. Your committee considers this to be unrealistic—

I can assure the minister, without disclosing what went on in the committee, that this was an almost unanimous view.

> —and would agree with the contention of the conference of defence associations, that in order to achieve the 30,000 effectives, the militia enrolment, even taking into account an increased efficiency, would have to be considerably higher. It must therefore be recognized that, after the militia is cut to 30,000 all ranks, it will be unable to fulfil its proposed roles.

Well, of course, we had to—

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Lachance): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I have to advise him that his time has expired.

Mr. Lambert: May I have another five minutes?

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Lachance): Does the committee give its consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lambert: I wish to thank hon. members for their courtesy in allowing me to have a few more minutes to complete my remarks. We did have a bit of a comic opera performance with regard to this matter this summer. It was announced that the 30,000 figure was going to be the end result. The minister's associate indicated that he would have to agree with the contention in the committee and the conference of defence associations that undoubtedly enrolment would have to be somewhat higher. He was not precise because one could not precisely indicate what that higher figure might be, but certainly it would be higher than 30,000. However, on a subsequent appearance the associate minister indicated that there was a hard line adopted, and 30,000 was going to be it.

Then we had the minister come before us the other day and say that the 30,000 figure still held but there would be an establishment of some 41,000. In response to questioning in the committee the minister agreed that in the implementation of this proposal it would be possible to get up to a figure of 41,000 if everybody enlisted up to the top and if they could get the money, which is another consideration, but he thought 30,000 would be the practical figure.

I believe he will agree with me that if he wants to get 30,000 men out of the militia, as set out in paragraph 70 of the defence committee report—those figures were taken straight from the ministerial statement in this regard, so there is no hocus-pocus or glossing over of the figures by the committee—he will not get 30,000 out of a 30,000 enrolment. Something has got to give. Perhaps the minister might be a little more frank with the committee and tell us just how many men he thinks he is going to get out of a militia force of 30,000.

I am going to leave to some of my colleagues the discussion of what may be the effects of the militia reorganization. However, there is one last point I should like to make, Mr. Chairman, at this stage of my remarks.

I do not claim originality for this idea, but I think it should be put to the minister, perhaps not so much to the minister as to some of his colleagues. As was indicated the other day, as a result of this reorganization of the militia, the reserves and the regular force, certain national defence properties are going to be surplus. What properties will become surplus is not yet determined. We know what happens when these properties are declared surplus; they are turned over to Crown Assets Disposal Corporation for sale. The proceeds of the sale are then credited to the consolidated revenue fund.

I know that in my own city of Edmonton there may be several hundred thousand dollars worth of property that will go on the market, and it should. There are a number of lots there that are producing nothing but the best weed crop possible. They are surrounded by a fence and posted with signs saying "No Admittance, Department of National Defence". Neither is there admittance for a weed cutter. I am sure the situation is paralleled in a number of other cities, and that there is property worth hundreds of thousands of dollars which could be disposed of by the department.

Admittedly the minister is short of funds for the purchase of new equipment. If, by reason of the Financial Administration Act, it is impossible to take the funds realized from the sale of these properties and return them to the department for the purchase of new equipment, then I suggest an agreement should be reached with the minister's colleagues that he be provided with an extra credit in lieu of the amount realized. This makes sense, because in effect he would be disposing of properties that were purchased by his department.

This idea is not original but it is a commendable one, and I think the minister's colleagues should see the wisdom in it. I am sure the minister himself advocates this, and it can be pointed out that it is a one shot proposition because he will not be able to continue to find properties that can be sold.

I may have some other remarks to make depending on the minister's answers to questions raised, but for the moment that is all I have to say.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Chairman, it has been my practice, when leading off for my party in discussing item 1 of departmental estimates, not to prepare a statement but to rely on my own knowledge and understanding in the belief that it was only proper to await the minister's statement. I am sorry that in doing so today I made a mistake, because I found the minister's statement very frustrating, most disappointing and shocking—shocking in that through his evasion and rationalization he has not given the policy points of view to which we believe we are entitled.

The minister completely evaded two points. I am certain members of the committee recall statements made by leaders of the Liberal party during the last election campaign, and commitments made in this chamber, that the government would enter into negotiations to remove Canada from a nuclear role. The minister shakes his head.

Mr. Hellyer: Would you mind giving the quotations?

Mr. Winch: If you check the political statements made during the campaign, and if you also check *Hansard,* you will see the Liberal party promised to fulfil the commitments which it maintained the Conservative government had made and, having lived up to those commitments, was going to enter into negotiations to get us out of a nuclear role. You will find that on page after page of *Hansard.*

Mr. Hellyer: Read it.

Mr. Winch: You will find it there, but today the minister made no statement on the policy position of the government with respect to nuclear weapons and nuclear warheads. I believe we should have had some indication from him as to the policy of the government with regard to the role of Canada's armed forces in the use of nuclear weapons.

A second matter which the minister omitted to mention—and I hope he will not shake his head at this too—was that the government undertook to renegotiate the position of Canada within NATO. That was not only a campaign promise but is also to be found in *Hansard,* and the minister made no mention of it today. I know he made certain statements about NATO, but he did not go into the fundamental principle and philosophy of Canada's role within the NATO structure.

Up until now I have always supported Canada's contribution to NATO, but surely the time has arrived when the minister should tell us in detail what he has in mind for the future. If memory serves me correctly 1969 is the year for the re-establishment of NATO as a collective military alliance, and tied in with this question of NATO itself is the other question of how long Canada is to continue

maintaining thousands of its troops, at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, in the European theatre. V-E day was the day the surrender was signed in Berlin. That was may 8, 1945. We are now in November of 1964. Have our operations in Europe in the interval been considered as peace keeping? Was there any thought in the mind of the government when the surrender was signed in 1945 that in 1964 a small country of 19 million people would still be supporting occupation forces in Europe at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars?

I think this is a reasonable and logical question to ask, and one with regard to which we should have some information. We are entitled to have the views of the Minister of National Defence on this matter. I should be grateful, too, if the minister would indicate how he intends to implement the policy set out on page 15 of the white paper, the policy on peace keeping, in the light of what is contained on page 24 where priorities are outlined.

The white paper was interesting enough, but basically it deals in generalities. Even where it is detailed, how are the aims set out in the white paper to be accomplished having regard to the availability of Canadian forces and funds? Beyond this, bearing in mind the money available, what kind of efficiency are we to expect in our armed services? We are at peace, thank heavens, but it is amazing how much money Canada can spend through the Department of National Defence while the country is at peace. If my recollection is accurate, between 1949 and the end of 1963 the Department of National Defence spent $22½ billion on our armed services. And what is their efficiency? Now is the time to bring this question out into the open.

I had the honour of being leader of the opposition in British Columbia while Canada was at war. As leader of the opposition I had the privilege, along with the premier of British Columbia and the G.O.C. western command, of knowing what was going on. But because of public relations psychology I could never make known what I knew then, namely, some passenger ships with naval personnel on board carried guns made of wood. This was when Japan was in the war. I knew this, but I could not say so because we were at war and it would not have been advisable. But we are at peace now, and we should be able to discuss the efficiency of our forces. I heard nothing from the minister about this aspect of our defence situation.

I had hoped to hear about that naval exercise off Bermuda when three Canadian destroyers took part in combined operations with the United States navy Atlantic command. Members of the special committee on defence set up by this House of Commons were aboard the three Canadian destroyers taking part in this actual, factual exercise. There were three destroyers in line. I happened to be one of those on the first destroyer in line. What armament did those destroyers carry? They had a mortar for use against submarines, and they had only one piece of armament equipment for everything else, a 3 inch—70 guns for use against attacking forces or attacking planes. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that this was a prearranged exercise; it had been on the books for a long time. The department knew members of the defence committee would be present, so I imagine everything was ice cream and perfect.

What happened? In the beautiful, calm waters off Bermuda, when the drone plane flew over, the only armament available for use against an attacking force would function to the extent of only about 50 per cent. One of the guns aboard the destroyer I was on would not fire. We had that experience. The gun on the second destroyer would not fire at all on two runs. Aboard the third they were luckier. Remember, this was shooting at a drone plane; and the only armament carried would not function to more than 50 per cent of capacity. Would the minister say these ships are ready for war if it ever occurs? We were told these guns were the most intricate and complicated in the world, but they are the only guns provided, and this is the situation.

Surely we have a responsibility as well as a right to ask the minister now what is being done in this regard. Is the armament being changed? I understand there is an arrangement with Britain for skilled men to come over here to assist us with our submarine program. Does the minister not think there should be a similar arrangement for technical assistance in connection with these guns? Or should there be a change of armament? Remember this is the only armament those destroyers possess apart from the mortars which are only for use against submarines. Now we are at peace I think we should be absolutely honest, and that we are entitled to expect honesty from the minister.

May I call it one o'clock?

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

Supply—National Defence

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Chairman, when the committee recessed at one o'clock I was speaking about the fantastic expenditures of the Department of National Defence amounting, as I pointed out, to $22½ billion since 1949, and my own experience as a member of the defence committee in finding out the inefficiency of some armaments, despite these expenditures. If time permitted I would have liked to have the opportunity of enlarging on that phase of my remarks, because I think to a considerable degree it applies to the armaments, and in particular the mobility of our forces at home and abroad. However, in view of the fact that you were kind enough, Mr. Chairman, when I spoke to you a moment ago, to let me know that I now have 13½ minutes left, I would like to proceed from that phase of my remarks on item 1 of the estimates of the Department of National Defence to another matter which I mentioned at the opening of my remarks relative to our position regarding NATO, and in particular to what I maintain was the lack of responsibility by the Minister of National Defence in not outlining to this house what we should have had, and had the right to expect, namely an explanation of his policy statement which is to be found on page 15 of the white paper on defence, correlated with the priorities as outlined on page 24 of the white paper.

During my very brief remarks before the luncheon adjournment with regard to NATO I rather gathered from the expression on the face of the Minister of National Defence that he thought I might have been a little out of line. May I draw to the attention of this committee a press release covering the text of a speech made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs to the Atlantic treaty association at Ottawa on September 15, 1964. On page 4 of the press release we find the Secretary of State for External Affairs saying this:

> As far as the alliance itself is concerned, there is still a long way to go toward completion of the review of NATO defence policy which ministers required at the Ottawa meeting in May, 1963. While I would not wish to overstress the problems of the alliance in that regard, I cannot escape the feeling that the long term effects of not achieving some agreement in the fields of strategy, military integration, nuclear control, command structure and cost sharing are bound to detract from our effectiveness as an alliance in using the forces we have at our disposal. I believe that the time has come to face these problems and honestly to deal with them with the requisite boldness and imagination. In particular I believe that they point to the need for some re-thinking first with regard to a greater sharing in the military direction of the alliance, and second, in regard to the relationship between the civilian and military arms of the alliance.

Mr. Chairman, you will remember that when I spoke before the luncheon adjournment I expressed my regret that the Minister of National Defence had not given us any basic point of view or policy outline with regard to what I said then was a re-thinking of our position in NATO and its operations. That is why this afternoon, because I believed my memory was correct, I looked into my files; I was almost certain that a similar expression had been used by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in his speech on September 15. Members of this House of Commons are not children; they have responsibilities—big ones—and one concerns the relationship of our country to others, and the defence of our country. But for some reason or other there was an evasion of rationalization and no attempt whatsoever by the Minister of National Defence, in his introduction with regard to item No. 1 of these estimates, to take this house or the people into his confidence, into the government's confidence, on the major issues that face our country and others. Nor was there an attempt to give us an explanation as to how in his view, believing as he must in the general principles of peace keeping as outlined on page 15 of the white paper, we could follow the priorities set out on page 24 without a massive increase in defence expenditure or a cut down in other fields.

In the few remaining moments I want to speak on the cutting down in other fields. As I said this morning the surrender treaty was signed in Europe in 1945. Today we are still spending hundreds of millions of dollars, and have thousands of troops. For how long is this going to go on? Is it peace keeping? I would also like to be able to quote all of the observations on page 15, but may I just very briefly draw attention to this paragraph, which I presume reflects the views of the Minister of National Defence:

> Canada's own experience in this field points to the need for a high degree of versatility in preparing for possible United Nations service. In the past, requests from the secretary general for assistance have been for specialists of various kinds, mainly from the Canadian army and the R.C.A.F.—
>
> The success of United Nations peace keeping operations may depend on the speed with which they can be established on the ground. Once there, they may be required to exercise authority with limited personnel in broad areas. Thus, there is

a need for mobility as regards deployment, method of operation and logistic support. In most situations which can be foreseen, there is likely to be a need for highly mobile forces for ground observation, air surveillance, rapid transportation and reliable communications. These are among the United Nations requirements which Canadian forces have helped to meet in the past.

As I read the white paper, emphasis is to be placed on peace keeping and greater aid through the medium of the United Nations. That is why there is the requirement in the priorities listed on page 24 that:

On the basis of this assessment, major expenditures in the next few years will be designed to: (a) re-equip the army as a mobile force; (b) provide an adequate air and sea lift for its immediate deployment in an emergency; (c) acquire tactical aircraft; (d) maintain a relatively constant improvement of maritime antisubmarine capability.

I believe with regard to (d) that the minister is doing an excellent job. With regard to (a), (b) and (c) heavy financial requirements will be necessary to meet these objectives.

I honour the Minister of National Defence for the approach he has made toward integrating the forces. That is an experiment which is being watched around the world. I think he is to be commended for the courage he has shown in some of the new approaches which are being made. At the same time, sir, I think that he did a disservice to the members of this house by not stating whether or not these savings which he hopes to accomplish can or will meet what he states in the white paper to be his objectives. In not giving us that information he failed to give the complete picture regarding our continued operation on the present basis within the commitments of NATO and particularly in connection with NORAD.

I was most interested in what he had to say about the two Bomarc installations in Canada, one in Ontario and one in Quebec. I noted his remarks to the effect that the interceptors at Comox are going to have nuclear warheads. I say it is time we had some honesty both from the minister and from this government. Up till now we have had only what I maintain is dishonesty in certain matters of policy. Is the minister actually telling this committee that in the event of an attack on the North American continent the enemy would give warning of the approach of manned bombers so as to give the United States time to get its I.C.B.M.'s on their way? And on the other side of the picture—I know this will not happen but I put it hypothetically—if the United States ever attacked the U.S.S.R., do you think that it would send its manned bombers and give the Russians time to get their I.C.B.M.'s on their way to North America? Of course not.

That being the case—and surely that is logical and reasonable—what is the basis for Canada spending money as it is today on Bomarc bases and nuclear warheads for interceptors? What is the basis for the millions which Canada is spending now on NORAD, with this change in technological warfare and the staff which is available? In the past it has been necessary for one purpose—to see that the strategic air command of the United States was kept up in the air. But surely that is not the position today in the event of war. Fifty per cent of the strength of the strategic air command of the United States is up in the air all the time as it is; but it can only meet manned bombers. Surely it is time we had an explanation from the minister of the necessity for spending millions of dollars and utilizing Canadian personnel on Bomarc stations, nuclear warheads, interceptors and NORAD, all of which would be of use only in the event of attack by manned bombers. I might add, although this has no connection with NORAD, that this month saw the completion of four stations outside of Canada to detect the launching of an I.C.B.M. anywhere in the world.

I am down to my last 30 seconds, Mr. Chairman, and I do not want to take additional time. Perhaps I will have an opportunity later to speak again, but may I conclude my remarks by saying what I said at the outset. There was no reference to matters of policy or matters of viewpoint and no indication of the government's understanding of the objectives given in the statement made by the Minister of National Defence. Such being the case the minister has shown disrespect for and disregard of the members of this committee and the responsibilities each and every one of us has as a member of this House of Commons. Before we are through with these estimates I hope we will have a clear exposition by the minister, and that he will take all of us into his and the government's confidence.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to draw to the attention of the house a situation which I deplore at the present time. Today, the house is taking up the estimates of the Department of National Defence, which represent 25 per cent of Canada's national budget; and even though the matter is a rather touchy one, and

one that is discussed at length during electoral campaigns here and there across the country, very few members of the house are interested in discussing it when it comes up for debate in the house.

I think that the absence of the members of the defence committee from the house is particularly unfortunate. The 24 members who have been chosen by the House of Commons and by the various parties to scrutinize the national defence problem in this country as well as the financial impact of national defence are surely of all the members of this parliament the ones who should deem it their duty to be here today.

This being said, must we come to the conclusion that the defence committee have no more work to do once they have completed their study outside the house, and that their members ought not take part in the discussions that can go on in this house? I hope not.

This committee did a good job by allowing several members to examine thoroughly the very complex problem of defence. And the house could thus avoid momentarily the discussions on national defence which we have known in the past.

During the first session I sat in this house, in 1962, I remember that almost every day questions were being placed on the order paper concerning national defence. I remember that long discussions and debates occurred on this question. At least, since the committee on national defence was formed to examine this matter, those discussions calmed down in the house. Sometimes several weeks go by without the Minister of National Defence having to answer any questions from members of the opposition.

We have at least attained that objective. But, in my opinion, when the estimates of the Department of National Defence are examined in the house, it is the duty of every member, Conservative and others, to attend the debate, because this matter affects a very important area, not only at the economic but also at the social level; many Canadians are thereby affected directly: those in the armed forces, and indirectly, their dependents. And I could also add all the taxpayers who foot the bill at the end of the year.

In his statement the minister outlined the general policy which the cabinet intends to apply concerning defence. Of course, he did not have much information for us, members of the committee, except that there are still many questions unanswered, including the one raised a while ago by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch).

I think that the Minister of National Defence did not give us exactly what we had a right to expect.

When he talks about maintaining NORAD agreements for the defence of the North American continent, with the United States, does he mean to maintain them exactly on the basis which has prevailed since 1957? Will he renegotiate the agreements when they come to an end?

I think that we are all in agreement in this house—and all Canadians will support the suggestion—that we must maintain our contribution to the defence of the North American continent. But I think it is proper for Canadians to wonder on what basis it will be.

We are all aware, because it was repeated many times, that our present system of defence is simply out of date and obsolete. Therefore, when we talk about the defence of the North American continent what are we talking about exactly? Before setting up defence policies it would be a good thing to know exactly what threat we have to face. Are we facing an invasion by some foreign force on the continent? Are we facing an air force attack? Or is there a danger for Canada to be destroyed by remote controlled nuclear head missiles?

I believe that it is easy to determine what type of war or attack could take place against Canada.

It is quite unlikely that we would be faced with an invasion of land forces, since, for more than 300 years now, no sizeable enemy has ever set foot on our Canadian soil, with the exception of small raids by the American people at the beginning of the last century.

It is unrealistic, in my opinion, to maintain some of our present defence items when we all agree that they would be inefficient against the only threat really conceivable.

We have Bomarc bases. Now, we all know that these bases do not represent actually any kind of protection. Yet, we continue to maintain them, perhaps, to please our allies across the border. We maintain squadrons of Voodoos equipped with nuclear missiles.

Have we fully realized the extent of the threat that is hanging over us? There again I very much doubt it, because in the light of all the information we have been able to get in the committee on defence, it is more obvious every day that an attack would not

be launched against our continent by long-range bombers.

Therefore, once again we are clearly behind the times.

I know that the minister has discarded two squadrons and reduced that force of Voodoo aircraft to three squadrons only. Of course, that was a step in the right direction, but that does not solve the problem at all, because I think the whole problem is based on the following question: What will the next war be like and what will be its pattern?

In co-operation with the Americans, we have developed a radar system which had to be discarded as soon as, if not before, it was completed, because several radar stations, all across the country, were closed during the last year. I am a little amazed to notice that we closed radar stations and that actually, we are building some others. It is quite difficult to reconcile those rather extreme positions.

The hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) was obviously referring to the promises made by the Liberal party during the last election campaign when he mentioned that, after coming to power, this government was supposed to renegotiate the agreements signed with the U.S.A. by its predecessor with respect to North American defence and also Canada's role within NATO.

What has the government done in the two years it has been in power? Has it renegotiated anything? Of course, it will argue that the agreements in question have not yet expired but, in my opinion, one does not have to wait until agreements have expired to renegotiate them. The government must decide what policy it will follow when those agreements come to an end.

While I am on the subject of NATO and of Canada's role within the alliance, I might say that I had the privilege of visiting our bases in Europe. Like the other members of the defence committee, I was in a position to realize the importance of Canada's presence on the old continent, but I must say that that importance is more psychological than military because, 20 years after the war, our presence there is more or less necessary, in my opinion. I am not advocating Canada's full withdrawal from NATO, but I feel that we should be active in all organizations. What should be our role? It should be adapted to our capabilities and to actual needs. In the last year we have undertaken, as Canadians, to build up a much more mobile military force which could be put at the disposal of the United Nations. I think this is a good thing, even if it may present certain negative aspects.

I believe that our sense of responsibility compels us to take that course but, personally, if I consider the part we are called to play in NATO and our intention to increase our contribution to the United Nations, I feel it would be logical to conclude that we should reduce our NATO expenses in proportion to the intended increase in United Nations contribution, since these two organizations complete one another, to a certain extent. In my opinion, it is rather difficult to justify a double expense for the same purpose.

Considering that European nations such as France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, England and Italy regained an economic stability and a power which cannot be doubted and which are clearly superior to ours, I think it is logical for Canada to reduce its contribution to NATO and, like the great majority of Canadians, I would be pleased to see a reduction in our armed forces within NATO.

Considering our commitments, I think Canada should get ready, when these commitments are fulfilled to withdraw the major part of its military forces in Europe, leaving a nucleus of officers charged with co-ordinating the work of the soldiers in Europe and with keeping the military forces in Canada and Canadian authorities aware of any development which might occur on the European continent.

The minister spoke about the CF-104 supersonic aircraft stationed in Europe. We have all had to decide, for some time, not to renew these aircraft. If we consider the role assigned to such aircraft, I believe that the decision not to replace them is logical, and that it is also logical to conclude that our participation in the air forces of NATO should be abandoned upon the expiry of our commitments. France, Britain, Germany and Italy are sufficiently strong now to replace the few squadrons we still have left on that continent.

I believe that there is a point here that we must consider, a rather important point which is raised by our presence in Europe. It is the human aspect of the matter. It is the sacrifice required from those thousands of Canadians in Europe who have to live away from their family, their parents, their environment, their country. Several have their family with them but this is not the case for the majority. I feel there is a human problem there. In my opinion, it is illogical, in the circumstances, to maintain in Europe

a force which, for all practical purposes, cannot be justified.

There is also another aspect to consider: the expenditures which contribute to increase to a certain point our trade monetary deficit with the other countries. Canada's balance of trade is unfavourable, and it is obvious that all expenses made in other countries by Canadians increase this deficit. Even though we ship the majority of equipment and provisions for our troops in Europe, it remains that these people spend a lot of money in those countries and that the Canadian treasury must pay to keep them there.

We are all in favour of a greater role for Canada in peace keeping operations. I think the action taken by our country during the Cyprus crisis proves our willingness to solve that problem even in other parts of the world.

I believe the experience of Canada in Cyprus will serve in other circumstances. Personally, I think Canada has reason to be proud of its contribution in that part of the world.

I should like to say a few words about our navy. It seems to me that, for the past few years, our navy has been somewhat neglected, with the result that, today, we are faced with a rather sad situation, and by that I mean that we now have a navy whose definitely obsolete equipment is not suited to the tasks we intend to assign to it. There is no doubt that before purchasing equipment for our navy, we should determine what part we mean it to play.

At present, following all those discussions, the committee is aware that the military role of the Canadian navy is extremely limited. Our coast line is quite extensive and we Canadians cannot expect our present navy to be able to guard and keep watch efficiently over all our shores.

It would therefore be impractical to consider such a possibility. We must also ask ourselves if, should a conflict occur, it would be fought at sea. We have all recognized that, in case of war, the battle is not very likely to take place at sea. A little of it at first, perhaps, but for such a short while that our ships would hardly have time to weigh anchor. This raises the question of whether a navy is justified for the defence of our country.

The defence committee decided that the only role our navy could play would be to destroy submarines. It is quite clear that our navy could play an important part in the detection of submarines, but I feel there is all the difference in the world between detecting a submarine and preventing it from attacking.

In fact, if we compare the features of a submarine with those of a surface ship, namely speed, depth and period of immersion, mobility, armaments, I am of the opinion that the submarine has more advantages than the surface ship.

Moreover, I think that if we had to face a war in which atomic submarines would play a part, our surface ships would be definitely in an inferior situation and we would suffer heavy losses, notwithstanding the few gains we might achieve.

Does that mean that we must give up any role in that field? Of course, I do not believe so, but we must try to limit ourselves to probabilities and possibilities, and in my opinion, the submarine detection system seems better when it is operated by airplanes and their radar systems.

If we take into consideration the fact that a destroyer may cost $10, $15 and even $20 million, according to its shape and class, and that an Argus or Neptune airplane may cost half a million, a million or $2 million; in short, if we consider the work that one may do as compared with the other, I feel that we may easily conclude that for the amounts of money available in this field, it is definitely better to increase the number of aircraft for air patrol, rather than increase the number of destroyers. It would be easier for the enemy to destroy a surface destroyer than a flying aircraft.

On the other hand, if we consider the possibility of patrolling a wide area, again the aircraft has definite advantages over the destroyer.

It has been argued that an aircraft has limited means to destroy the enemy. I think that it is true, but under the circumstances, it must also be admitted that the destroyer has also very limited means to destroy a submarine.

There is also another aspect which must be considered. When an atomic submarine is given the order to take part in a conflict, it is most probable that its only warning will be a guided missile with nuclear warhead. I feel that it is illogical to think that we can prevent a submarine from firing its missiles; even if we know its location, those destructive missiles will be ready to be fired when orders are given and even if it is destroyed afterwards, I do not think that this will make much difference in the results.

There is also something else to be considered. The purpose of a submarine is to destroy populated and industrial centres of our continent. It would surely not attack a ship because such prey is not worthwhile. If it attacks anything, it will surely be highly populated cities, administrative and industrial centres of the continent. What will be the use then of destroyers, even on the surface, if we no longer have administrative centres in Canada, if the population is partly destroyed?

At that time, our ships will have to remain at sea, unable to return to their home ports, since they will have been destroyed.

It is therefore illogical to recommend increased expenses in the naval service. However, I must recognize that the personnel of our armed forces is very well disciplined and trained, and that we can be proud of them. But I wonder whether to experience such pride, we should spend $1 billion, $1½ billion or $1¾ billion a year, to maintain those fine sporting clubs and to allow those young men to indulge their taste for adventure at sea? Should we spend yearly $200 or $300 million to provide them with toys with which they may play?

I believe this is a question we should ask ourselves. If the navy plays a necessary role, if there is need for it, in brief, if the threat to our security is real, then, there can be no question of money. Should our country be threatened, the point is not to ask ourselves what we can do, but what we must do. But at this time, we are unable to establish exactly the magnitude of this threat, and even less how we can face it.

Mr. Chairman, the expenditures of the Department of National Defence at present account for about one quarter of the national budget. I believe drastic cuts will have to be made, for its present spending is in no way commensurate with the aims sought.

Other questions obviously have to be considered in connection with the curtailment of the national defence budget, and I know that the minister himself has been severely criticized for some cuts in some particular fields.

The military establishment has been brought down to 10,000, and the minister was criticized for this action. He closed down radar stations, military bases all over the country, and for that too he was sharply criticized. Economic consequences on our economy of military expenditures will have, of course, to be considered.

Committee members have received reports about studies they had requested, precisely with regard to the economic implications of military expenditures on the country and also to the economic consequences in case of world disarmament.

We know that throughout the world countries are now studying the possible economic implications of an international agreement on total disarmament. I feel that this is a matter the study of which will be most interesting, and, so far as I am concerned, I feel sure that the members of the committee will devote much of their time to its study; for it is a problem that must be faced, considering the criticism which resulted from the cuts in military personnel and expenditures in certain sections of the country.

We all hope that military expenditures will be reduced, provided it does not affect us personally. However, I feel we should be more realistic and recognize that, if certain cuts can be made in military expenditures, we must also find ways of spending money in other fields which will be more productive and will contribute to increase the value of our country as a whole.

It is, of course, very easy to criticize, but it is much more difficult to achieve something. I know that the Minister of National Defence is conscious not only of the problem as such, but of its magnitude; as far as I am concerned, and like all the other members indeed, I shall support any suggestion tending to the reduction of military expenditures, in accordance with our abilities, while maintaining the part we should logically play in the free world's defence.

[*Text*]

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak today on behalf of the Ralliement Créditiste on the estimates of the Department of National Defence, but I have changed my mind. I wish to deal with an aspect of the matter different from what we have heard so far this afternoon. I hope you will permit me at this time, Mr. Chairman, to pay homage to those of our fellow men who fought for this country, especially those who were called by the Department of National Defence when things were dark both in Canada and across the world. I am referring to our veterans, those who made the supreme sacrifice of their lives, in the service of this country. I notice the minister is wearing a poppy today. I am sure he calls to mind various poems and writings which arose out of those days of turmoil. Indeed one of these poems comes to my mind now—the one of John McCrae which contains these familiar words:

In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses row on row.

I realize this has only an indirect connection with the estimates which are before us. But were it not for the Department of National Defence I imagine there would not be a Department of Veterans Affairs. This is the aspect to which I wish to devote some time this afternoon.

We have been talking about 25 pages of expenditure. We have been talking about figures, acceptances, transformation, integration, and so on. But we have not heard very much about the moral aspect of this whole question, something which cannot be evaluated in the book of expenditures, something which cannot be divided into subsections. It is a quality one is born with; it is the understanding and the comprehension we should have among ourselves and which nations should have among themselves. We shall be celebrating Remembrance day very soon, a time that affords a good opportunity to remember what has gone by. However, I do not think we should remember our veterans only on one special occasion. I am asking the minister as well as all those in his department and all those in this Canadian parliament that we should bear them in mind throughout the year.

The decisions which the minister has to take are, I am sure, not taken lightly. But we often forget the human side of the whole picture. We may discuss the steps which should be taken to promote the greater efficiency of our armed forces, but let us not forget one thing—if there is a war, if there is turmoil, somebody is responsible for it. It was not in the divine plan that nations should be forever quarrelling with each other; that is not in accordance with the natural law. Wars and conflicts are caused by some organization somewhere which does not agree with the principles being followed by another organization. If today there is a state of crisis between Turkey and Greece, this situation came about as a result of their legislation, as a result of their ways of living, which in turn resulted in strain, misunderstanding and, finally, bloodshed. This is not something new, but perhaps if we appreciate it more fully we may take a different attitude toward the whole of our military set-up. We buy, we plan, we produce and we build to defend ourselves against an enemy; to defend ourselves against an attack from a nation which may not agree with our views. Or else we try to help out our neighbours, as we are doing in Cyprus.

[Mr. Langlois.]

But when will we arm ourselves to fight at home? There is a fight to be fought here, too; a fight which is not carried on with cannon or atomic bombs. In this country as well as abroad I think the best war which can be fought is the war against misery, against incomprehension, against the lack of understanding which exists among nations. It is the fight against misery and poverty in our own country. If we were to abolish many of these sore spots we might save ourselves a great many of the 25 pages we are now considering in the estimates book. The evils I have just mentioned are, basically, the reasons why nations rise up against each other. Something is missing at home.

It would be the same in Canada if the situation which prevails here now were aggravated. I am talking about hunger, about misery, about social insecurity. These were the conditions which prevailed in Germany before the last world war; these were the conditions which prevailed in Cuba. And until we arm ourselves to fight this general enemy we shall have this issue to face; we shall always need arms to defend ourselves, not only against other nations but even against our own people. Legislation flows from this building and we are responsible for it. We in this parliament as well as those in other parliaments across the world are the guiding lights of the nations. Decisions are taken in parliament by human beings, by responsible men. I believe we have too often forgotten those enemies which are not fought with guns or with ammunition. This is the direction in which we need to concentrate our efforts, here at home, and right now. I think possibly that the government understands this, but it is not making a strong enough effort.

The minister had a great deal of information to give the house today. He gave us many details, but they were all related to the same picture, a material picture. I know that the generals, the wing commanders and so on have their needs. They will speak to the minister about them. But they are willing accomplices; they have a job to do and they will ask for the equipment to do that job. I ask this question, though: To what extent is their job necessary? A picture has to be complete, but if it does not fit on the wall it is out of place, no matter what kind of picture it is. It is the whole room one has to look at, not just the picture. Right now I am thinking of the affairs of this nation as a whole. I am wondering whether the minister of defence would cut down his budget—

An hon. Member: To $1.

Mr. Langlois: I do not know about $1, but at least from 25 pages to 15 pages. I think he would do so if there were less stress or tension in the world today. We ourselves have a part in building that tension. We are all individuals in this world, each having individual liberty and each wanting to keep it.

This is why we are fighting for it all the time; but sometimes we forget to use the right methods to go about it. We wait too long and then we have to take up arms to defend our liberties, or to get them back if they have been taken from us. It often happens that somebody oversteps his rights, and when that happens he is necessarily stepping on somebody else's rights. In this area we have a great job to do, not only in Canada and America but across the world. We belong to the Atlantic treaty organization, to NORAD, to the United Nations and other world-wide organizations. I think we had an example not too long ago of how race, colour, religion, nationality, social stature, and so on, need not enter into this question. I refer to the Olympic games that were held in Tokyo. The athletes there came from every nation in the world, including Russia; but there was something that struck me and most of our Canadian sports commentators over there, and this was the link, the understanding among these people.

I will tell you one thing, sir. There was no suggestion of declaring an international war at those Olympic games. They had something in common; they had a common interest; they understood each other. This is the direction in which the United Nations, NATO and NORAD should be moving now. They should be cutting down on arming themselves with nuclear weapons and trying to beat the enemy in manufacturing nuclear weapons. They should get out and try the other course; that is, beating the enemy at giving more information and helping nations to understand each other as much as possible. In that way we would at least be trying to achieve real peace, not by fear but by understanding and comprehension.

The army is needed, and so is the air force and the navy; but not in order to fight wars or defend our own skins. We need them for other things. We need organized forces like these for the purposes of which I spoke previously when the minister presented his white paper. I refer to having an organized, mobile army at home in order that we may use it when needed in order to fight conflagration, floods or any kind of emergency that may arise. In that way our forces could help this nation not only in time of war but in peacetime, and they would not have to be shining buttons all the time. It is all right to have discipline; it is all right to have well dressed officers; it is all right to look sharp. I go along with that, but as well as a smart appearance we must deal with urgent needs in this country and in the world. Canada is playing a role in Cyprus today, a peace role. But if we had moved in in time to give these people the opportunity to think about what was happening before they engaged in a quarrel, as they did, and perhaps if we had done our job three years ago in regard to that island, and the United Nations had worked in that way to greater advantage, we would not have Canadian troops standing between the Turks and the Greeks over there. It is all right to be the referee in a matter like this, but I like the rules to be laid down before anything starts.

This is the part I wanted to talk about today, a part that we often forget in this house; in fact, I have not heard it mentioned too often. I do not want hon. members to suppose that I am giving a moral lecture, because I am not. That is not the attitude I am taking and I do not want hon. members to take that point of view. I am putting this forward as something that everyone in this house should be conscious of with regard to national defence or any other activity. It is this. When we do something, we should be doing it for the welfare of the nation. When I talk about the nation I am talking about industry, about companies, about families, about municipalities, about school boards, and about every single individual in this nation; and the nation shall be itself a proud, strong nation as long as the individual stands up proudly and strongly himself. This is very much like the apple cart; the apple cart is worth a lot so long as the apples in it are not rotten. If we do not take time to correct a situation when it begins, soon we will have everybody feeling the effects of some little, cock-eyed idea of a person or group of persons; and these things sometimes cause a national calamity and crisis. We have to guide the nation, to tell the nation what to do. But we have to do it ourselves. We have to tell ourselves what to do and when to do it. That is one thing we should not forget.

I am saying to you, sir, and to the Minister of National Defence that we have a war to fight all right—but not with arms, at the

moment. We have wars to fight across the world today. One of the greatest wars is fighting communism. Does the minister expect to fight communism with an atomic bomb? Does he expect to kill with an atomic bomb the idea that communism is better than the free, democratic world in which we live? He does not believe that for one single moment; nobody does. But what are we doing? We are arming ourselves in case somebody from the other side decides to take over this part of the world. But we sit and wait; we do not want to be an aggressor. I know why: It is because deep down in our hearts we know we will not attain any kind of goal by trying to destroy the eastern bloc with arms of any kind. The eastern bloc idea is for communism to creep throughout the world by one method, and it is going to creep into Canada if we let things go that far. They try to spread communism through our own social security, through our own misery at home, through hunger and misunderstanding. This is when they come in with the magic formula. This is how they got into some of the satellite countries of Russia. This is how communism got into Russia itself. This is how it is creeping now into the countries of South America where hunger prevails.

In this connection I would refer to statistics of the last world war. These are not my statistics; our dominion bureau of statistics can give them to you. They were produced by an international bureau of statistics, I imagine, although I do not know where they were picked up from. All I look at are the the figures they give me. They took long enough picking them up, so I am not going back to find out where they came from. With regard to the last world war, more people died in one day from hunger during the world crisis than during the worst week of the war. We fought the war but we forgot to fight this monster that was with us during the last world crisis. There are still signs and pangs of it here today. We sent our Canadian troops over to defend this nation, and they did it proudly. But they wanted to defend something else; they did not want only to defend us from the enemy, or prevent the enemy coming over here. They fought hoping that this country would continue to progress; that this country would be able to give three meals a day to the people living in it. They fought for these ideals, just as Americans did for America and as the English did for England.

I think the Minister of National Defence, who is primarily concerned with this business of warfare, should give some thought to this. I am sure he has already, but I would ask him to extend his thinking and meditation in this way. If he does I assure him he will have the best army which ever existed either on this continent or anywhere else, on the day we stop thinking in terms of who is stronger in the military field, and start thinking about who is stronger in understanding human beings.

We sometimes forget here the principles with which we were born. Until these principles are restored to their right place, no matter what kind of army or nuclear forces exist they will not be strong enough to appease the uprisings which occur across the world. More and more these uprisings, both in the past as well as today, are caused by hunger and social insecurity, and in many cases by regulations imposed by governments. There is enough in this world for everyone to live on, and it is up to us to distribute these goods to each and every one.

Someone has said that war contributes only to the well-being of those who manufacture or purchase war materials, and I agree with that. As a result of the last world war we were left billions of dollars in debt. A lot of Canadians were literally slaughtered, as was the growing youth of other nations. Who profited from the war? A few more millionaires came into being, but that is all; everybody else is still paying for it. Sometimes we forget that during the ten years preceding the war we needed to look down to each individual's needs and problems of the moment. We have a little insecurity in our own country at the present time. We hear talk of extremism on one side or the other, and of separatism. But if we looked at the heart of the problem we would see we had forgotten something. If this parliament has also forgotten, let it say "Mea culpa" and try and correct the situation as soon as possible.

In my own province there is an area where there is social insecurity now—the closing of a mine with consequent unemployment. Do you think, Mr. Chairman, that these people are worried about how many bombs we have or how many nuclear arms there are on NATO soil? They are more worried about whether they are going to eat tomorrow morning. If they are left in that state we will not be worrying for long about NATO; we will be worrying about the guys who come up to Ottawa and perhaps cause more turmoil than we already have. This is because of the social insecurity there is at home and the economic gaps in the system which fail to provide the

people with the basic requirements, such as a home, security for their children and for their families. That is what they want. I think the government should look at this problem more closely.

I go along with the minister in reducing his defence budget. I congratulate him for this, although he has not reduced many of his activities. However, I hope he reduces his expenses a little more. He has integrated the forces. Let us hope they are all united in one group and that he will direct them to fight for this common problem across the world, the problem of hunger and misery. It is there, do not worry. Two thirds of the people in the world today go to bed at night starving, so something must be wrong. I think it is the responsibility of the government to discover what is wrong, to correct the mistake and to try to bring about a real peace both in our nation and in other nations.

I have referred to this particular aspect today, which has been left aside to a certain extent in view of the fact that Remembrance day is approaching and has brought back to me memories of the things for which our brothers fought, and possibly that has inspired me to talk on this particular aspect of national defence, our responsibility to this nation and to the world. If the minister has not got any, I have many books I would gladly lend him written by independent authors, writers, businessmen, leaders and nation leaders across the world, past and present, all of them dealing exactly with this subject. So far many governments have turned a deaf ear to this sort of plea, and thus caused international crises, calamities and wars. I think it is the responsibility of the government at least to open its ears and to listen to what nations and the people in them have to say; because when one listens to the social worker, the labourer, the civil servant at the bottom of the ladder, the farmers and their children, the housewife, and so on, and hears their grievances, he can be pretty sure that he has reached the heart of the nation. That is where the strength of a nation lies. That is where the best national defence you could ever hope for lies. Destroy it and you have not even got a country to defend.

That is where I should like the Minister of National Defence to concentrate his efforts, along with those of his colleagues in the cabinet, and give peace of mind first of all to the people who need it, to the people who want it and to the people who are yelling and begging for it. When you do this you will find you have the best national army you could ever want for a country, and it would be the best example we could give to the world to show that we can attain peace economically at home, and by the same means internationally, because the same thing would result if this were done in other countries as well as Canada.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, my first general criticism of the minister and the government with regard to defence could be summed up in the phrase that theirs is a record of big talk and small performance. The minister's publicity machine has been working overtime ever since he took office, and as a result the general public has been given the impression that great financial savings were being made and that great things were being accomplished in the way of increasing the efficiency of our defence forces, while in actual fact expenditures have increased rather than decreased and our general defence situation has steadily been weakened.

I object on general principles, and I object as far as defence matters are concerned in particular, to this kind of propaganda which gives the people of Canada a false picture of what is going on in matters of defence. It is the sort of thing which I hope the minister will stop. The Canadian people have been led to believe, as a result of statement after statement about savings to be made, that the minister was cutting down the cost of defence and thus making money available for other government purposes; or, perhaps of more interest to them, for making tax cuts.

The last speaker at one point complimented the minister for cutting down defence expenditure. That member is a member of the defence committee but he does not seem to realize that instead of defence expenditures being cut down they have actually been increased. This fact is indicated by a press release which came out only last week, on October 28. A Canadian press article by Dave McIntosh states in part as follows:

> Defence spending in the 1963-64 fiscal year rose to its highest point in the last seven years, officials have disclosed.
>
> Despite slashes in some navy and R.C.A.F. equipment programs, defence expenditures in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1964, amounted to $1,683,471,003, the biggest outlay on defence since the $1,759,426,000 spent in 1956-57 when the Liberal government was last in office.

This is a fact of which the general public has not the slightest inkling. I know as a result of some letters I have received and conversations I have had with several indi-

viduals that the facts contained in this article struck them as a great shock. The situation as disclosed by this article was exactly opposite to what they had been led to believe by statements made by the minister about the general situation. They thought the reverse situation was true, and there would be quite a saving which could be applied in the form of tax cuts, or for some other purpose.

The article then continues as follows:

> The Liberals, who again assumed power in April, 1963, have promised to reduce expenditures on defence department housekeeping—military personnel costs and operations and maintenance—and increase spending on new weapons in equipment. But in the last fiscal year the trend was in the opposite direction. Military personnel costs rose—

Apparently equipment costs remained almost the same as they were, although they did rise slightly. The article then continues:

> The defence budget for the current 1964-65 fiscal year is $1,526,000,000.

As I have said, more than seven months of the year have passed.

> It calls for a cut of nearly $250,000,000 in personnel, operations and maintenance costs to $1,126,000,000, a figure which many officials now say they doubt will be achieved.

I do not think there is a doubt in the world that this will not be achieved. The reductions in strength which have taken place up to date, and seven months of this year have gone by, make it an impossibility that the estimates now before us for consideration will be sufficient to cover these costs. I do not think there is any question but that we will be faced later on with supplementary estimates, which when taken into consideration will show an increase in these costs. This article in the last sentence states:

> The original 1963-64 defence estimate approved by parliament was $1,590,006,537. Actual defence expenditures were $93,464,466 higher.

The estimates for 1963-64 were prepared when I was minister, submitted to and received the approval of treasury board. However, the expenditures were made almost entirely during a period when the present minister was in office. He was the person responsible for this increase of some $90 million odd in the expenditures over what we had planned to spend for military purposes last year.

While this increase in expenditures was taking place, as I have said I will demonstrate by what I have to say in the next few minutes, our general military posture was steadily weakening, or decreasing. Before going on to some of those other matters I should like

[Mr. Harkness.]

to state that I am pleased that the white paper and the minister's statement have made it clear that our general defence policy of the past seven, eight or ten years is to be continued. That is, our strong support of NATO, NORAD and the United Nations will continue to be the basis of our defence policy.

The speakers who immediately preceded me, and who sit in the left hand corner of this chamber, have cast considerable doubt on the value of NATO and have advocated in some cases that we should put an end to our NATO expenditures and apparently leave our defence in the hands of the gods. What they do not seem to realize is that no country at the present time can look after its security except through an adherence to a system of alliances. No country, particularly one such as Canada, has adequate resources to look after its own defence entirely alone. The only way in which we can obtain a reasonable amount of protection and security is by combining with like-minded nations, pooling our resources with theirs, from a military point of view, and obtaining the maximum amount of security at a minimum cost. However, we cannot expect other countries of NATO or of the western world to protect us if we are not prepared to pay something for that protection. The idea that we should get a free ride in this regard is one which is not worthy of us as Canadians, and one which is completely irresponsible and pays no attention to what is the general situation in the world today.

There is no doubt that we must continue in our support of these three great alliances, and if we expect them to continue to be effective we must play our reasonable part, and by "reasonable part" I refer to one which is related to our population resources.

In actual fact this is one of our difficulties at the present time. The proportion of our manpower which we devote to military purposes to play our part in these alliances, particularly in the case of NATO, is considerably smaller than that of most of the other members. The proportion of our gross national product which we devote to military purposes for the support of NATO has been steadily decreasing year after year for quite a number of years. The proportion of our actual government expenses devoted to military purposes has been decreasing. Our position in NATO relative to our allies has been getting worse all the time, rather than the reverse.

The main question to be asked is whether we should not really be increasing the proportion of our resources which we devote to

these purposes in order to play our fair part in the defence of the entire west. One of the things I think we must also realize, but which is not realized by quite a number of people, is that our adherence to these alliances determines to a very considerable extent the size and the organization of our defence forces. We have assumed certain responsibilities to NATO, to NORAD and to the United Nations, and in order to meet those responsibilities we have provided and must continue to provide certain types of military forces. Everyone in the house I am sure is familiar with what those are, and I will not go into detail.

I should also like to note that I was pleased to hear the minister state this morning that the nuclear armament has now been supplied for the Bomarc, for some of the 104's, and for the Honest John battery, and that the armament for the 101 aircraft for the defence of Canada is expected to be supplied some time in the new year. This was one of the chief election pledges of the present government. I have been extremely surprised that they have been so slow in implementing it. I find it extremely difficult to understand why it has taken them a year and a half to implement this decision, and yet the 101's are not equipped with nuclear weapons. I believe this is an example of the slowness of the government in getting things done. Having taken the main decision to acquire nuclear weapons for weapons systems which were already in existence, I think the government has been deficient in the lack of speed they have shown in accomplishing that purpose.

Now, this is one case in which the general position of the defence force has been improved. However, in other directions we have been steadily falling behind so far as our commitments to NATO are concerned. I think the minister and most other members of the house are well aware of the fact that we are steadily and rapidly falling behind in the number of naval vessels which we have available or will have available in the years ahead to meet our responsibilities for our own local coastal defence and our commitments to NATO. This is a matter which has been of considerable concern to me because of the time lag between the institution of a naval building program and the time you actually get these ships into service. This time lag in the past has always run between four and five years. I think it is very doubtful whether there will be any improvement in the future. The present government scrapped the general purpose frigate program which had been started, but has substituted nothing for it. The minister did say today that he hoped to be able to make an announcement in a few weeks about some naval rebuilding program. However, there will be a considerable time lag during which we will be deficient in meeting our naval responsibilities.

The same things applies so far as the Canadian air division in Europe is concerned. We had agreed to provide an air division of eight squadrons of CF-104's equipped for the strike-reconnaissance role, which meant nuclear equipment. This government has equipped six of those squadrons with nuclear weapons. The other two squadrons have been converted to the reconnaissance role and are going to be armed with some type of unknown or unspecified conventional weapons. What this means, in effect, is that the actual striking power of the air division has been reduced about 25 per cent, a very material reduction in our obligations to NATO so far as air power is concerned. It is all very well for the minister and his government to talk about meeting our commitments to NATO and other people, and they have to some extent met them as they said they would in regard to supplying some nuclear weapons for the weapons systems we have in Europe, but they have considerably reduced what we had agreed to provide. They are failing in this regard.

Another thing upon which I should like to comment is the closing down of a large number of military installations. Undoubtedly —I think nobody would argue this—this process really weakens our actual and potential military strength. I am quite prepared to agree that in some cases the closing down of these installations was justified in order to save money for expenditures in other lines. However, what I do object to is misrepresenting the situation by saying that the closing down of these military operations has actually improved our military situation. This is what the minister is constantly doing. I feel the minister should quite frankly lay the cards on the table and say, we have closed this installation, that one or the other, in order to save money for some other purpose because the total amount of money we have is limited. I think it is completely wrong to try to pretend that while you are doing this you are increasing your military effectiveness when, as a matter of fact, you are actually decreasing it.

The reorganization of national defence headquarters is a matter upon which I spoke at considerable length when the bill providing the legal basis for that was before us. I do not propose to repeat what I said at that time except to say that, in my opinion, some basic mistakes were made. I refer particularly to the introduction of what has been called the supremo concept, having a single military adviser on whom the minister has to depend for all his military advice. I think the history of military organization in western Europe has shown clearly that this is not as good a system as the one we had, whereby you had a chief of staff for each service. I believe our future experience will show that this is the case.

I should like to say of course, and I think no one realizes it better than I do, that some reorganization was required at national defence headquarters. Parkinson's law had been at work there for many years, and certainly a reorganization was required. The present minister may recall that as long ago as when I was before in opposition, I used to be pointing out that this was a necessity, and pointing to some of the overgrown staffs, branches and what not. I might say that while I was minister I started on this process, as the minister is aware, by setting up a ministerial manpower commission whose job it was to survey the entire personnel set-up of national defence headquarters and to recommend how that could be reduced or reorganized. I have no doubt that perhaps a considerable amount of the work of that commission has proven useful in the reorganization which is going on there now. So far as the reorganization of national defence headquarters is concerned, I quite agree some reorganization was required. I do express reservations as to the way in which the reorganization is being carried out so far as some phases of it are concerned.

In so far as this matter of integration of the services is concerned, it has been quite apparent ever since the minister made his first statement in regard to the matter that there was no plan in existence so far as integration below national defence headquarters was concerned. This long delay in issuing a statement on what will happen below the level of national headquarters in Ottawa has given rise to a great deal of uncertainty on the part of serving personnel. There is nothing which produces decline of morale more rapidly than uncertainty, and it is extremely unfortunate there has been such a long delay, with still no prospect of a statement being made.

This morning the minister said that stage two, the next step, would be integration of commands. However, he gave no indication what the term "integration of commands" means. If he has any plan with regard to it, then surely this is the place and now is the time to make it known, so that members of the committee may have an opportunity to express their opinions on it.

Neither has the defence committee been told what is to be done below the level of national defence headquarters. If there is any plan dealing with integration below the Ottawa level the time is long past when it should have been disclosed to hon. members.

From some of the statements made in recent months by the minister and the associate minister, I gather that what seemed to be the minister's original idea of rolling all the services into one bale or one pot, if it may be described that way, has now been seen to be an impractical and impossible proposition. You just cannot move a man from an army job to a naval or air force job, and I hope the minister now has firmly in his mind the fact that fighting units cannot be disturbed very much. They have to remain pretty well as they are. It is just an impossibility to switch an infantry officer to fly a jet plane, or anything else along that line.

I would like to hear what is planned concerning integration of the administrative services. There is no doubt this is the area in which integration can be carried forward with resultant considerable savings and, I would hope, an improvement in efficiency. I would urge the minister to make a statement on this matter.

Once more this morning the minister tried to give the impression, when speaking on equipment, that these were all new programs which he and the present government had instituted, and that the improvement which would result from them would be entirely due to this government. In actual fact in all cases they were programs which were instituted whilst the Conservative government was in office.

Dealing first with armoured personnel carriers, the minister is well aware that we had a program to produce these in Canada, but unfortunately it did not proceed as rapidly as everyone hoped it would. He scrapped that program and purchased armoured personnel carriers from the United States, and I have

no quarrel with that. In fact I am glad the personnel carriers will be delivered soon.

Heavy helicopters for the army were ordered and were in the course of production long before the minister assumed office, and the fact is that they are just now coming into service. The same situation applies to the anti-tank missile.

So far as the navy is concerned, the program to equip destroyer escorts with variable depth sonar was well under way before I ceased to be minister of national defence. Similarly, plans for the Oberon class submarine were advanced to the stage where they were just waiting for a final arrangement between the British government and ourselves which would involve the British buying some equipment from us. Research on a hydrofoil vessel and the production of a prototype had also been launched. There is nothing new in any of these things. We purchased four of the Hercules aircraft to see how they would work out, and if satisfactory said we would purchase more. They did prove satisfactory and now the program is proceeding.

I was glad to hear the minister say that the NORAD agreement will be renewed, thus setting at rest rumours which have been current in newspaper articles that it would not be renewed. I thoroughly agree with him that it is essential for us to play our part in this agreement for the joint defence of the North American continent.

The minister also said today that he hoped within a few weeks to be able to announce a shipbuilding program. Last week the associate minister made a statement which seemed to indicate that what is planned is some type of troop carrying vessel. If they are planning to build naval vessels which would have the primary function of transporting army personnel I hope that plan will not be proceeded with, because there could be no greater waste of naval funds than to build ships of that kind. Ordinary merchant vessels are available in large numbers and can always be secured in order to transport personnel whenever such a requirement arises.

Basically our navy has primarily been an antisubmarine navy, and its continuance in that role is confirmed by statements in the white paper. Therefore I hope the type of ship to be built will contribute toward that role, or if the role is to be changed we should be told so at this time instead of waiting until an announcement is made on the type of ship to be built, a type that might not contribute much to naval effectiveness even though it would provide some work for our shipyards.

If what the associate minister had in mind was a type of naval aircraft carrier which could be adopted for carrying personnel, tanks and other equipment, and which could be used for various task force purposes, then this means a departure in the general policy which has been pursued so far as the navy is concerned, and we should be given an opportunity of discussing that.

I would like to say something about the reserve forces but I see my time is practically at an end, so I shall resume my chair and come back to that matter later.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): My remarks on these estimates will be brief. It is not my intention to be repetitive, and therefore I shall not attempt to deal with subjects already dealt with by the hon. member for Calgary North and the hon. member for Edmonton West. However, I do want to ask the minister for a further explanation of his observations with regard to the integration program. I should like him to give, once and for all, a definition of what he means by integration. I should like him to say how far the program of integration is to go within the definition he gives. He did say that the unification of headquarters was in progress, that stage two would be the integration of commands and stage three the integration of schools. As I recall it, he stopped at that point. Are we to assume that this is the total picture, or are there to be stages four, five, six, and seven and so on which he did not mention, but which nevertheless he has in mind? If he does have further stages in mind, what are these stages? I believe the members of the various services are not completely sure what the future policy may be in this regard.

The minister mentioned savings which might accrue as a result of integration but, as has already been said, the term "savings" in this context is inaccurate. What the minister may have in mind is a direction of defence spending along different channels, with increased accent on certain types of expenditure and a reduction in other fields. I have no quarrel with this as long as it can be justified. But something which has been completely omitted from the minister's remarks is a reference to the cost of this reorganization. It is well and good to give the picture on one side of the coin only, but we must also have an idea of what this reorganization is costing in terms of extra expense having to

do with the premature retirement of personnel, and so on. More important still is the cost in terms of the effort which is being expended at the present time on this reorganization and I should like to have some estimate of this cost if one has been made. I presume that at the present time a large number of personnel of all ranks are devoting a large part of their time, if not all of their time, to the solution of the problems caused by reorganization itself. This has to be placed on one side of the balance against the gains which are visualized on the other, because it is only net savings in which we are interested. If we were starting from scratch to set up a department of national defence and defence services, one system might have a considerable advantage over another. But it does not necessarily follow that there is any advantage in changing from one system to another. It is like remodelling the floor plan of a house; the cost may be greater than the advantages, or at least the cost has to be subtracted from the advantages gained.

The minister could not be expected to cover all the aspects of defence in the limited time available to him, but he omitted to mention in his remarks what progress has been made in the study which a special committee on antisubmarine warfare has been conducting. I may not have called the committee by its correct name, but I have a special interest in this subject; the committee is conducting a study of the proper mix of aircraft and naval units for the most effective conduct of antisubmarine warfare and coastal defence.

Mr. Hellyer: I referred to that in my statement.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Only briefly; but I should like to have a fuller statement as to what changes in policy are contemplated as a result of this study. If there are changes involved I should also like to know whether the minister is in a position to spell them out accurately and in detail, and perhaps he would tell us at what point they will come into effect.

I intend to say a word now about a recent announcement of decisions by the department of defence with regard to the closing down of reserve units. As is generally known, committees were appointed, one for the air force, one for the navy and one for the army, to study the position of the reserve units in all three categories. In most cases the department accepted the recommendations of these committees though, of course, not in all cases.

[Mr. MacLean (Queens).]

I think it is unfortunate that the department did not see fit to accept the recommendation of the Hendy committee that H.M.C.S. *Queen Charlotte,* which happens to be in my constituency, should be continued. I am perhaps being parochial up to a point, but I say this because of wider interests. I think it is an unfortunate anomaly that our small province of Prince Edward Island should be the only province in Canada without any naval presence whatever, as will be the case when this unit is closed.

The unit has been in existence for about 40 years. It has an excellent record, and in this connection I might say that all the reserve units in Prince Edward Island have always received magnificent support from the general population. As a matter of fact, on a per capita basis, compared with the country as a whole the number of people who have over the years entered the militia and the other reserve units is about three times as great as the national average. I admit at once of course that there are areas in Canada where the opportunity to join the reserve forces is not as great. However, this particular reserve force had a magnificent record during the last war. I cannot quote this as an accurate figure but I believe more than 150 naval officers who had been members of the *Queen Charlotte* before world war II or in the early days of world war II served in the Canadian navy during that war. This is a magnificent contribution to the war effort to come from such a small unit as this, and I believe it is unfortunate that the unit has been done away with.

I have an uneasy feeling that when the Hendy committee was appointed to deal with this subject the public was told that it had been appointed to give advice to the department as to how the money spent on these units could be used to the best advantage so that as many as possible should be kept in existence. However, the fact seems to be that the committee was actually formed so as to give these reserve navy units a decent burial, as it were. To continue the analogy, the people who thought they were being called in as medical advisers found that their duties were actually those of pallbearers. In the Hendy report I find this statement on page 27:

> While no official decision on this will be reached until—

He is speaking of the naval reserve divisions:

> —the report of the militia commission is completed it is certainly obvious that the militia are looking forward to the acquisition and use

of the buildings which the naval divisions have been directed to surrender.

Yet the government was trying to create the impression that no final decision had yet been taken and these reports were being asked for in good faith. The Hendy committee had this to say about H.M.C.S. *Queen Charlotte*, and I will quote briefly:

> This division located in a provincial capital and on salt water would be expected to have naval facilities established in emergency. The division is admirably located overlooking the harbour with communication facilities. It is not, however, using its building anywhere near to maximum use for defence purposes. . . .It is believed the militia also wish to acquire this building and it would seem that some space sharing arrangement is feasible here as in other centres. This will, of course, have to await findings of the militia commission. As the division will not be closed until December first of this year, it would seem that there would be no problem in entering into consultation and making concrete proposals at a later date, but it is certainly the committee's recommendation that every effort be made to retain this division because of its particular situation although a complement probably not more than 15 officers, 50 men and 10 Wrens is indicated and this should be borne in mind in determining the utilization and allocation of costs between the various users.

However, when the commission on the reorganization of the army reported, the report indicated that it contemplated having all the militia units that were to survive in Charlottetown housed in H.M.C.S. *Queen Charlotte*. I can only draw two conclusions from this: Either the army reorganization committee knew beforehand that the government was going to close down *Queen Charlotte* and therefore it was available to them, or there is still room in H.M.C.S. *Queen Charlotte* for the naval reserve unit as well as a militia unit. If that is the case, the justification for closing down H.M.C.S. *Queen Charlotte* is reduced. The explanation that was given the other day in committee seemed to be that this was just a question of mind-reading; one did not happen to know what the other was doing and it was a case of serendipity and just happened this way. This, in my mind, does not quite wash. I do not want to say any more about that, Mr. Chairman. I have lodged my statement of non-approval of what has been done in this connection, and I believe I am not alone in this respect, because this view is shared not only by the people who are interested in the naval reserve as such but by the general population of Prince Edward Island. With regard to the militia reorganization, I have no particular quarrel with the reorganization as it affects my own constituency or Prince Edward Island generally. I think it was recognized that these are on the whole excellent units and there was a minimum of reduction in the establishment there. I want to express my appreciation of that fact.

However, in the wider view I think it is unfortunate—the minister may wonder why I have any particular interest in this, but I did live in Vancouver for a year on one occasion—that the recommendation of the militia commission with regard to the Irish Fusiliers in Vancouver was not accepted. I say this because, perhaps only by coincidence, the Irish regiment in Toronto is also one of the units which got the chop, and I believe there are two other cases of units which have an historic association with some particular groups of citizens or people of some particular racial origin, at least technically. I think it is unfortunate that two of the Irish units in Canada should be wiped out at the same time. It is true that they have only nominally been disbanded. What has happened to them is that they have been transferred to the supplementary order of battle, which is a polite way of saying that they are going to be sort of embalmed to give the impression that they are still alive—the same idea as Lenin's tomb in Moscow, or something of this sort.

As far as I can read this, it has no significance whatsoever except that these units will probably be represented by some dead files in a filing cabinet somewhere in headquarters and perhaps they will have the honour of having their colours deposited in a church somewhere, and their silverware and this sort of thing may still be retained in the armouries they originally occupied. But as far as I can see, as units it is just a figure of speech to say they have been transferred to the supplementary order of battle. They just do not exist—unless it means that if at some future date there should be an expansion of the militia, these units would have priority with regard to being revived. If that is the case, it makes a little bit of sense and there is some shred of consolation for the people who are particularly interested in them.

I would like the minister to clarify that small point. I would have hoped there would be a little more awareness of the fact that these reserve units have a special meaning to the civilian population who have served in them from time to time. This may be brushed aside as foolish sentiment; but it is well to remember that the greatest military exploits of all time and the finest units in all armies of all time had this bit of sentiment, which meant the difference between being just a good,

efficient unit and a superb one. That is all I have to say at the moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, there will not be time for me to complete my remarks today in just the 20 minutes remaining, but I can make a start on them. I echo the disappointment my colleagues have mentioned in regard to the statement made by the minister today. My seatmate, the hon. member for Queens, was just too charitable; he said it was unfortunate that the minister did not have more time to complete his statement. On the introduction of estimates the committee has never refused an extension of time to ministers making statements with regard to their departments; so the minister was not limited to 30 minutes. In fact, he should have gone on, and the committee would have welcomed a complete, comprehensive statement with regard to the policy of the Department of National Defence, with regard to the efficiency of the forces at the present time, with regard to our commitments overseas and with regard to the most recent announcement concerning the reorganization of the Canadian militia.

I said at the conclusion of his remarks that it was a shocking omission not to say something today about the proposed reorganization of the Canadian militia, and I will deal with that on the next occasion these estimates come before us. Because to omit any reference today, when the minister's estimates are before the committee for the first time in this calendar year, to the Canadian militia, who received a very severe blow within the last week, is inexcusable. There was not one word of thanks from the Minister of National Defence to the militia, who have served this country from its origin and who are serving the country at the present time. No ray of hope was given to those who are in doubt today as to what may be their future. That is an attitude on the part of the Minister of National Defence that cannot be excused, and I hope that some of my colleagues will deal at length with that subject in the future.

When the former minister of national defence, the hon. member for Calgary North, was speaking a few minutes ago he drew attention to the sham surrounding the present Minister of National Defence and his department. He mentioned the fact—we have drawn attention to this matter before but I reiterate it—that we have had a great press personal relations build-up of an incompetent Minister of National Defence. We have had statements on the radio and on television and press stories about what this man was to do. But what have been the accomplishments in the year and a half in which this minister has been in office? There has been a great ballyhoo across the country about the savings which were going to be made. As the hon. member for Calgary North pointed out, the expenditure in the last fiscal year was the highest for seven years. What saving has been effected in the fiscal year 1963-64? What saving is going to be effected in the fiscal year 1964-65? The estimates placed before us —the main estimates plus a supplementary estimate—indicate that on the basis of the very large figures for the preceding fiscal year there will be a saving of $100 million odd. I suggest that by the time further supplementary estimates have reached us, either this month, next month or in January, February or March, there will be an even higher expenditure in the Department of National Defence than in the last fiscal year.

How is the minister to live up to his promises unless there is more money available? This pretence that he is saving money by chopping off militia units, closing down establishments, retiring officers of long service on three months' notice and reducing the total strength of our forces represents no effective saving which has been shown to us today; it is only a transfer of expenditure from one area to another.

The minister told us a year and a half ago when explaining this matter to us in the house—he repeated it when we had the white paper in front of us and then when we had the bill setting up his supremo—that unless something were done immediately the amount of money available for replacement of equipment for the navy, army and air force would not be forthcoming but that all the money would be utilized to pay the personnel who are in the services plus the housekeeping charges. We are fully aware of that; there was to be a decrease in the amount of money available for equipment. But the minister has tried to mislead the Canadian people to the extent that he was going to make such savings on housekeeping, on streamlining the forces and increasing efficiency—these are some of his own words—that he would have money available for equipment.

About a year and a half ago he reported in one of these magnificent press releases that he was entering upon a 60 day period of decision during which he was going to place orders for equipment for the navy, the army and the air force. He is still fiddling around with this. Where are these orders

for new equipment for the services? Except for certain transport planes and for armoured personnel carriers and anti-tank weapons there has been none. What about the navy? What are we going to do about the air force, with the long range policy which is planned for it? In wartime we used to have a branch of the army known as the camouflage branch. The minister should be colonel in chief of a reactivated camouflage branch of the Department of National Defence, because I say that this matter has been camouflaged. He has pretended to the Canadian people that enormous savings were being made without decrease in efficiency, when this has not in fact resulted. I question very much, as did the hon. member for Calgary North, whether the efficiency of our fighting forces has been maintained.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me indicate some of the deception to which we have been subjected over these last two years. It is just about two years since the Minister of National Defence and the present Prime Minister were talking in this house about defence policy and what they were going to do when they got into office. All you have to do, Mr. Chairman, is to look back to the session of 1962-63, where you will find some of the statements made by these gentlemen at that time. I wonder whether the Minister of National Defence thinks as much of his vaunted Bomarcs now as he did two years ago. Two years ago, or almost two years ago—February 4, 1963—he said, as reported at page 3429 of *Hansard*:

> Mr. McNamara has not much more faith in it than I have.

That was in speaking of the Bomarc. Almost two years ago he had no faith in the Bomarcs. Now he has equipped them with nuclear weapons. What faith has he got in them at the present time? They are sitting ducks for the first missile to attack this continent in the event of nuclear war. I asked the minister several questions during the course of the last two or three months about the arming of our forces. I asked him whether nuclear missiles had been provided for the Honest John battery in Europe; whether the 104 air division over there had nuclear missiles; whether the Voodoo planes in Canada had nuclear missiles. All these things were going to be attended to. They told us that these matters should have been done by February, 1963. They said we were not living up to our commitments and that these missiles and nuclear devices were to be supplied. To the questions which I asked the minister, his reply in the summer was that they had not been supplied or that he did not know whether they had. It is only recently that he has informed us that the Honest John battery in Europe may now be provided with nuclear missiles. Why were they not provided when this minister took office in April, 1963? If we were in default, and those are the words he used in February, 1963, the present government stayed in default until just a few weeks ago.

What about the nuclear weapons for the 104's in Europe? Have nuclear weapons been supplied to that great air division? I asked the minister that question some time ago and his explanation was that the air division was operative. He did not say it had nuclear missiles. I wanted to know whether the aircraft of that division were on alert stations with nuclear weapons attached to the aircraft. He just said the air division was operative. Perhaps he will answer that question now. Are nuclear weapons available for our air squadron in Germany? Are some of the aircraft sitting at action alert with nuclear bombs attached to their fuselages? The minister does not answer my questions. All we are told is that the air division is operative.

I asked him a question about the two squadrons in France which are not armed with nuclear weapons or with conventional weapons. His answer was that the photographic equipment used by those squadrons constituted armament. I do not know what sort of a missile or bullet could be fired from a camera, but that was his answer. He said we were in default in respect of our alleged commitments, when speaking in this house in February, 1963. He had been over to Europe and was talking about the nuclear equipment of the air division and said, as reported at page 3427 of *Hansard*:

> We were also told that the first squadron was intended to go on target on May 1, 1963 and that in order to go on target a bilateral agreement would have to be signed with the United States by November 1—

That was November 1, 1962. Then he continued as follows:

> —NATO headquarters in Europe puts a very high priority on that particular project. The infrastructure, as it is called, the runway extensions and the ammunition depots to contain these weapons were being built under top NATO priority. It was being considered by the supreme commander and his associates to be an urgent matter because it was recognized that Canada, at the time we were there in November, was in default.

That reference is also November, 1962.

The minister then went on to state:

> Well, if we were in default then we are that much more in default at the present time.

The minister made those statements on February 4, 1963. I state to the minister that we were in worse default from the time he took office in April, 1963 until just a few weeks ago than at any time when we had the responsibility for our NATO commitments.

The present minister retired the Sabre jets from the air division in Europe before the 104's had been completely delivered, ready for operations, and before missiles were provided. For almost one year the air division in Europe could not even fire a peanut; it had no weapons at all. That is not the proper action of a responsible minister of defence. We have yet to receive the requested information in this regard.

I have mentioned this situation before, but what I say very frequently does not get the same attention given to statements of the Minister of National Defence and the minister of external affairs. I remember very well that in November and December of 1962, as well as January, 1963, great pictures and stories appeared in the newspapers with headings such as "Honest John Battery in Europe Unarmed"; "104 Aircraft in Europe Unarmed"; "Voodoo Planes in Canada Unarmed".

Canada's defence situation was indicated to the Canadian people as being absolutely incomplete, yet for a space of almost one year the air division in Europe, presently equipped with 104 aircraft, had no weapons to discharge. Did any of you see in the newspapers of this country, the weekly and other magazines, stories about the unarmed air division in Europe?

What about the Voodoo aircraft in Canada? They have not been armed yet with the nuclear missiles about which this minister complained so much when he was sitting on this side of the house. These aircraft were to be equipped immediately for the protection of Canada. In the event there was an air attack we would be caught without missiles on the Bomarc and our Voodoos would not be able to intercept because they were not armed with the required missiles. A period of 18 months has elapsed since this minister took office, yet the Voodoos are still unarmed so far as nuclear missiles are concerned, which he said were so essential to the protection of Canada.

[Mr. Churchill.]

What is the situation in Toronto and Montreal, where the newspapers which carried those headings about unprotected cities were published? The stories suggested that the cities were unprotected because the Conservative government failed to arm the Voodoos with nuclear missiles. Those cities have been unprotected since and are unprotected at this moment.

It being five o'clock, Mr. Chairman, this is perhaps a good time to resume my seat.

Progress reported.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to a consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely public bills and private bills.

HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING DUTIES OF SPEAKER AFTER DISSOLUTION

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Essex South) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-62, to amend the House of Commons Act (Speaker on dissolution).

He said: Mr. Speaker, after having come into this house as a member of the opposition in 1962, and then after having come back into the house after the election in 1963 as a member of the government party—

Mr. Winch: Does that make a difference?

Mr. Whelan: It does in this party—I was amazed to find out how this institution we call parliament was run. One of the things that amazed me was the power of the Speaker. It is a constitutional principle of our form of government that a Speaker of the house lives and dies with the house. This principle is incorporated in section 44 of the British North America Act which provides:

> The House of Commons on its first assembling after a general election shall proceed with all practicable speed to elect one of its members to be Speaker.

In these few words, there are three constitutional conventions which are as follows:

1. There can be no Speaker during a dissolution and this vacancy continues until the newly elected House of Commons first assembles;

2. The house, when it first assembles after a general election, cannot exercise any of its rights, prerogatives, privileges, jurisdictions and duties which are normally in the trusteeship of the Speaker except one, the right to elect the Speaker;

3. The Speakership dies when the house is dissolved because the Speaker must be a member, and when the house dissolves there are no members.

Except by amending our constitution, we cannot depart from the principle that there is no Speaker of the house during a dissolution of parliament. This is so because section 18 of the British North America Act provides:

> The privileges, immunities, and powers to be held, enjoyed and exercised by the Senate and by the House of Commons, and by the members thereof respectively, shall be such as are from time to time defined by act of the parliament of Canada, but so that any act of the parliament of Canada defining such privileges, immunities, and powers shall not confer any privileges, immunities, or powers, exceeding those at the passing of such act held, enjoyed, and exercised by the commons house of parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and by the members thereof.

When we refer to the constitutional position in the United Kingdom, which we cannot exceed, we find that in 1704 the house of lords and the house of commons jointly agreed as follows:

> That neither house of parliament have power, by any vote or declaration, to create to themselves new privileges, not warranted by the known laws and customs of parliament.

In the light of these authorities, it is not constitutional for our Speaker to continue as Speaker during dissolution. The constitutional position of the Speaker is recognized in section 15 of the House of Commons Act. This section provides:

> The person who fills the office of Speaker at the time of any dissolution of parliament shall, for the purpose of the following provisions of this act, be deemed to be the Speaker until a Speaker is chosen by the new parliament.

The person who is designated in this manner is authorized to prepare and sign the house estimates and to deal with misconduct or unfitness of employees. It is obvious that these powers are only the barest minimum necessary to keep the internal economy of the house functioning. It is obvious also that the person so designated is deemed to be Speaker only for the purpose of status in signing the estimates prepared by the Clerk of the House and Sergeant-at-Arms. The power of disciplining employees is that held by any deputy minister of a department, in this case the Clerk of the House.

There are other statutes which name the Speaker and in which it is not clear whether, constitutionally, they can apply to the Speaker during a dissolution. For example, I cite section 10 of the House of Commons Act respecting a vacancy after a general election; the Controverted Elections Act, the Library of Parliament Act, and others.

In 1936 the question of the status of a Speaker, so-called, during a dissolution was referred to the standing committee on privileges and elections. The reference was moved by Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King on March 23, 1936, in the following terms:

> That the standing committee on privileges and elections be instructed to inquire into, study and report on, the usages, customs and practices respecting the status of the Speaker of the House of Commons during the period of time which may elapse between any dissolution of the House of Commons and the assembly of a new parliament, and in particular the rights, prerogatives, privileges, jurisdiction and duties ordinarily and customarily exercised by the Speaker under such circumstances in previous years in Canada;
>
> And, also, the status of clerks, officers, messengers or other persons attendant on the House of Commons, distinguishing between such persons as are permanent officers and such as are temporary and those whose duties are of a sessional character;
>
> And the right and proper procedure to be adopted with respect to the retention or dismissal of any such employees;
>
> And that the committee have power to print such papers and evidence from day to day, as may be ordered by the committee for the use of the committee and members of the house.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, this reference was made to the standing committee on privileges and elections as a result of the action of the Speaker in dismissing some employees before a new Speaker had been appointed. One of the main reasons for drafting this bill was, as I said, some of the things I learned after coming back into parliament in 1963. Before the session opened that year I was in my office in the west block and, to my amazement, I heard some strange noises in the hall. I wondered who was making these noises. These noises were made by a former minister of the crown and the former Speaker, which I thought was rather strange at the time. The Speaker was checking on the offices, who was in them, how long they had been in these offices, and so on. I asked him what he was doing, and he said he was still the Speaker of the house and still had these powers. I wondered at that time how a person could be appointed a minister of the crown and still be the Speaker of the house, a position that is held in high regard and beyond patronage and political influence. I wondered how a person could be the Speaker, then a minister of the crown, and then go back to being the Speaker. This is why I feel that when the house is dissolved this responsibility should go to the Clerk of the House in whom we have the utmost confidence, and

we actually state he has this authority now. I urge the house to adopt this bill so that we will not again have this type of operation during dissolution of parliament.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, this is rather an odd bill and I hope I will not be considered a little too equivocal in regard to it. I think it is a good idea to bring it forward, but I certainly do not agree with the hon. member and I think a lot of the premises on which he has founded his arguments fall to the ground.

For the purposes of historical accuracy I might inform him that the reference to the committee of the duties of the Speaker did not come about as a result of the actions of the Speaker who was then carrying on, but as a result of the actions of the man who ultimately was to become Speaker, he having moved into the House of Commons a week or ten days before being elected to office and summarily fired some 129 people who were on the staff.

I can also tell the hon. gentleman that if he reads enough of the 1935 *Hansard* he will find that on the occasion of the election of the Speaker both the prime minister, Mr. King, and the leader of the opposition, Mr. Bennett, gave some very good definitions and descriptions of the office of Speaker, and I would commend them to the hon. member for his edification. It is a matter of historical record that the election of the Speaker of the day was unopposed, on a recorded vote, on condition that the matter be referred to a committee. May I also say that though the election was recorded on division, something which is rather strange, the persons involved were restored to the staff and some of them are still members of the staff.

I think it was unfortunate that the continuing Speaker of the day did not stand by the authority that was granted to him by the act because there would not have been all that difficulty or, shall we say, degradation of the office by another man who had been a member of the house for a considerable length of time and who decided he was going to wield a very heavy patronage axe. Therefore if the hon. member is using the incident of 1935 in order to buttress his arguments, the complete contrary is the result.

I would suggest that one of the strongest arguments is that this is one of those areas in which there should be no vacuum. Again, however, I quarrel with the language of the bill because the hon. member limits it to the Senate and the House of Commons Act, and the requirements of the Financial Administration Act must be taken into account. The Speaker is the only person authorized to sign the estimates and confirm certain appointments to the staff.

There is nothing incongruous in the Speaker's continuing in office. After all, a minister continues in office even though he ceases to be a member. So far as the house is concerned the Speaker is in the equivalent position of a minister, and there is nothing that says a minister must be a member of the house, although he cannot take his seat in it unless he be a member.

The hon. member may not be aware that in 1962 the Speaker of the house, the former member for St. Paul's, was defeated in the election, yet he administered the affairs of the house until the very day that I was elected Speaker. Thank goodness he did. I do not know if the hon. member some day aspires to that office, but may I assure him that having the counsel and advice of a continuing Speaker in office is of the greatest importance to a new Speaker.

Another incident that the hon. gentleman has missed occurred in 1953 when Mr. Speaker Macdonald, on dissolution of parliament, was appointed to the other place and appointed solicitor general, yet he continued as Speaker and carried out the functions of that office. May I also inform the hon. gentleman that the position I found myself in, in 1963, was referred for opinion to the law officers of the crown and it was found to be perfectly regular with no disability on my part. As a matter of fact, parliament having been dissolved there was nothing to prevent my taking the position of a minister of the crown without resigning the position of Speaker, because the position had fallen vacant, saving and excepting for the purposes of section 15 and also the requirements of the Financial Administration Act. Certainly the affairs of the house had to be administered by a member, and the person who carries out those functions is a member of the house.

Mr. Olson: Not during dissolution.

Mr. Lambert: He is a member of the house. He is the man who is carrying on. This is not something that existed only in 1963. It existed in 1962, in 1957, in 1953 and in 1949. In 1945, Mr. Speaker Glen went into the ministry and in 1949, when parliament resumed, Mr. Speaker Fauteux took his seat as an ordinary member until he was appointed to the office of lieutenant governor a matter of a few months after returning to

parliament. But he did act in that period between the dissolution of parliament and the election of Mr. Speaker Macdonald in 1949 or early in 1950.

I have no precise knowledge of what happens in the United Kingdom but I would be the most surprised man in the world if there the clerk were to become speaker *pro tem.* At no time do we consider an administrator or a deputy minister as eligible to take on the duties of a minister, certainly, within the statutes which parliament has determined. He may, of course, make certain decisions, but under the terms of the Financial Administration Act he would have no power to sign documents, which can only be signed by a minister or an acting minister. This is why we have acting ministers—so that there may be someone who can act at ministerial level. Again, with the Clerk of the House in the chair, I feel that when we come to the election of a Speaker there is a neat point about rulings at that time. The Clerk of the House simply presides in a silent way during the election of Mr. Speaker. He is not the presiding officer of this house. All he does is to read out the letter summoning hon. members to the bar of the other house to attend upon the deputy of His Excellency in order that they may receive instructions from him to elect themselves a Speaker. Then the Clerk of the House is merely in the position of indicating to hon. members that they may have the floor if they wish to propose candidates for the office. Beyond that, the Clerk has no power in this house. He is not in a position to make any decision affecting the members and I would say that in my opinion we would be placing the Clerk of the House as such in a most invidious position were he elevated to a position of authority and protocol as far as the Speakership is concerned.

As I say, there have been other proposals from time to time that there should be a permanent Speaker of this house—that he should be a kind of supra-official, not a member of the house. That is in the same category. But if we stick to the principle that Mr. Speaker should be a member of this house, then I put it to hon. members that it is the Speaker who was in the chair at the time of the dissolution of parliament who should continue to fill the office until a new Speaker has been elected by the house.

As far as the ministry is concerned, again, for the purposes of the Financial Administration Act, if unfortunately there should be a decease or a resignation, a vacation of office for some such reason, then an acting minister takes over, not a deputy minister. I put it to hon. members that this practice should continue and I think it is far better for the administration of the affairs of this country that Mr. Speaker who occupied the chair at the time of dissolution should continue to discharge the duties of that office which it is necessary for him to discharge. With all due respect to the Clerk of the House, he is not Mr. Speaker, and therefore Mr. Speaker should continue in office until he is replaced.

After all, there is always a possibility that Mr. Speaker will be re-elected. This happens usually if the administration continues. There is nothing to bar him even if there is a change, though we know of the practical difficulties which may arise. It does happen. In 1957-58 it would have been ludicrous to have Mr. Speaker Michener stand down for all purposes and then come back immediately the new parliament was re-opened in May, 1958 to be re-elected. The same applied to Mr. Speaker Lemieux who carried on for more than one parliament.

So, with the greatest of respect to the hon. member who has put forward this idea, I think that for a multitude of reasons it would be preferable on balance to continue the present arrangement. Since the burden of showing the desirability of change is upon the hon. member who is proposing a change to the house, I suggest the hon. member has failed to discharge that burden, the reasons he has advanced being insufficient.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Whelan) by the introduction of this bill has focused our attention upon a problem. However, I do not feel that the terms of his bill solve that problem and I think there are manifest reasons why the bill in its present form should not be passed by the house.

At the same time I do not suggest that we simply talk the matter out. It seems to me this is a subject which might well be considered—I mean the subject itself, not the hon. member's precise proposal—and at the end of my remarks I intend to move an appropriate amendment. As a matter of fact, hon. members who know the composition of the special committee on procedure and organization will not be surprised if I say that my good friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) knows of the amendment I am about to move and is prepared to be named as its seconder. I may say at this very moment that the purpose of the amendment I shall move will be to refer the subject matter of this

bill to the special committee on procedure and organization, which has already indicated in a report to the house that the question of the Speakership is among the items on its agenda.

I suggested that the hon. member is perfectly right in pointing out that this is a problem. As he has told us, under the terms of the British North America Act a person cannot be Speaker of the House of Commons with all the rights and privileges which pertain to that office when there is no House of Commons of which he can be a member. But he has also pointed out that the functions which Mr. Speaker carries on after dissolution and before a new Speaker is elected are not the functions of Mr. Speaker in this chamber; they are the administrative functions set out in the House of Commons Act, in the Financial Administration Act, and so on. Nevertheless there is a bit of a problem that it would seem wise for us to look at.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is unfair for me to say, basing my remarks on what the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Whelan) himself said, that there seems to be some feeling on his part that things were not handled quite properly during the period of time when the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) was, if I may say it affectionately, a lame duck Speaker. The hon. member knows what I mean by that. I refer to the period of time when he was no longer Mr. Speaker of the house but was administratively the Speaker. If the bill is being introduced on the basis of some kind of a grudge over what happened, I do not think this is a very good basis on which to ask us to change an important piece of legislation. Therefore, if there is something to look at, let us look at it in a more calm light than is suggested by this basis.

I also think there is something in what the hon. member for Edmonton West said about this bill in so far as it refers to the Clerk of the House of Commons. I wonder if it is fair to the Clerk, in view of the responsibility that he carries as the permanent head of the administration—the deputy minister, as it were—to ask him to assume for a certain period of time what would amount to a position of minister. Certainly I would want some opportunity to discuss this with the present Clerk before we impose such a duty on him. As the hon. member for Edmonton West said, there is some relationship between the situation here, where we have a Speaker and a Clerk, and the departments of government, where we have a minister and a deputy minister. No one would suggest that in the absence of a minister for any reason whatsoever, the deputy minister should become the minister. Is it not, therefore, a bit strange to suggest that the deputy head of the House of Commons administration should become the head for that period of time?

Mr. Winch: It would make it political, too.

Mr. Knowles: It would also involve the Clerk, as my hon. friend from Vancouver East suggests to me, in decisions which, whether it is correct or not so to designate them, are sometimes thought to be political. The administrative things that the person acting as Speaker has to attend to after an election, between an election and the first meeting of parliament, even such matters as the allocation of rooms, secretarial staff, seating arrangements in the House of Commons and appointments, can certainly seem to have political connections.

I know that I had to deal with Mr. Speaker Michener on the question of seating arrangements after the 1962 election. I had to deal with Mr. Speaker Michener—at least, I tried to deal with him—on the question of our trying to create a vacancy so that our leader could come into the house. I had to deal with Mr. Speaker Lambert after the 1963 election on one or two of those same issues. Actually, I did not get satisfaction from either of those two Speakers, but that is beside the point. The issues I was raising then were admittedly political in character.

Mr. Lambert: You did not get all you wanted.

Mr. Knowles: The hon. member for Edmonton West says I did not get all that I wanted. That is a fair comment. But I think it would have been most unfair for me to have to place these matters before a permanent official such as the Clerk of the House; in other words, to present him with issues which would in effect be political in character. Therefore I believe there is a lot in this question that has to be looked into.

Also, as the hon. member for Edmonton West has pointed out, there is discussion in the country about the possibility of our achieving something in the nature of a permanent Speakership. I am afraid that phrase is a bit of a misnomer. If we ever achieve it, it will not actually be permanent, but what we may achieve some day is a tradition whereby a Speaker continues from one parlia-

ment to the next, and I hope such a tradition may some day be established. Twice in our history, in the case of Mr. Speaker Lemieux and in the case of Mr. Speaker Michener, the Speaker did get elected to the chair in a second parliament.

It seems to me this is not the time to try to disturb the present statute by seeking to pass a bill like this during the course of this one private members' hour. As I have already pointed out, the fact is that the subject of the speakership is on the agenda of the special committee on procedure and organization. It is not a secret; this agenda was given to the House of Commons in the first report made to the house by that special committee and it is listed there in black and white. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we should not prejudge this issue by a decision made here at this time, but rather that we should refer this question and all its various angles and aspects to that committee. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson):

That Bill No. C-62 be not now read a second time but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the special committee on procedure and organization.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I want to make it clear now that I had no personal grudge against the former Speaker of this house. I said there was noise outside my room. He never bothered me in my office. There would have been a lot more noise if he had. But I could not for the life of me see how a minister of the crown could go back to being Speaker, because as far as I can see there is no way we can get away from the fact that he would not be neutral to the extent that the Speaker should be.

Mr. Knowles: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, since this is not a point of order, perhaps the hon. member could make his remarks by speaking to my motion.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in seconding this motion to refer the subject matter of this bill to the special committee on procedure and organization. I want to say at the outset that, although I see some merit in the bill that has been presented to the house this afternoon by the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Whelan), it does not in my view take care of the entire problem and, as has been said by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), it seems perhaps unfair to expect the house to deal with this matter in one hour and delve into all the details of the problems and the possible solutions without having the matter referred to a committee where we can call witnesses for advice.

I think Bill No. C-62 does, in its intentions, tidy up some anomalies perhaps in the official position of Speaker during dissolution, and certainly we should be concerned about it. I should say, also, that some consideration is being given to taking care of the anomalies that we have and the contradictions in the law. For example, the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Whelan) quite properly pointed out that under the British North America Act the House of Commons shall appoint or elect one of its members to be the Speaker. There is a contradiction here. All of us know that as of dissolution there are no members of the House of Commons. Therefore if the Speaker must be a member of the house there appears to be some contradiction.

It has been argued that ministers of the crown carry on after dissolution; but it has also been pointed out that ministers of the crown do not have to be members of the House of Commons. Therefore I do not believe that this parallel takes care of the situation. I do not believe in many other respects that there are differences between the position of Speaker, so far as one administering what may be termed the legislative branch of government, and that of a minister of a department, although they are not quite the same.

The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) contended that he checked with the law officers of the crown during that period between dissolution and the next session of parliament to make sure that he did in fact have the authority to carry on the duties of Speaker. However, I think the reason the law officers gave him that opinion was that there was nothing else for them to do. There is no other provision to provide for the carrying on as head of the legislative branch of parliament during such a period.

I do want to be very brief, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this bill. I think there is some merit in transferring this authority to the Clerk of the House of Commons during dissolution of parliament. At the same time I see some problems arising therefrom, because if you read the bill carefully you will find it provides that:

The Clerk of the House of Commons at the time of any dissolution of parliament shall, for the purposes of this act, be deemed to be the Speaker until a Speaker is chosen by the new parliament.

I believe there may be some validity to the argument that the Clerk of the House should carry on some of the administrative duties of the Speaker, but I think those duties should be considerably restricted and by no means amount to the total authority of a Speaker during dissolution.

This brings up the thought, of course, which many of us have held for a long time, namely that there be a permanent Speaker. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) stated, and I agree, that no member of parliament has ever advocated that a Speaker should continue to hold office on a permanent basis without being re-elected from one parliament to another. This bill specifically deals with that period between parliaments; it does not deal with the period between sessions of the same parliament. So that even if this house did take action to elect a permanent Speaker for an entire parliament, it would still not take care of the period from the date of dissolution of one parliament to the assembly of a new parliament.

I do not want to take up any more time because other hon. members want to speak to this bill, particularly in view of the fact that an amendment has been moved to send its subject matter to a committee. But I do urge all hon. members to support the sending of the subject matter of this bill to a committee because, after all, the committee on procedure and organization has under consideration the Speakership of this house. It is well known to members of the house that there have been some changes in the administrative staff under Mr. Speaker during the past few months. I do not think we should consider those changes as being a complete revision of the administrative staff set-up of this house and which is under the Speaker. This is another of those anomalies which needs to be tidied up, and certainly this should be done before any committee considers the matter and witnesses are called before it.

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, we have before the house an amendment to the House of Commons Act to change the status of the Speaker of the House of Commons in order to confer some of the responsibilities which he now exercises upon the Clerk of the House. I may say that in my view this is a very sound proposition and well worth consideration. I say that because of the circumstances which occurred after the end of the election in 1963 and in view of some of the incidents which arose at that time.

Other hon. members have pointed out to the house the responsibilities which rest upon the Speaker when the house is not in session and even when there is no parliament in existence. He has the responsibility of surveying in an administrative way the functioning of the house. He also has other very important responsibilities. However, I suggest in this connection, as in all other connections affecting the Speaker's duties, that we should bear in mind that the prime requisite of his duties is that he be impartial.

Perhaps the duty of a Speaker has never been better expressed than in the following quotation from Hon. Ernest Lapointe, which is quoted in an article by James H. Aitchison of Dalhousie University entitled "The Speakership of the Canadian House of Commons". He said:

> "Impartiality on the part of the Speaker is the supreme law of his office. It is essential that every member should have the conviction that when our colleague ascends the throne of the Speaker he ceases to be the man of the party and becomes the man of the whole house."

That is the end of the quotation from Hon. Ernest Lapointe. Mr. Aitchison continues:

> When Lapointe moved the election (for the second time) of Lemieux to the Speaker's chair he formulated in these words the prime requirement of the Speakership of the popular branch of the legislature of a parliamentary democracy patterned on the classical British model.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker is placed under a duty to abstain from partisan political action not only in fact but to make it apparent to all, and particularly to his fellow members of parliament, that he has no part in party politics. He is in fact like Caesar's wife: Not only must he be pure but he must be above suspicion.

The particular incident from which I understand this amendment arises relates to the activities of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) when he was still occupying the position of Speaker following the election in April 1963. The hon. member made some reference to the fact that at that time he was exercising those duties; he also made some reference to the fact that he was exercising them even though, during the interval after he was elected Speaker of the House, he accepted a position as minister of the crown. So that while he was under the solemn trust to the members of the House of Commons as their Speaker he accepted an appointment as a minister of the outgoing government and participated actively in a

campaign against those members of the House of Commons to whom he owed the duty of impartiality.

The Speaker is in an anomalous position when elections are called because he must be re-elected to the house. However, I would point out that while he may be under an obligation to regain election in his own constituency he certainly is under no obligation to carry on an active campaign on behalf of the government in office as a whole.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker—and I put it forward respectfully to the house—that this was a serious thrust at a fundamental democratic right in this country. Perhaps criticism of this particular action has not been put better than by a native Albertan, a distinguished academic from the hon. member's own province, Mr. Denis Smith, a former lecturer in political science at York University, now at Trent University, in an article which he wrote appearing in the *Canadian Forum* for April 1963. He refers in particular to the state of the Speakership at that time and says:

> The election of Mr. Michener was auspicious; his unanimous re-election to the chair in the 24th parliament suggested that the prime minister—

The reference in that case is to the hon. member for Prince Albert, the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker).

> —and the whole membership of the house, had learned the lesson of the pipe line debate. But from then on, while Mr. Michener dignified the Speakership, the prime minister—

Again I would remind the house that that is the Leader of the Opposition.

> —progressively allowed political interest to cloud his conception of an independent Speaker. The office of Deputy Speaker was used, as the Speakership had once been used, as a test for prospective ministers. The prime minister did not always defer to the Chair, as parliamentary practice and the prime minister's own conscience should have demanded. Finally, after the defeat of Mr. Michener and the accession to the chair of Mr. Lambert in the last parliament, Mr. Diefenbaker gave up entirely his belief in an independent Speaker. In his desperate search for ministers after the cabinet crisis, he turned to Mr. Lambert, and by implication made the Chair once more a stepping-stone to political office.

We have in question here, Mr. Speaker, not so much the question of whether or not it is desirable for the Clerk of the House to exercise these duties, and my personal opinion is that the present Clerk of this house as an experienced former member of this house is well qualified in the operation of the administrative duties of this house, but the question of conflict of interest which faced the hon. member for Edmonton West when he was in that particular position.

It is my suggestion that the best way in which we can remove that conflict is by taking the responsibility for these administrative duties away from the Speaker when he is in this kind of half life—in the position of perhaps not having been re-elected or, if re-elected, not having been selected again as Speaker of the house.

Mr. Speaker, the kind of measure which the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Whelan) has put forward is the kind of measure which should commend itself to the house so that that kind of conflict of interest or breach of the impartiality which is expected of the Speaker will not occur again.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, I am not attempting to justify myself. The point I am making is in respect of the office I occupied. I suggest that the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice should take that statement from Professor Denis Smith's article, whose father is the distinguished chief justice of the province of Alberta, in context with the fact that Mr. Smith is primarily interested in the establishment of a continuing Speakership. That is the thread of his article.

The hon. member for Rosedale, of course, failed to mention Mr. Speaker Macdonald, Mr. Speaker Glen and Mr. Speaker Fauteux, all of whom were my predecessors in office.

Mr. Winch: Why did he not mention René Beaudoin who was in office in 1959?

Mr. Lambert: There has been no change in the position. Mr. Speaker Macdonald was solicitor general at the time he was carrying on these duties. These duties must be carried on.

Perhaps the hon. gentleman will indicate to me just where, in theory, there is impartiality on the part of the Speaker in the British house between dissolution and re-election. At this very time I dare say Hon. Sir Harry Hylton-Foster has not campaigned, but it is certainly a fact that a Speaker is going to campaign in the light of what the situation is at the present time. If the hon. member would guarantee that Mr. Speaker in office at the time of dissolution shall not be re-elected, then perhaps he would have a stronger point.

The fact that Mr. Speaker engages in a political campaign during the election campaign while at the same time coming into this house and carrying on with the adminis-

trative duties of his office surely does not indicate that he will not exercise impartiality. I have not heard anyone suggest that there has not been impartiality in this regard. If anyone thinks that to be the case, let him have the courage to stand up and make the charge. I do not think any of my predecessors in office would hesitate to put their records before the house, and I certainly am not afraid to do so.

I do not know whether the hon. member is aware of the ambit of the work of the special committee on procedure, which already has indicated that the powers, perquisites, duties and responsibilities of the office of Mr. Speaker shall be the subject of a continuing study by this committee. I am a member of that committee and I can assure you that this matter is being studied. As a matter of fact, one of the individuals who is making a study of the office of Mr. Speaker is Professor Denis Smith. He is preparing a memorandum, at the request of the committee, to assist the committee in this regard.

The hon. member for Rosedale was trying to make the point that there was something political in this question, and he picked out perhaps the only part of the article, out of context I may say, so that he could make these political points. His effort falls miserably in this regard, and I do not think anyone will take him seriously.

Mr. Winch: He certainly does not know history.

Mr. Lambert: As far as history of the office is concerned, I would suggest to the hon. member that he read Mr. Philip Laundy's book "Office of the Speaker". I commend that book also to other members of this house.

Mr. Macdonald: I will lend that book to the hon. member. I have it here.

Mr. Lambert: I have read it several times. Undoubtedly the hon. member got his lead to Professor Smith's article from a footnote in Mr. Laundy's book.

Mr. Macdonald: It is a pity you could not understand it.

Mr. Lambert: I commend that book to the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Whelan).

In so far as the subject matter now being referred to the committee, I am quite happy, and I will resume my seat so that can be done.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hour for consideration of private members' business has expired.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Before you leave the chair, is it the wish of the house that this private members' bill retain its position?

Some hon. Members: No.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, I presume the business for Monday will be as previously outlined.

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, November 9, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

STATEMENT ON LEGISLATION TO BE CONSIDERED

Mr. Speaker: The right hon. leader—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The right hon. leader of the government wishes to make a short announcement.

In accord with the understanding reached at the party leaders' meeting this morning I wish to announce merely that after three separate discussions and in spite of our best efforts, we were unable to agree on a program or timetable of work for the rest of the session.

Speaking on behalf of the government I should inform the house, as I promised to do, that the government considers the following matters should be dealt with before Christmas, and I give them not necessarily in order of time priority. First, estimates; redistribution bill; report of the flag committee; the labour standards bill and the pensions bill.

The order of business proposed for this week has already, I think, been given to the house. Today, as the house knows, we will be dealing with the pensions resolution, and tomorrow and the rest of the week—on Wednesday the house will not be sitting—redistribution and estimates. It should be possible, I believe, to deal with the matters I have mentioned in a month or so. If we do better than that and there is additional time before Christmas, there are other measures on the order paper which could be brought forward. I also have to make the customary and necessary reservation that any program of work is always subject to change due to any emergency developing.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there are one or two references I intend to make in reply to what the right hon. leader of the government has said represents the situation. We were together on three occasions, and I think it only proper that I should say at once that in so far as the objective is concerned as set forth by him, regarding what might be done before Christmas, I think each and every one of the matters referred to is necessary, and there is no reason why redistribution, the pension bill and those matters to which he referred other than the flag should not receive immediate attention.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: In so far as the flag question is concerned, I did not intend to go into that matter until I got the helping hand or the helping voice of some hon. gentlemen opposite. Certainly our attitude throughout was one of opposition to the three maple leaves.

Mr. Matheson: The royal badge.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We took our stand. Those sitting opposite said we were wrong; then when the committee met the Liberal members all agreed that we were right.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We were unable to agree with the suggestion that we should apply to ourselves a self imposed closure, but my own feeling is this. In so far as the flag debate is concerned, this represents the views of my caucus, the caucus of the Conservative party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I think quite a number wish to express themselves on this matter. That does not mean they will be repeating themselves more than once, but they have their views to express and they do not intend to have imposed on them anything in the nature of a closure, other than, of course, if the government chooses in its wisdom to bring about that measure; and we will come to that matter if it arises.

We do feel, however, that in order to expedite the business of the house Canadians as a whole would expect us in this house to vote on the question of whether there should be a plebiscite. A resolution was before the house; it was amended, and two subamendments were moved. One of the subamendments was dealt with on September 1. In so far as the subamendment that still stands is con-

cerned, and the amendment, we would like these voted on. As far as the Conservative party is concerned, Her Majesty's loyal opposition—

Mr. Matheson: Not very loyal.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —there would be no debate on that question at all. I do not know whether that interruption came from the putative father of confederation, but if it did all I can say is this; that it was he who said that the three maple leaves flag was in the tradition of the country and represented everything, and then he swallowed himself on it in committee.

In so far as our desire for a plebiscite is concerned, we do not want to debate the amendment or the subamendment, and to expedite matters I give the undertaking that if the government will give an opportunity for a vote on the amendment and subamendment we will vote on those amendments without any further discussion on our part. In so far as the resolution as it stands is concerned, we would then give our consent and approval to its immediate removal from the order paper. In other words, we want to give Canadians an opportunity of knowing what is the attitude of the House of Commons on the subject of the plebiscite, which according to a private television poll, a very large poll, has the support of 64 per cent of the Canadian people. I refer, of course, to Telepoll. We would then proceed with the recommendation of the committee and deal with it, not in a spirit of obstruction by any means—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It was not obstruction before, Mr. Speaker, because what we said turned out to be the view of all the Liberal members of the committee. I am sure that we, as all members of the house, will do our part to the end that these matters will be decided in time in a reasonable and fair manner, so that we may get on with the calling of the next session by the government.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, the members of this party regret that we have not been able to work out a satisfactory timetable for the business of the house for the balance of this session. However, I should like to stress two things which as far as this party is concerned are well known. We are desirous of accomplishing two things, and I place them in their order of importance.

First of all, we are desirous that a limited legislative program be completed before the end of this session. We would place as the essential items in that program the Canada pension plan, the labour standards act, the redistribution bill and the estimates. We think those matters ought to have top priority.

Second, we are interested in having the report of the flag committee disposed of. Indications are that there is very wide support in this house for that report, including support from members of all political parties in the house. I am told that at one time on a vote all 14 members of the committee voted in favour of a single maple leaf flag. However, it is not my intention to discuss the flag question at the moment but simply to say that we are quite anxious to see the flag question disposed of. But we are not prepared to pay as the price for disposing of the flag question the sidetracking of any of the legislative items which I have mentioned.

For that reason I do hope that the items which the Prime Minister read out are not necessarily to be taken in the order in which he read them. We would hope that redistribution, the labour code and the Canada pension plan can be disposed of before we deal with the report of the committee on the flag. I see no reason why we cannot dispose of all the items, including the flag question, but I do make a special appeal to the government not to allow the debate on the flag committee report to prevent us passing the other more vital and important items. I also hope that when the flag question comes up, even though we have not been able to agree on a limitation of time we will have the co-operation of the official opposition in disposing of it with the greatest possible dispatch.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, if every party in this house had shown good faith in determining the legislative program to be passed before the end of the session, we could have reached an understanding and settled the problems which face us at this moment.

After attending a meeting, I believe that it was especially good faith which was lacking on the part of the official opposition. Only a few items remain to be discussed before the end of the session. This year we have already beaten the record for the length of any session. We discussed the flag issue for more than 22 days, and it still seems to be the stumbling block. In my opinion, this is a

lesson for the Canadian people, because if the 265 members in this house cannot come to an agreement, how can we expect any agreement in Canada on the most important problems?

Mr. Speaker, I say that bad faith in some quarters prevented us from coming to an agreement and that will happen again in this house as well as throughout the country.

For instance, again today at noon following the very sensible statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) challenged the government with regard to the imposition of closure. Such a stand is an obvious proof of bad faith because the government has not talked about closure yet.

When the leader of the official opposition states that 30 members of his party want to talk on that matter, that means of course 15 hours of debate or roughly three sitting days.

I feel that things should be settled once and for all because the four other parties were ready to agree to the suggestion that the bills dealing with the pension plan and redistribution as well as the labour code be adopted first. If it had been possible to come to an agreement on the consideration of the estimates, we could have ended this session and passed all the items which have yet to be considered.

I believe that it would have been very easy to come to an agreement, and if we did not reach one I think that all those party leaders' meetings should stop as long as good faith is not the basis for discussion between the leaders of the political parties in this house.

[*Text*]

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, certain questions of substance have been raised and certain questions have been addressed to the government about the procedure that might be followed. I can deal with them immediately so as to clear up the points that have been raised.

In so far as the proposal made by the right hon. gentleman is concerned, that we should deal with the amendment and subamendment to the resolution on the flag, which was previously before the house, before we deal with the report of the flag committee, as I have already stated we are quite agreeable to that providing there is a time limit on the debate on the subject of the flag committee report.

So far as the proposal of the leader of the New Democratic party is concerned, that the pension bill be given very high priority, even before the flag discussion, with the understanding that there would be a time limit on that discussion we are very glad to accept that proposal, as I announced at the all party meeting.

UNITED NATIONS

COMMUNIQUÉ ON OTTAWA MEETING ON STAND-BY UNITS FOR PEACE FORCE

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the house I should like to table a communiqué, both in English and in French, issued following the conference on United Nations peace keeping operations, which took place in Ottawa from November 2 to November 6, and ask that it be made an appendix to today's proceedings.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house agree that the communiqué shall be made an appendix to *Hansard*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For text of communiqué above referred to, see appendix.*]

STANDING ORDERS

CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (for Mr. Asselin, Notre Dame de Grâce) moved that the third report of the standing committee on standing orders, presented to the house on Thursday, November 5, 1964, be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE

MR. MACEWAN—DISCLOSURES TO PRESS RESPECTING NEW INDUSTRIES

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I have a short question of privilege which affects all members of the house and particularly the people of the province of Nova Scotia and the constituency I represent. It has reference to a press report in the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* of last Saturday, November 7, dealing with a statement by Premier Robert Stanfield. The report reads in part as follows:

> Premier Robert Stanfield yesterday scored what he termed "federal authorities" and "federal sources" for premature disclosure to the press of secret negotiations that have been going on concerning three industries interested in settling in the province.

Reference is made to a proposed car plant for the Sydney area of Cape Breton, a

recording machine manufacturing company for Halifax, namely the Clairtone company, and a pulp and paper mill for Pictou county. The premier went on to point out that negotiations had been going on between the provincial government and these companies, and that disclosures had been made to the press by what he referred to as federal authorities and federal sources in Ottawa. The article goes on to report him as saying:

"Yesterday when I read the federal disclosure regarding Clairtone I understood for the first time the depth of Angus L. Macdonald's exasperation with Ottawa."

I hope it will not be repeated. My question of privilege is that when questions were asked of certain ministers during debate in the house with regard to industries which had signified their intention to settle in designated areas, those questions were not answered because we were told it might prejudice the negotiations. Apparently these ministers have now seen fit to allow some of their officials, referred to by the premier as "federal authorities" and "federal sources", to disclose this information, thereby making it possible that the negotiations will break down and these industries will be lost to the province of Nova Scotia.

I therefore submit to the Prime Minister that this practice should be stopped, that it should not take place again in the future, and that these federal officials and sources should wait until negotiations are fully completed and the province is assured of these industries. I point out particularly that it has been stated that the Scott Paper Company proposes to settle in the county I represent, a county of high unemployment for many years. This is an excellent opportunity, and I hope that industry will not be lost to the good people of that historic county.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the first point I want to make is that this is, of course, a very fraudulent question of privilege—

Some hon. Members: Why?

Mr. MacEachen: —because it is based upon a political speech made by the premier of Nova Scotia at the annual meeting of the provincial party for the purpose of restoring the sagging spirits of the party members.

Mr. Diefenbaker: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.

[Mr. MacEwan.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: —the minister should know that the word "fraudulent" is improper and must be withdrawn.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I used the words "fraudulent question of privilege", and I think those words were at one time used by a former Speaker of the house. I shall be glad to draw that to the attention of the Leader of the Opposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I ask for your ruling on that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Diefenbaker: The hon. gentleman does not even know the rules when he rises during a question of privilege.

Mr. MacEachen: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I had the floor on a question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Pictou.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I happen to have the floor at the moment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the use of the word "fraudulent" is a little strong, but I think feelings were strong at the time. I do not see that any particular damage or harm has been suffered at that moment.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, you have ruled the word "fraudulent" is not unparliamentary, and that is all I wanted to know. I want to say that that word, on the basis of all the previous records of the house, is not permissible, but whatever Your Honour rules will be accepted.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I was not ruling on the question of privilege because there was no motion proposed. Therefore there is no question before the house at the moment. On the use of the word "fraudulent", I shall have to consult the authorities and make up my own mind.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the statements made by Premier Stanfield were, of course, vague and general, and quoted federal authorities and federal officials. I challenge Premier Stanfield to produce cases or instances of either ministers or officials of government departments making statements or being responsible for leaks about these proposed developments in the province of Nova Scotia. If cases are cited they can be taken seriously by the house and the govern-

ment, but until that time they are completely unsupported.

I believe that in the next day or so it will be possible to demonstrate the exact source of these leaks, much to the embarrassment of my hon. friends across the way.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman went quite beyond his rights, but we will be very interested in finding out whether the leaks to the Toronto *Star* regarding Banks came from his side of the house.

LABOUR RELATIONS

MARITIME UNION TRUSTEES—APPEARANCE BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE

On the order: Government notice of motion:

November 5—The Minister of Labour—The following proposed motion:—That the standing committee on industrial relations be empowered to hear and to examine members of the board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions concerning the acts performed and the facts found in carrying out the duties entrusted to them by the Maritime Transportation Unions Trustees Act and to report to the house from time to time.

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.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ATLANTIC PROVINCES HIGHWAY DEVELOPMENT GRANT

Question No. 1,623—**Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton):**

In connection with a recent announcement of a grant of $10,000,000 for highways by the Atlantic development board, to be expended in the Atlantic provinces (a) what are the details showing locations of highways to be improved and estimated expenditure at each location (b) is any portion of expenditure to be matched by any provincial government?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I have been advised by the Atlantic development board that the detailed arrangements have been worked out with the governments of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as to the use of their share of the $10,000,000 grant for highways from the Atlantic development fund. The share assigned by the board in each case is $3,000,000. In Newfoundland and Nova Scotia the provinces are paying 50 per cent of the cost of specific sections of highways, while in New Brunswick the proportion will be 75 per cent federal and 25 per cent provincial, which will inevitably result in a shorter mileage in that province than the other two. The proportion of cost to be borne by each province was, under the policy, negotiated with each province separately. However, final agreements have not yet been signed. As soon as this has taken place the details of locations and estimated expenditures at each location will be made available. Discussions are still proceeding with the government of Prince Edward Island as to the use of that province's share, which is $1,000,000.

STUDY OF CAUSEWAY, LABRADOR-NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 1,893—**Mr. Côté (Chicoutimi):**

1. Have surveys been made, by employees of the federal government or by independent oceanographers, in the strait of Belle Isle, with a view to studying the possibility of constructing a causeway nine miles long in a body of water 150 feet deep between Labrador and Newfoundland?

2. If so, what were the conclusions of such surveys with respect to preventing cold water currents from penetrating into the gulf of St. Lawrence and adversely affecting the weather in the maritimes and the province of Quebec?

3. If no surveys have yet been undertaken will consideration be given to ascertaining the pros and cons of a project which could be undertaken by the federal government to connect Newfoundland to the continent through the extension of the trans-Canada highway, the construction of a railway line by the C.N.R. and the installation of electric transmission cables?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. No survey has been conducted for this specific purpose; however, surveys have been made by the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys to assess seasonal temperature and salinity conditions, to forecast ice freeze-up and breakup, and to study the movement of water through the strait.

2. The results of these studies to this date indicate that the flow of water through Belle Isle strait varies in direction and speed across the strait, and fluctuates in time in response to meteorological changes. These variations in time and space are such that there is no clear evidence that on the average there is any substantial cooling of the waters of the gulf of St. Lawrence because of the net flow through Belle Isle strait.

3. A survey of this magnitude would require decisions by the government as a whole.

Questions

[*Text*]

*APPLICATION OF FEED GRAIN POLICY TO NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO

Question No. 1,941—**Mr. Fisher:**

1. Before the Minister of Forestry announced the "interim policy on feed grains" in July, was any consideration given to any benefits this policy would have for farmers in northwestern Ontario, i.e., between Nipigon and the Rainy river, Dryden, and Kenora regions and, if so, what are these benefits?

2. If no consideration was given to such benefits, for what reasons?

3. Was any consideration given to providing freight assistance for feed grains transported from Manitoba by truck to northwestern Ontario points and, if not, what explanation is there, in detail, for not going forward with such an arrangement as policy, particularly in view of this geographical juxtaposition, contrasted with the isolation of northwestern Ontario from normal eastern distribution points?

4. What steps did the government take to explain to farmers in northwestern Ontario how the new interim policy would affect them, including the dates of any press releases, their contents, and any information that went forward to truck shippers who transport in and through northwestern Ontario?

5. If no steps have been taken, for what reasons were they not taken?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): 1. For eastern Canada the feed grain policy applies to transportation from Fort William/Port Arthur to points east thereof. Transportation charges west of Fort William/Port Arthur are not assisted under the policy as such charges are reflected in correspondingly lower prices at the various assembly points in the west.

2, 3, 4 and 5. Answered by 1.

FERRIES IN BORDEN-CAPE TORMENTINE SERVICE

Question No. 2,044—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. What ferries are now in operation on the Borden-Cape Tormentine service?

2. On what date was each placed in service?

3. What was the cost of construction of each boat?

4. In each year from 1953 to 1963 inclusive, what was the total operating cost for all ferries in operation on this service?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1 and 2.

Name of Vessel	Date placed in service
S.S. *Prince Edward Island*	1916
M.V. *Abegweit*	1947
S.S. *Scotia II*	1956

(S.S. *Scotia II* was transferred from strait of Canso service. This vessel was built in 1915).

M.V. *Confederation*	1962

3. S.S. *Prince Edward Island,* $878,484; M.V. *Abegweit,* $7,067,710; S.S. *Scotia II,* $348,948; (The sum of $500,856 was spent on the *Scotia II* in 1956 on being transferred to the P.E.I. service). M.V. *Confederation,* $3,436,932.

4. 1953, $2,113,200; 1954, $2,024,078; 1955, $2,413,882; 1956, $2,214,010; 1957, $2,668,078; 1958, $2,650,985; 1959, $3,290,053; 1960, $3,372,344; 1961, $3,795,857; 1962, $4,136,358; 1963, $4,263,481.

PROVINCIAL EMPLOYEES IN GOVERNMENT, SCHOOLS AND MUNICIPALITIES

Question No. 2,066—**Mr. Gelber:** (Supplementary)

1. What is the most recent information in the Department of Labour on the number of persons employed by each provincial government, and the average annual wage for each province?

2. What is the most recent information in the Department of Labour on the number of persons employed in each province in primary and secondary schools, and what is the average annual wage for each province?

3. What is the most recent information in the Department of Labour on the number of persons employed in municipalities in each province, and what is the average annual wage for each province?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Part 3 only. The number of employees given in the previous reply as shown on page 9409 of *Hansard,* for Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia should read 29,125, 45,168 and 11,-159 respectively. The gross earnings for Quebec and Ontario should read $131,521,016 and $194,095,601 respectively.

WHYCOCOMAGH INDIAN RESERVE WATER SUPPLY

Question No. 2,070—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

Has the domestic water supply at the Whycocomagh Indian reservation been condemned by health authorities?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No. There are four good wells on the Whycocomagh reserve with properly installed hand pumps set on concrete blocks. Officers of the Department of National Health and Welfare tested the water from these four wells in mid August of this year and found it suitable for domestic drinking water. However, the water from three of these wells does have a turbid appearance and the Indian residents have refused to use it, and insist on getting their supply from surface wells, springs and brooks.

Samples from these sources have been tested and have been found to have a high coliform count. The superintendent of the Indian agency has been advised of this situation and requested to instruct the residents of the

reserve that all water from surface wells, springs and brooks should be boiled for 10 minutes before being used for drinking purposes.

DISPOSITION OF RECREATION HALL, R.C.A.F. SEA ISLAND BASE

Question No. 2,085—**Mr. Prittie:**

Has a request been received from the corporation of the township of Richmond, B.C., for the acquisition by the township of the recreation hall of the former R.C.A.F. station, Sea island, B.C., and, if so (a) has the government department concerned entered into negotiations with the township of Richmond (b) what is the present status of such negotiations?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): A request was received from the township of Richmond, B.C., to lease building No. 77 (recreation hall) at the former R.C.A.F. station, Sea island, B.C.

The Department of Transport is dealing directly with the township of Richmond in the matter.

OFFICERS RETIRED WITHIN TWO YEARS OF NORMAL AGE

Question No. 2,118—**Mr. MacEwan:**

How many of the officers, who are to be advised in November that they will be prematurely retired, are within two years of normal retirement age of their respective ranks?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Eighteen.

AIRPORT RESTORATION AND REPAIR, MONCTON AND QUEBEC

Question No. 2,126—**Mr. Marcoux:**

1. Has the Department of Transport authorized the restoring and enlarging of the airport in Moncton, N.B., at a cost of $1,127,000?
2. Does the department intend restoring and enlarging the airport in Quebec city?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. A contract was awarded on October 1, 1964 in the amount of $1,127,250 to effect alterations and extensions to the terminal building at the Moncton airport, N.B.

2. A contract was awarded during the first week of October, 1964 in the amount of $202,000 to reconstruct and improve the airfield drainage system at the Quebec airport.

[*Text*]

EFFECTS OF CONSUMPTION OF FLUORIDATED WATER

Question No. 2,193—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Has the government conducted or supported research into the effects on human physiology of the consumption of fluoridated water for periods of 20 years or more and, if so, what have been the findings of each such study?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The Department of National Health and Welfare, in its studies over the past 16 years, primarily investigated the dental effects of water fluoridation. However, no ill effects of a systemic nature attributable to the presence of fluoride in water supply has been reported by the health authorities or by the practising physicians in the fluoridated cities studied by this department. The physiological aspects of fluoridation have of course received a great deal of careful scrutiny in the world scientific literature.

PUBLIC SERVICE DEATH BENEFIT PLAN SURPLUS

Question No. 2,194—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. What has been the surplus accumulated under the supplementary death benefit plan (Public Service Superannuation Act) in each of the last five years, and to what purpose have these funds been used?
2. Has consideration been given to a reduction in premiums for this plan?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1. The excess of income over expenditure in each of the last five years has been

	Public service death benefit account	Regular forces death benefit account
1959-60	$ 538,334	$1,429,556
1960-61	2,422,807	1,538,127
1961-62	1,261,588	1,580,400
1962-63	1,247,740	1,738,761
1963-64	1,144,768	1,775,987

These amounts have been used to build up the contingency reserves.

2. Yes.

*NEW INDUSTRIES IN SASKATCHEWAN

Question No. 2,201—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. What industries has the Department of Industry assisted in establishing in Saskatchewan since it was first set up?
2. How many employees are there in the department?

Questions

3. What is the salary range for employees within the department?

4. How much has been spent on research or developing industries in Saskatchewan since the department was established?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. The Department of Industry does not attempt to duplicate the industrial promotion activities of either the provinces or the municipalities. However, representatives of the department have been working with provincial officials and industry representatives in support of various projects in Saskatchewan to encourage the expansion and improved competitiveness of a number of industries, including food processing and manufacturing of wood products. In addition, officials of the area development agency have been working with provincial officials and industry representatives on various regional projects of interest to Saskatchewan.

2. Three hundred twenty eight (Oct. 29/64).

3. $2,280—$23,000.

4. The day to day duties of departmental officers include a wide variety of activities and it is impractical to keep detailed accounts allocating their time to each of these tasks. Therefore, statistics are not available on the costs of specific activities such as research or consultations with government officials and representatives of industries in individual provinces.

CONTRACT FOR REPAIRS, BAILEY'S BROOK, N.S.

Question No. 2,220—**Mr. MacEwan:**

What repairs are being carried out under the present contract at Bailey's Brook, Nova Scotia?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): The present contract at Bailey's Brook, N.S. includes the following work: A 125 foot length of the east pier near the inner end is to be completely replaced with a timber pilework type structure. Construction of a timber bulkhead wall 50 feet in length situated about 600 feet from the outer end of the east pier. Reconstruction of the superstructure of the outer 661 feet of the east pier. Replacement of the west breakwater superstructure over a length of 80 feet commencing 20 feet from the outer end of the breakwater.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, CANADA-COMMON MARKET COUNTRIES

Question No. 2,221—**Mr. Balcer:**

Calculated in dollars, what was the extent of imports and exports between the countries of the common market and Canada for each year since 1947?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Imports and exports between the countries of the common market and Canada, calendar years 1947 to 1963.

Year		Belgium and Luxembourg	Federal Republic of Germany	France	Italy	Netherlands
		(Thousands of dollars)				
1947	Imports	9,952	496	8,467	3,859	3,325
	Exports	52,856	5,903	80,758	35,643	55,899
1948	Imports	13,456	1,338	12,443	6,939	4,998
	Exports	33,324	11,776	92,350	32,129	43,750
1949	Imports	18,887	6,696	13,061	8,925	5,431
	Exports	56,896	23,046	35,705	12,357	13,869
1950	Imports	22,680	10,658	14,423	9,292	7,946
	Exports	66,792	8,584	18,232	15,383	8,635
1951	Imports	38,473	28,835	23,085	13,994	10,854
	Exports	94,720	36,827	46,426	48,814	26,450
1952	Imports	32,902	20,313	18,388	11,406	12,990
	Exports	104,622	94,659	48,316	52,803	41,587
1953	Imports	28,823	30,989	21,407	14,073	17,788
	Exports	69,768	84,251	32,216	33,254	41,895
1954	Imports	24,794	40,413	21,331	14,781	18,528
	Exports	55,222	87,614	33,589	25,351	40,081
1955	Imports	28,854	52,215	24,364	18,307	19,073
	Exports	56,720	42,736	42,419	27,532	48,179
1956	Imports	52,379	84,430	31,719	24,644	21,524
	Exports	58,146	134,520	53,236	37,707	54,859
1957	Imports	43,681	92,527	34,987	32,536	21,690
	Exports	60,584	154,521	57,492	62,889	70,194

Year		Belgium and Luxembourg	Federal Republic of Germany	France	Italy	Netherlands
		(Thousands of dollars)				
1958	Imports	35,759	102,644	40,007	32,150	26,905
	Exports	69,948	201,902	45,506	29,890	75,020
1959	Imports	44,786	123,905	56,940	37,656	29,154
	Exports	56,813	130,323	43,682	31,981	54,296
1960	Imports	41,401	126,988	50,121	42,843	31,456
	Exports	69,495	167,561	73,585	68,917	63,075
1961	Imports	44,780	136,530	54,280	49,140	33,493
	Exports	76,794	191,500	73,120	68,337	62,107
1962	Imports	48,672	141,198	56,160	51,859	37,049
	Exports	69,003	180,444	59,214	75,406	77,788
1963	Imports	47,342	144,023	58,170	55,303	36,736
	Exports	78,305	175,903	65,649	78,432	88,765

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, CANADA-U.S.

Question No. 2,222—**Mr. Balcer:**

Calculated in dollars, what was the extent of imports and exports between the United States and Canada for each year since 1947?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Imports and exports between the United States and Canada, calendar years 1947 to 1963:

Year		$'000
1947	Imports	1,951,606
	Exports	1,052,560
1948	Imports	1,798,507
	Exports	519,713
1949	Imports	1,915,227
	Exports	1,525,326
1950	Imports	2,089,531
	Exports	2,050,178
1951	Imports	2,752,087
	Exports	2,332,479
1952	Imports	2,887,628
	Exports	2,344,807
1953	Imports	3,115,301
	Exports	2,457,482
1954	Imports	2,871,279
	Exports	2,359,079
1955	Imports	3,331,143
	Exports	2,600,539
1956	Imports	4,031,394
	Exports	2,863,571
1957	Imports	3,887,391
	Exports	2,920,834
1958	Imports	3,460,147
	Exports	2,895,795
1959	Imports	3,709,065
	Exports	3,181,903
1960	Imports	3,686,625
	Exports	3,036,416
1961	Imports	3,863,968
	Exports	3,214,518
1962	Imports	4,299,539
	Exports	3,744,664
1963	Imports	4,444,556
	Exports	3,913,352

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, CANADA-U.K.

Question No. 2,223—**Mr. Balcer:**

Calculated in dollars, what was the extent of imports and exports between Great Britain and Canada for each year since 1947?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Imports and exports between Great Britain and Canada, calendar years 1947 to 1963.

Year		$'000
1947	Imports	184,207
	Exports	749,170
1948	Imports	293,535
	Exports	685,015
1949	Imports	302,420
	Exports	706,364
1950	Imports	400,811
	Exports	470,512
1951	Imports	415,194
	Exports	634,353
1952	Imports	351,541
	Exports	749,653
1953	Imports	445,441
	Exports	666,423
1954	Imports	382,229
	Exports	655,936
1955	Imports	393,117
	Exports	772,314
1956	Imports	476,371
	Exports	816,834

Questions

Year		$'000
1957	Imports	507,319
	Exports	726,049
1958	Imports	518,505
	Exports	776,668
1959	Imports	588,573
	Exports	794,271
1960	Imports	588,932
	Exports	924,941
1961	Imports	618,221
	Exports	921,213
1962	Imports	563,062
	Exports	919,943
1963	Imports	526,800
	Exports	1,014,925

*BILINGUAL CAP AND UNIFORM FLASHES, CUSTOMS SERVICE

Question No. 2,227—**Mr. Pigeon:**

Is the Minister of National Revenue considering the possibility of having bilingual wording on cap and uniform flashes for Canadian customs officers and, if not, for what reasons?

[*Text*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): The official badge worn by uniformed customs officers is bilingual. It is in the form of a gold coloured metal shield bearing a crown, the words "Canada", "Customs—Excise", "Douanes—Accise", and an identification number. Consideration is presently being given to a new uniform cap which will not embody any wording except "Canada". Customs uniforms do not bear flashes.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BANK SHARES

Question No. 2,228—**Mr. Latulippe:**

As of October 1, 1964, what was (a) the number of shares issued by each of the chartered banks in Canada (b) what was the par value per share of each of the banks and the value of all the shares issued by each bank (c) for each of the banks what was the market value of each share of each bank, the total for each bank and the total for the eight banks (d) what is the number and the par value of the Bank of Canada shares (e) what is the market value per Bank of Canada share, and the total market value of all Bank of Canada shares?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance):

	(a) Number of shares issued	(b) Par value of all shares issued	(c) Market value of each share	(c) Total market value
Bank of Montreal	6,075,000	$60,750,000	$69	$419,175,000
The Bank of Nova Scotia	3,000,000	30,000,000	77	231,000,000
The Toronto-Dominion Bank	3,000,000	30,000,000	69	207,000,000
La Banque Provinciale du Canada	900,000	9,000,000	58	52,200,000
Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce	6,968,000	69,680,000	68	473,824,000
The Royal Bank of Canada	6,652,800	66,528,000	77	512,265,600
Banque Canadienne Nationale	1,200,000	12,000,000	77	92,400,000
The Mercantile Bank of Canada	400,000	4,000,000	10	4,000,000

Notes (b) All bank shares have a par value of $10 each. The issue prices have varied but for many years have been substantially greater than par.

(c) Approximate, based on stock exchange quotations, with exception of The Mercantile Bank of Canada which is not listed and stated here at par. Total market value $1,991,864,600.

(d) 100,000 shares, total par value $5,000,000.

(e) All shares are issued in the name of the Minister of Finance to be held by him on behalf of Canada and are not marketable.

[Mr. Sharp.]

[*Text*]

INCOME TAX PAID BY PERSONS OVER 70

Question No. 2,231—**Mr. McCutcheon:**

1. How many Canadians 70 years of age and over paid income tax in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1963 in the (a) province of Ontario (b) province of Quebec?

2. What was the total amount of money paid in income tax by the people in this age category in the same year in the (a) province of Ontario (b) province of Quebec?

3. How many people in this category received a return on the tax paid in the same year in the (a) province of Ontario (b) province of Quebec?

4. What is the percentage of the money received in tax from Canadians in this category to the total

amount of money paid in old age security to all Canadians over the age of 70 years in the (a) province of Ontario (b) province of Quebec?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): The following answers are based on returns filed for the 1963 calendar year, processed up to and including October 29, 1964.

1. Filers over age 69 in Ontario, 66,194; filers over age 69 in Quebec, 25,166.

2. Tax paid in Ontario, $31,602,624.29; tax paid in Quebec, $16,943,658.74.

3. Received refunds in Ontario, 13,162; received refunds in Quebec, 5,010.

4. Ontario, 11.26 per cent; Quebec, 10.29 per cent.

FATAL MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS

Question No. 2,240—**Mr. Mather:**

What was the percentage of fatal motor vehicle accidents, in relation to the number of licensed motor vehicles in Canada, in the years 1943, 1953 and 1963?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Fatal motor vehicle accidents as a percentage of motor vehicles 1943, 1953 and 1963:

	Total fatal accidents[1] No.	Total motor vehicles registered No.	Ratio[2] of fatal accidents to total registered vehicles %
1943[3]	1,051[4]	1,511,845	0.066
1953	2,564	3,430,672	0.075
1963	3,578	6,074,655	0.059

[1]Traffic accidents involving motor vehicles in which one or more fatalities occurred.

[2]Ratios are expressed as percentages.

[3]Newfoundland data not available prior to 1949.

[4]Includes an estimate of 53 fatal motor vehicle traffic accidents for Nova Scotia.

STUDENT LOANS

Question No. 2,251—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. As of September 30, 1964, how many students in each province and territory have been granted Canada student loans?

2. In each province and territory, what was the total of loans as of September 30, 1964?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1. This information is not yet available.

2. This information is not yet available.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

RICE IMPORTS—GRAIN EXPORTS TO CHINA

Question No. 2,199—**Mr. Hamilton:**

1. What were the values and quantities of rice imports into Canada for each of the last ten years by country of origin?

2. What has been the value of all grains exported by Canada to China for each of the last ten years?

Return tabled.

SHIPPING STATISTICS, PORT OF CHURCHILL

Question No. 2,202—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. On what date in 1964 did the shipping season commence at the port of Churchill?

2. On what date in 1964 did the shipping season end at the port of Churchill?

3. How many ships loaded grain at the port of Churchill in 1964 and in what country was each ship registered?

4. What amount of grain was loaded each day in 1964 at the port of Churchill and what was the destination?

5. To what countries were shipments made from Churchill in 1964 and what amount of grain was shipped to each?

6. What was the total amount of grain shipped during the entire season of 1964 and 1963?

Return tabled.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I ask that my question No. 1,550 be dropped, so that it can be rephrased and thus more readily answered.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house give consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Order discharged and question withdrawn.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

HAL BANKS—REPORTED CONTRIBUTIONS TO CAMPAIGN FUNDS OF LIBERAL MEMBERS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, following the expression of views by the Toronto *Star* regarding Mr. Hal Chamberlain Banks and certain contributions that he made to some Liberal members of the house, I ask the Prime Minister whether this report has come to his attention and whether an examination has been made of the records in the Department

of Labour in this respect. Possibly the Prime Minister would speak up and clear up this matter immediately.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to speak up on this interesting matter at the invitation of my right hon. friend, and to remind him there is a motion on the order paper for the production of papers, which I hope will be dealt with on Wednesday. In fact there is no reason why it should not be dealt with on Wednesday; and if there are papers dealing with this matter that can be tabled at once, this can be done so that my right hon. friend's understandable curiosity about what appeared in the Toronto *Star* will be satisfied.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I knew the Prime Minister would feel that way toward the article in the Toronto *Star,* and I am sure the hon. members who were delighted to receive these fortuitous payments will be equally anxious that the fullest information be given to the house.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): I have a question for the Prime Minister supplementary to that asked by the Leader of the Opposition. With respect to moneys received by Liberal members from Mr. Banks, could the Prime Minister, in order to avoid a motion to adjourn the house to discuss this most urgent and important matter, assure the house that Thursday or Friday will be set aside to debate the estimates of the Department of Justice?

Mr. Pearson: Certainly not. I welcome the hon. member back to the house, but if he wishes to make a motion of that kind, that is his responsibility.

REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF STATEMENT RESPECTING MEMBER FOR WINNIPEG SOUTH CENTRE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. Would the Prime Minister like to take this opportunity of withdrawing the false charge he made in his recent Hamilton speech, that I made a speech in Edmonton and used words to the effect that the Tories would bring the government to heel on interim supply?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, but I will be pleased to get the report as it appeared in the newspaper in question and read exactly what the hon. member said as reported in that newspaper. If my hon. friend had given me notice I would have had it before me now.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister consider that he is now casting doubt on the accuracy of the report of an experienced member of the press gallery, Mr. Victor Mackie, who has seen the transcript of the Prime Minister's speech and was present when he delivered it?

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, but I do happen to have the quotation from the Edmonton *Journal* of October 3 as it appeared in an article written by Mr. J. R. Walker of the Southam news services, who was reporting on no doubt a very interesting speech made by the hon. member in Edmonton on that or the previous day. This is what Mr. Walker has to say:

> Conservative house leader Gordon Churchill said in an interview Thursday that "no decision has been made" on how the party would handle interim supply, but he admitted that the possibilities of holding it up until the government came to heel on the flag question had crossed party minds.
>
> "I can foresee a crisis in November", he said. "But then we have had crises before in this session and they have backed down."

Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to back down on this one, or come to heel.

LABOUR RELATIONS

STRIKE OF LONGSHOREMEN—IMPLEMENTATION OF PENSION PLAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Labour regarding the one day strike by longshoremen in the province of Quebec, who claim that the shipping federation has refused to honour the implementation of the pension plan recommended by Judge Lippe. I want to ask the minister whether his department is doing anything about this, particularly in view of the fact that the men went back to work because they accepted Judge Lippe's report in good faith. I also ask the minister what action he is taking to see that the shipping federation honours its part of the bargain entered into at that time.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have had a meeting with representatives of the longshoremen which I interrupted to come into the house. I hope to meet them again later in the day, or to be in touch with them, with the prospect in mind of making a proposal that might be a

basis for resuming discussions between the parties.

The dispute centres on pension and retirement funds affecting five ports in Canada and the action taken by the trustees with respect to the Lippe report. It is a complicated question, too extensive, I think, to be gone into on orders of the day.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the minister if he has had any discussions with representatives of the shipping federation to ascertain whether they are prepared to re-examine the somewhat arbitrary position they seem to have taken in repudiating their earlier agreement to carry out this part of the recommendations of Judge Lippe?

Mr. MacEachen: I did have a telephone call from the secretary of the shipping federation advising me of his intention to send me a telegram containing certain proposals. I expected I would have received these proposals before I came into the house. When I do receive that telegram I hope to be able to consider it in relation to the representations made by the longshoremen, with a proposal for a possible meeting.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour.

Could the minister tell the house whether this one day strike on the part of the longshoremen in the St. Lawrence harbours is legal?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: I have not received legal advice on this question up to the present time. Presumably if I had I would not be permitted under the rules to answer that question, because it is a legal question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Labour a supplementary question?

As the latter stated that the leaders of the longshoremen's union of Montreal harbour which, if I am not mistaken, is represented by Mr. Asselin and Mr. Tremblay who are now in his office to discuss the pension plan, could the minister also ask those two union leaders whether they would allow an inquiry into the administration of this fund, as asked by a group of Montreal longshoremen, whom I brought to his office about two weeks ago, and who wanted an investigation on the management of that pension plan?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: I will be glad to draw the views of the hon. member for Lapointe to the attention of the delegation later today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may I direct another supplementary question to the minister? At the same time, could the Minister of Labour ask those two trade unionists whether they could not accept among their membership the few dockers who were ousted from their union because they wanted to become members of another union?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: That question also will be noted.

AVAILABILITY OF WORKING PAPERS OF LABOUR-MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to address to the Secretary of State. I should like to ask the minister whether the background papers prepared for the current labour-management conference, which is being sponsored by the economic council of Canada, are available for distribution to the members of the house for our information and, I hope, edification.

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving me notice of his intention to ask this question. I am happy to say that the working papers are available on request to the economic council. I should also like to add that the conference reports which will be published as soon as possible after the seminar will contain these working papers, and the published reports will be made available to all hon. members.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REPORTED COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF FRENCH NETWORK

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Justice a question? Could he inform the house of the results of his discussion with the Quebec minister of justice, Mr. Wagner, concerning Mr. Arsenault's charges relating to the presence of communists and communistic activities within the C.B.C.?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, in view of my talks with the attorney general of the province of Quebec, I am now in a position to tell the house that the R.C.M.P. is making an investigation to obtain from provincial authorities, and from any person who may have made statements on that matter, all the information that might be made available to the authorities.

[*Text*]

REPORTED STATEMENTS RESPECTING COMPETENCE OF STAFF

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Secretary of State. I should like to ask him whether the C.B.C. has sought information from Mrs. Jean Desprez in order to know who were those C.B.C. employees who are rubbish and deadwood, incompetent and good for nothing, as she recently stated, during a t.v. program, and whether the Secretary of State has obtained the results of such an investigation?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I brought the hon. member's request to the attention of the C.B.C. authorities but I have not yet received an answer.

[*Text*]

PUBLICITY ON NEWS BROADCASTS FOR POLITICAL MEETINGS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Secretary of State.

In view of the fact that last Saturday the Quebec city local station of the C.B.C., on the occasion of the regional news broadcast at 11 p.m., took the liberty to advertise a public meeting of the R.I.N. under the chairmanship of Mr. Bourgault in Quebec city, and in view of the fact that it was the first time that the C.B.C. advertised the meeting of a political party, would the Secretary of State inquire whether that is a new policy of the C.B.C. and whether the other parties, the Liberal party, the Conservative party and the Créditistes, will now be able, like the R.I.N., to have their public meetings advertised on the C.B.C. news?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I shall be glad to do so, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Grafftey.]

[*Text*]

UNITED NATIONS

REPORTED U.S. DECISION TO STOP TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AID

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Does the Canadian government intend to support the reported United States decision to stop all her aid to the principal technical assistance programs of the United Nations in an alleged attempt to solve the serious problem of the organization's constitutional and fiscal integrity?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I am sure the hon. member for Oxford would not expect me on behalf of the government to say we intended to support a reported decision. We would wish to make sure, first of all, whether the government of the United States has in fact reached such a decision. If it has, and after we have had an opportunity to examine the report, then we will make up our minds as to the course Canada should follow.

Mr. Nesbitt: Can the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell us, then, whether there has been any consultation with the United States government concerning the possibility of the United States withholding aid to the United Nations technical assistance programs?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): As of this date, no, sir.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

BIRD, MAN.—TRANSFER OF RADAR SITE TO PROVINCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Defence Production. Can the minister say when the government intends to complete the order in council which I understand is necessary to turn over the buildings and property of the abandoned mid-Canada radar site at Bird, Manitoba, to the province? If it has been completed, perhaps the hon. gentleman will so inform us.

Mr. Speaker: Surely this is a question for the order paper.

Mr. Simpson: I believe the minister was ready to answer. This is a matter to which great urgency is attached; it is necessary to get the buildings off the site very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: I am not in a position to judge the urgency. Certainly it is only right to accept the statement made by the hon. member. Is the minister able to answer the question?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): It is my understanding that the order in council has been signed.

PIPE LINES

REPORTED INTENTION OF TRANS-CANADA COMPANY TO BUILD LINE THROUGH U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): I wish to ask the Minister of Transport whether he or his officials had any discussion with Trans-Canada Pipe Lines before the company announced that it planned to build a gas pipe line to eastern Canada through the United States.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): It was a complete surprise to me, sir.

Mr. Fisher: Could the minister at least inform the house whether it would be necessary for this company to obtain an act of parliament or a private bill before being able to proceed with this particular project.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is, of course, a legal question to which I would hate to give an offhand answer. But I dare say an answer could be procured, and I will draw the question to the attention of my deskmate, the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Fisher: I wonder if the minister could at the same time give an indication of the government's policy in connection with such a project, in view of debates many years ago which he will remember, debates which bear upon this project and the location of oil pipe lines of a similar kind.

Mr. Pickersgill: I understand that this is not an oil pipe line. I also have grave doubt as to whether this is a matter which properly comes within my administrative jurisdiction at all. But I will consider what the hon. member has suggested and see whether some appropriate reply cannot be made.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

CONSULTATION WITH ATTORNEYS GENERAL RESPECTING PAROLE APPLICATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): My question is addressed to the Minister of Justice. Can the minister confirm to the house that he has entered into an agreement with the attorney general of Quebec as a result of which the attorney general of that province will have the right to review all Quebec parole files? If so, has he received any similar requests from the attorneys general of other provinces, and what have been his replies or what agreement has been reached?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): The hon. member's question probably stems from a report in one of the Toronto daily papers. I may say that I had a discussion of a general nature in the course of a meeting which took place between the attorney general of Quebec and myself last Thursday on the occasion of an address which I delivered in Montreal. It is more than probable that the words in the statement which may have been made subsequently by the attorney general of Quebec in relation to the administration of the parole system have been misreported, because I am completely conscious and aware, and I am sure Mr. Wagner is also aware, that under the National Parole Act neither the commission nor the government may undertake to submit the decisions of the national parole boards to the approval or the veto of any outside authority.

Furthermore, I am aware that the question as to who ought to be consulted by the national parole board and when such consultation ought to take place is one of internal policy for the chairman and the members of the national parole board themselves. If, for instance, the parole board were of the opinion that it would be advisable to obtain the views of the attorney general of a province in a case where the public safety is involved, that practice would be up to the parole board itself to adopt, and not up to the government.

Anyhow, I could not have made any such undertaking as has been reported, because before our discussions Mr. Wagner and myself had told newspapermen that we would probably not be in a position to make a joint statement to them after our meeting because in that most informal meeting we were not permitted, and it would not have been appropriate for us, to bind our respective governments.

Mr. Lambert: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Rhéaume: Ask him to analyse the answer.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Lambert: Would the minister advise the house whether there has been any agreement of the parole board to consult the provinces? Is this now understood, namely that such consultation should be a matter of practice?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I just said there has been no agreement made by myself to the effect that the attorneys general would be, as a matter of course, intervening for the purpose of accepting or refusing the decisions of the national parole board. I may also add that there has been no formal undertaking made one way or the other, because I repeat that any matter such as who should be consulted, and when, is a matter of policy for the members and the chairman of the national parole board to decide upon. The National Parole Board Act gives them exclusive jurisdiction to deal with the matters placed before them, except as—

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rémi Paul (Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question?

In the course of a speech made last Thursday evening in Montreal, before the Canadian criminology society, the hon. Minister of Justice said:

> Isolated reforms, dispensed with an eye-dropper, are useless; what we need is a truly grand charter of penitentiaries—a clear, systematic and over-all program.

Did the hon. minister mean, by these words, a complete and far-reaching revision of the present system of release of prisoners, and if so, will an appropriate legislative measure be submitted to the house during the present session, as well as the proposed amendments to the Criminal Code of Canada?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has given me advance notice of his question.

However, I think it should have been put on the order paper.

I should like to say for the time being that since our penal system has gone through the first two stages of its evolution, the moment has come to establish an all-inclusive and integrated policy in the field of penology. Obviously, I shall be making recommendations to my colleagues in the course of this session. As I said, though, the two committees I mentioned will have to meet and submit a report before any final policy is worked out. If the question of rehabilitation can be taken up right now, I feel immediate steps should be taken and that they should take into account the rehabilitation of prisoners as much as possible. I am considering the immediate introduction of amendments such as the disposal of penitentiaries like the one at St. Vincent de Paul.

[*Text*]

Mr. S. J. Enns (Portage-Neepawa): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the Minister of Justice could tell the house how soon the committees he has mentioned both in the house and elsewhere, namely on justice and penal reform, will be established.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I said to the house, and I have repeated, that in my view the establishment of the parliamentary committee ought to be effected within a matter of days. As far as the other committee is concerned, of course the question of the fineness of the terms of reference will have to be settled, and it should be a matter of weeks.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE OF CONVICTED MURDERER

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I asked the Prime Minister about this matter the other day, and I realize he has not had very much time to look into it. It has to do with one James Meeker, who recently had his sentence commuted. I am not going into that question because the matter of the exercise of mercy in no way can be brought before the house, but I ask the Prime Minister this question. In view of the fact that two psychiatrists testified that Meeker would probably repeat his offences if he were set free, namely rape, torture and murder, and that his impulses are without concern for the effect on others and he is incapable of learning from experience, will the government not order that this man shall not be freed at any time, and that indeed in his case a life sentence shall be just that, in the interests of society and for the protection of others?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I told my right hon. friend, I think it was on Friday, that we were considering this matter in relation to this particular case and probably in a wider relationship as well. I discussed the matter with the

Minister of Justice this morning, and I hope he will be able to make a statement either tomorrow or at the latest the next day.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Thank you.

POSSIBLE ACTION RESPECTING ONTARIO SUPREME COURT JUDGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the Minister of Justice that he said he would make a statement to the house on the propriety of the continuance on the bench of Mr. Justice Landreville. Is he yet able to make a statement with respect to this matter?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, for reasons which I will be pleased to discuss with my hon. friend I must say that I will not be in a position to make such a statement this week. However, I said I would make one, and I will do so on the first available occasion.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

REPORTED REPLACEMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State.

Could the minister tell us whether someone has been appointed to replace Mr. Robert Choquette as associate president of the centennial commission and if so, whether it is Mr. Lorenzo Paré of *L'Action,* as it is rumoured?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, nobody has yet been appointed to replace Mr. Robert Choquette who is leaving in a fortnight.

[*Text*]

AGRICULTURE

REPORTED LOSSES ON CATTLE—STEPS TO IMPROVE POSITION OF EASTERN FARMERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Is the minister aware of the fact that this year the over-all loss to farmers with regard to feeder cattle has amounted to $14 per head, representing the lowest price since 1962? Has the minister any explanation to give the house for this grave situation that has developed in the industry since he assumed office as Minister of Agriculture?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it is probably time that some of these wild accusations were corrected.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hays: The average market prices for steers at Toronto during the month of October for 1964 and 1963 were as follows: choice steers were $23.70 in 1964 and $24.81 in 1963; good were $22.43 in 1964 and $23.76 in 1963. The particular kind that my hon. friend speaks of, medium and common, were as follows: medium were $20.64 in 1964 and $21.44 in 1963, or less than a cent a hundredweight less; common steers were $16.83 in 1964 and last year they were $17, or 17 cents per hundredweight less.

I might also add that this year the amount of beef consumed in Canada has been about 9 per cent more than last year. The figure is 27 per cent more than in the previous six years from 1957 to 1962. I do not think the stocker market is a good one. We all realize this, but at the moment we are on an export basis. We are consuming more beef in Canada than ever before in our history, and if it were not for our buoyant economy today, and had it been like it was in 1960, 1961 and 1962, we would be in great trouble.

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I have grave doubt that the question was in order at all. It seems to me it should have been put on the order paper; it was not that pressing or urgent. I do hope hon. members will not start to debate this problem.

Mr. Winkler: I have a question I should like to put to the Minister of Agriculture, and it is this. In light of what the minister has said—I might add that this is the same question I put last week, and I am glad the minister is here today so that I can put it in his presence—has he any immediate statement to make on steps to be taken which may alleviate the depressed position in which the farmers of eastern Canada find themselves?

Mr. Hays: Mr. Speaker, I did invite the hon. member up to my office so that I could explain these matters to him. In so far as milk is concerned the price is almost 30 cents or 40 cents a hundred higher than it

was when the previous government was in power. We have been able to get rid of all the butter they were storing and could not sell. So far as agriculture is concerned it will reach $3.5 billion this year, which is the highest on record. It is a great deal higher than it was a year ago, and many times higher than it was in the years 1956 to 1962.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I must say I am not satisfied with that reply, and wish to debate it further at ten o'clock this evening.

QUEBEC—PROVISION OF FEED GRAIN STORAGE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture or to the Minister of Forestry, who is responsible for feed grain at present.

In view of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture stated that the previous government did nothing for the eastern farmers, would the Minister of Forestry tell us when eastern farmers will be in a position to take advantage of the storehouses which were supposed to be built and of a feed grain agency?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I think that if the hon. member took part more frequently in the meetings of the agriculture committee he would see that the matter is under active consideration.

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

Since I am only one person, I can only be in one place at a time.

Now, because the present government had set up a flag committee I had to attend its sittings.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I revert to the question I asked earlier, as I did not receive a satisfactory reply. This time, however, I am directing it to the Prime Minister.

Does the government intend to provide feed grain warehouses in eastern Canada before the ground freezes over this fall?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Surely this is also a question for the order paper.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I have been asking this question for a year and I am still waiting for an answer. I think the minister could at least give an indication of what the department is going to do, if they are going to do anything this fall, so that eastern farmers will know exactly what is what.

[*Text*]

FEEDER CATTLE—REQUEST FOR PRICE PROTECTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, November 5, I addressed a question to the Acting Prime Minister which he said he would take as notice and see that it was answered later. Perhaps I could pose the question to the Prime Minister today. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the federal government is going to move into the market to protect the level of prices on feeder cattle in western Canada?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to look into that matter with the Minister of Agriculture.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

FEDERAL GRANT TO CONVENTION OF NURSES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Having heard that the minister granted recently a subsidy for a nurses convention which took place in Niagara Falls, I should like to know whether it is customary for the Department of National Health and Welfare to grant subsidies for such conventions?

[*Text*]

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, Mr. Speaker. This was a request from the government of Ontario under the health grants program. The grant was made in the ordinary way, it being regarded as a worthy project.

INQUIRY AS TO MEASURES TO COMBAT AIR POLLUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport, notice of which I have sent him. In view of reported statements by officials of the meteorological branch of the Department of Transport to the effect that

air pollution is a threat to the future of mankind, will the minister indicate what action is being taken by the department to alleviate this problem?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid this is far too large a question to be answered on the orders of the day.

TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR RETURN OF RAILWAY STOCK CARS TO WESTERN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether any action has been taken to speed up the return of livestock cars from eastern to western Canada so the feeder and stocker cattle coming into the market places there can be shipped out to overcome this congested situation which has developed in some market places.

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I think this question was asked the other day of the Minister of Forestry. We are taking a look at this, and if there is anything we can do we will certainly direct the matter to the attention of the carriers.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

REPORTED STATEMENT RESPECTING POWERS OF PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice based on a speech made by Mr. Lucien Saulnier, chairman of the executive committee of the city of Montreal, to the Kiwanis club of Victoria, British Columbia, on November 3 last, in which he stated categorically that Quebec must "assume many powers which are essential to the normal development of the community, including social security legislation, radio and television, immigration and participation in drawing up external trade policies"; and also that "provincial states which so desire should be able to assume external jurisdiction in those areas which are theirs at home". Would the minister comment on this? Does he agree with it—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is not in order under our standing orders.

Mr. Baldwin: With respect, Mr. Speaker, this is the type of question asked of the minister in respect to the penal institutions, and it is following up the same matter of provincial powers. I submit penal institutions are a matter not as important as the question I am now posing to the minister.

Mr. Speaker: The subject matter raised by the hon. member is of intense interest, I admit, but I do not think it is in order to ask that type of question at this time.

Mr. Baldwin: May I put a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Has the attention of the Prime Minister been drawn to an article in the last issue of the *Financial Post* which gives the views of a number of constitutional authorities, deans and professors of law, the great majority of whom oppose the proposed formula for amending the constitution recently agreed upon? In view of these opinions does the Prime Minister not consider that this matter should be referred to a parliamentary committee with power to summon witnesses and to discuss this most important issue before the formula is endorsed by parliament?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there will be a statement in a day or two on the procedure to be followed in this matter. Perhaps the article to which my hon. friend has referred, which is a very interesting one, can be considered, but in the meantime it might be referred to Mr. Fulton for his comments.

METHOD OF DETERMINING FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN QUEBEC

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a rather important question to the Minister of Finance.

Since the report of the Minister of Finance on federal expenditures in each of the provinces and on the federal revenue accruing from every province was published last Saturday, could the Minister of Finance tell us whether the amount of $915,301,000 assigned on an equal per capita basis to the province of Quebec, or almost 50 per cent of federal expenditures in the province of Quebec, has actually been paid to the province of Quebec in 1961?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I suggest that this question, important as it is, is one for the order paper.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I would still like to point out that this report was published recently by the Minister of Finance in reply to a question put on the orders of the day.

It is precisely because it is a reply to a question on the order paper, but a reply which is neither clear nor precise, that I take advantage of the period allotted to oral questions today in an attempt to obtain precisions in regard to the reply given by the Minister of Finance.

Under the circumstances, I believe the hon. Minister of Finance should be asked to answer my question.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I still think the hon. member will obtain more enlightenment by putting his question on for discussion at ten o'clock.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I request that this matter be discussed at ten o'clock this evening.

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, with great respect, I would much prefer to answer the question now if I may have your approval to do so.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact this is obviously not my day, would the minister answer.

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, all I want to say is this. The answer which was given to a question that became an order for return is very lengthy, preceded by ten pages of closely typed explanations as to how this complicated and complex tabulation was prepared. I might say that it has taken many members of the Department of Finance some five months to complete this tabulation, at a considerable cost to the country. I would be glad to supply my hon. friend with a complete copy of this statement. I think if he will read the ten pages carefully he will find the answer to his question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance.

After having studied the report he speaks about, precisely because fuller particulars are required, can he tell us—this would not take too much time to answer—whether the $915,301,000 allocated on an even basis, per capita, were actually paid in the province of Quebec as mentioned in the report?

[Mr. Speaker.]

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, as explained in the supporting memoranda there are categories of expenditures including, for example, expenditures on defence, which are made for the benefit or for the security of all Canadians everywhere. It is impossible to allocate expenditures of that kind accurately or fairly on a provincial basis; therefore they were allocated in this tabulation on a per capita basis.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may I put a further supplementary question to the minister? In view of the fact that the interest of one billion dollars paid each year by the Canadian government on its debt is included in that amount, can the minister tell us whether this amount of interest on the debt, which often goes 60 years back, is still paid to the United States or to other countries to the benefit of all Canadian citizens and whether that is included in this amount of $915 million?

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: It certainly is, Mr. Speaker. If we were to repudiate our obligations of this kind I think it would certainly react to the detriment of all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. We are beginning a debate, and this is precisely what I was trying to prevent a few minutes ago. May I suggest ten o'clock if the hon. member wishes any more information.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, which I will take only a minute to state. I would like to mention that I never suggested any debt repudiation, as the Minister of Finance hinted in his last statement.

[*Text*]

[*Later:*]

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance which I assure you is not calculated to arouse further debate. In view of the very interesting and important information in the document to which he has referred, would he undertake to have it reproduced in sufficient quantity so that it could be made available to members generally?

Mr. Gordon: I would be very glad to, Mr. Speaker.

HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS

NEW BRUNSWICK—REQUEST FOR INCREASED EXPENDITURES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister of northern affairs. In view of his statement in Halifax that he is doubling the expenditures for historic sites there, will the minister say whether the same will be announced for Saint John and, if so, when?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, we shall do the best with what money we have available.

Mr. Bell: In view of the controversy there has been in this regard would the minister take this matter under consideration, particularly having in mind that we in New Brunswick think we have just as much history and just as much right to the same type of treatment that Nova Scotia is getting?

Mr. Laing: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is entitled to this view from my department, that in light of the fact that we are arriving at our confederation centennial a great number of locations in all parts of the country are doing their best to draw the attention of the historic sites and monuments board to items of particular interest. The board met here two weeks ago and had a great number of submissions before it, and I think public opinion would support us at this time in setting aside more funds for these particular purposes than heretofore. Therefore we intend to apply to parliament for more money in this regard, and I think it will be forthcoming.

Mr. Bell: May I say to the minister that if Saint John is included I will be glad to support that application.

PENITENTIARIES

ST. PIE DE BAGOT, QUE.—INQUIRY AS TO CONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice.

Can he tell us if the penitentiary of St. Hyacinthe-Bagot is among those he talked about last week and if its construction will begin soon?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, an answer has already been given in the house to the first part of that question.

The last part of the question dealing with the construction of a penitentiary was allowed to stand.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Here it is. I would like to know if that institution will be built within two years, as stated by the minister last week. Yes or no?

Mr. Favreau: The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REPORTED INTENTION TO INCLUDE FARM LABOUR

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 Agriculture, whom I welcome back after his recent speech to the U.F.A. meeting in Alberta which opened with the admission that the last Liberal government deserved to be kicked out when it was. During the course of that speech the hon. gentleman said he was preparing legislation or giving consideration to a system whereby farm employees would be compensated during periods of unemployment or illness. Would the minister say whether the government now intends to bring farm labourers under the Unemployment Insurance Act?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question I should like to say that perhaps I should have gone on to suggest that the previous government also needed to be brought down in so far as agricultural policies were concerned, because they did nothing for the eastern farmers.

In relation to the other question, we will have some very interesting legislation coming forward in the first part of next year which will be introduced in the usual way.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, will that interesting legislation include a method of placing farm labourers under the Unemployment Insurance Act in the way which was indicated in his speech?

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I suggest that in view of the time that has elapsed this afternoon, unless there are some very urgent questions we get on with the business before the house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I did not understand the suggestion, but when a minister makes a statement of policy outside the house we have the right in this house to ask what that policy is that has been announced.

PENSIONS

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTRIBUTORY PROGRAM

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure, to be known as the Canada pension plan, to establish in Canada a comprehensive program of retirement pensions payable to contributors; to provide for the payment of supplementary benefits, including benefits for the widows and orphans of contributors and benefits to contributors who become disabled; to provide for the co-ordination of pensions payable under the Old Age Security Act with benefits payable under the Canada pension plan and for the payment of adjusted pensions under the Old Age Security Act beginning at any age from 65 years; to provide for the adjustment of pensions and other benefits in line with increases in earnings and the cost of living; to provide that funds arising from the operation of the Canada pension plan shall be invested in securities of the provinces, provincially guaranteed securities of provincial crown agents, and securities of Canada; and to provide further that all expenditures under the Canada pension plan, including costs of administration, shall be financed from contributions by employees and employers and from contributions by persons in respect of self-employed earnings.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Chairman, it is perhaps unfortunate that in dealing with this matter today the committee will only have a total of some four hours. However, since we are proceeding under the new rules and hon. members are restricted to 20 minute speeches, it is hoped that a great many members will be able to participate.

Earlier this year, Mr. Chairman, we had an opportunity to discuss a resolution similar to that now before the committee which preceded Bill No. C-75. However, the resolution which is before the committee today goes much further than the earlier version and introduces a social insurance measure of much wider scope. This more comprehensive program has been made possible by a number of developments, many of which hon. members are aware of, which have taken place in the past several months.

It will be recalled that the earlier resolution dealt mainly with a contributory old age insurance program and that as well contained certain amendments to the Old Age Security Act to provide for the payment of adjusted pensions beginning at any age from 65 years onward. The resolution now before us provides in addition for the payment of supplementary benefits for widows and orphans of contributors, and benefits to contributors who become disabled. This, of course, represents an important new dimension in the Canada pension plan.

I should like to recite some of the history in regard to this matter in order to freshen the recollection of members of the committee. Soon after Bill No. C-75 was presented earlier in this calendar year, during this session of the house, the government of the province of Quebec exposed the details of its own proposed pension plan. When these details were exposed it was clear that the Canada pension plan as incorporated in Bill No. C-75 and the proposed Quebec legislation were much closer in detail than had been anticipated at one time. Many of the features of the Quebec plan as revealed at Quebec city attracted favourable comment from provincial representatives who were there. Clearly there was a common goal that there should be a national contributory plan, and as a result of that consensus a series of negotiations were then undertaken to reach that common goal.

As I mentioned, one of the features found most attractive in the Quebec plan was the provision of supplementary benefits mentioned as desirable by government speakers from the beginning but which were not incorporated in Bill No. C-75 for reasons of which hon. members are aware. However, at Quebec city and subsequently all provincial representatives agreed that these features would have to be included in a truly comprehensive scheme.

Hon. members of this committee know full well that under the British North America Act, federal jurisdiction in this area is confined to pensions for the aged, and it was quite clear that if we wished to be able to add benefits of this kind to a comprehensive national scheme we would have to have an amendment to the constitution. Indeed, the previous government had at one time sought approval for such an amendment.

Not very long after that, agreement was reached on the phraseology of an amendment to be presented. This resolution was presented to the house by my colleague, the Minister of Justice, was approved, transmitted to Westminster, and in due course passed there. That amendment meant that the jurisdiction which was provided under section 94A of the B.N.A. Act was extended in order to cover supplementary benefits as well as old age pensions.

Before going into a closer examination of some of the provisions in the bill I would like to draw hon. members' attention to a new and important development. It will be recalled that in the earlier bill, Bill No. C-75, there was provision to base pensions on current earnings levels. That approach has been retained in the new bill and, in addition, provision has been made for an upward adjustment of benefits if living costs rise.

Throughout, one of the criticisms made of the earlier bill was that it failed to provide for our elderly citizens already in receipt of pensions. Indeed, the Canada pension plan, as opposed to the amendments to the Old Age Security Act, which are also incorporated in the bill, following September last year was never intended to provide anything for those now in pension. It will be recalled that the original intent was that there be a $10 supplementary payment made to one million odd old age pensioners from the proceeds of the Canada pension plan. When it was made clear by the province of Quebec in August of 1963 that it would produce its own plan, legislation was introduced and passed with the approval of all hon. members, to increase pensions to $75 a month, without waiting to go on with the Canada pension plan.

Since that time a number of representations have been made to the government, not the least being remarks made by interested hon. members in this chamber. Therefore we have provided under the new Canada pension plan, in addition to the $10 increase which was granted just over a year ago, that all future old age security pensions will be pegged to the cost of living index and will increase automatically if living costs increase.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Miss LaMarsh: This is a new departure in old age security. It is in response to the oft heard cry of those in receipt of pensions that they are unable to keep up with their own expenses if the cost of living rises as they have to depend on intermittent pension payments which may be raised at any time or may be held down to a certain level for some years. We hope, and I know this feeling will be shared by members in all corners of the chamber, that this will provide not only a greater measure of security but will also protect the real value of the pension dollar for Canada's million-odd pensioners.

The Canada pension plan as described in this resolution provides, as I said, for supplementary benefits and this makes it a truly comprehensive social insurance measure. Up until this time we have in Canada used the social assistance approach as the principal means of aiding survivors and disabled persons. As hon. members know, since world war I there has been provided in the provinces the kind of legislation known as mothers' allowances to help out widows who have dependant children. In recent years the federal and provincial governments have cooperated to provide assistance as well to the disabled. But these are welfare programs based on a test of need or means.

This plan, the Canada pension plan, is one which provides help as of right rather than on a need or a means test, for those who suffer the loss of a loved breadwinner or those who find themselves disabled and unable to carry on work. I think hon. members will agree this is a giant step forward in Canada's social security program.

These disability benefits under the Canada pension plan will provide help in family crises when it is most needed. When the head of a family dies and leaves his widow with young children, she will be provided with a pension to help her through those difficult years. A widow 35 years old or over, even though she has no dependant children, as hon. members know, often finds it difficult to re-enter the labour force and obtain work. There is provision for a pension for her; and the older she is and thus the less likely to be self-supporting, the greater her need and therefore the higher is her pension. Nor have the orphans of contributors been forgotten. They will be entitled to draw a benefit, generally until they join the work force.

Then in addition—and this is a new feature —upon the death of any contributor a payment will be made to his estate, whether or not there is a survivor's benefit payable.

For those who become disabled there is at least the comfort of knowing that a pension will be payable, on a temporary or on a permanent basis as needed. This pension is also available to a disabled widow or widower.

While one basic change in the program now to be considered is the fact that it is broader in scope by the provision of these supple-

mentary benefits, the other important development is that the program in fact will be truly national in its application, whether administered by the federal government or by a provincial government. The plan will operate uniformly across the country, and rights to benefit under it will be completely portable from sea to sea. As such we have every reason to believe that it will prove an important instrument in reinforcing our national unity as Canadians.

In a country such as ours which has such a high degree of mobility of manpower, the desirability of one common approach to pension legislation is readily apparent. This was one of the key points stressed during the negotiations already referred to, particularly by the head of the government of Ontario.

Through the long months of federal-provincial discussions leading to the bill which this resolution precedes, most of the best features of the proposed Quebec plan and of the Canada pension plan have been incorporated into this new program, along with a number of suggestions put forward by the other provinces and by various groups in their representations to the federal government.

One of the important changes from Bill No. C-75 is the extension of coverage of the self-employed on a compulsory rather than voluntary basis. Last year submissions were made to the Canadian government by a number of bodies, including the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, which made its submission on February 26. At that time that body asked that farmers be covered on a compulsory basis. Several of the provincial premiers at the meetings which we have had also indicated concern that farmers and fishermen, ordinarily at the lower end of the earnings scale in many provinces, would not be adequately protected if coverage were left as entirely voluntary. The Quebec report favoured the approach of involuntary coverage, and that is the one followed in the old age and survivors' insurance program in the United States.

It will be clear that good arguments can be advanced for either approach, but on balance it appears in Canada there is a much broader support for the approach now incorporated in the new Canada pension plan. It is apparent that in this and in many other aspects of the program there will, of course, be honest differences as to whether one approach or course is better than another. But a great effort has been made to develop a program which will receive general acceptance by Canadians, knowing that in any plan which is as complex and attempts to be as comprehensive as this one there will be some reservations on one point or another.

There is another change. The level of benefits provided for retirement is higher in the new bill than under Bill No. C-75. This was indicated in the white paper which hon. members have had a chance to study since August, and it will be noted when they see the new bill. This higher level of benefits has resulted from an adjustment of the maximum pensionable earnings and of the percentage of those earnings which was used to calculate the amount of the retirement benefit. This means that a maximum monthly retirement benefit of $104.17 is now proposed. This, combined with a maximum old age security payment of $75 a month, will make the over-all maximum pension $179.17 at age 70. I hope this increase in benefit will commend itself to all hon. members. Some will say it is too low; others will say it is too high. However, we have balanced as carefully as we could all of the factors involved—Canadian wage levels, our economy, the cost of living and so forth—and on balance we decided that this represents the most reasonable benefit provision. The figure I quoted is, of course, the maximum and it is perfectly true that many people will receive somewhat less, depending, naturally, on the amount of contribution they have made in the course of their working lives.

For the average contributor, there is another change. The new program now envisaged being a richer one, there is a somewhat higher rate of contribution required. This higher rate of contribution will make it possible not only to finance the more generous retirement benefit, and the new survivors' and disability benefits, but will also result in higher investment reserves. These reserves will be made available for investment in obligations of provincial governments or of any agent of Her Majesty in the right of a province if that is guaranteed by the province. There will be interest on these reserves which are utilized by the provinces and this interest will go to the credit of the Canada pension plan and help finance it. These funds, moreover, will be very helpful to the provinces in the development of their social capital for such purposes as schools, roads, sewers, and hydroelectric projects, as well as for such developments as may desired in the provinces in the field of health and welfare, all in accordance with the scale of priorities of the provinces themselves.

The proposed legislation will also deal with the question of safeguards to the provinces,

and restraints in relation to future changes in the Canada pension plan. If the federal legislation dealt with a matter exclusively within federal jurisdiction, such provisions would not have been included. In fact, however, as hon. members know, parliament's power to legislate pensions is subject to the limitation that it must not affect present or future provincial laws. This gives to the provinces a legitimate day to day interest in the Canada pension plan, now, as well as in the future.

Special attention has been given to fulfilling the need for the closest possible co-ordination between the Quebec plan and the Canada pension plan. Suppose, for instance, a contributor has been paying into the plan in Quebec while he lived and worked there, and that he later went to live and work in another province where he paid into the Canada pension plan. From which authority will he draw his payments when he retires? When his pension becomes payable, under an agreement we have worked out with the Quebec authorities, he will receive one cheque to cover his total benefits; it will not matter to him where he worked—whether he stayed in one place all his life or whether he moved across the country. The act will determine which of the two jurisdictions will pay the pension and there will, of course, be provision for reimbursement from one to the other. It will be obvious that arrangements of this kind are essential for the highest possible co-ordination between the two plans, and this has resulted in a bill containing 125 clauses, a bill which is long and extremely complex.

When the bill goes to the joint parliamentary committee which it is proposed to establish, members of this committee will have before them, in addition to the white paper and the bill, actuarial and economic studies of the Canada pension plan for their information. When hon. members have a chance to see the bill this evening and when the public as a whole becomes familiar with the provisions of the new pension plan I feel sure the measures will receive a warm response—certainly it will be warmer in some places than in others—from almost all in the country.

It seems to me we are taking today a most important stride toward social security in our country, a stride of which all Canadians may be justly proud. It is one which is intended to provide not only an opportunity for the individual to help save for his own future dignity but also to help him provide for those who are normally dependant upon him. I hope it will do much to bring not only members of the House of Commons together, members of this committee and of the special committee, but that it will do much to bring together all Canadians working under one plan to provide for their own and one another's security.

Mr. Monteith: When she rose to make her statement to the committee, the minister I noticed received very warm applause. I was pleased this was the case because I knew she would need this encouragement after so many previous ill-fated efforts.

I believe the hon. lady indicated that the supplementary payments to which she referred had been urged on previous occasions by her own supporters. My recollection is that speakers from the government side of the house mentioned those supplementary payments only very occasionally in the course of previous debates; that it was, actually, opposition speakers who pressed for a recognition of the need in this regard.

I was very pleased to hear the minister's statement concerning a cost of living index adjustment to present recipients of old age security payments. This is a matter about which we have been greatly concerned in the past—something which was completely ignored in previous efforts.

I wish, now, to reiterate the stand I took on March 17 last when I stated that the party to which I belong is in favour of a Canada pension plan. Let there be no misunderstanding. The Progressive Conservative party—the government in power at that time—started this whole program rolling back in 1958. We have always stood for this type of guarantee, for this type of guarantee against fear for our older citizens as old age creeps on. At least the government has seen fit to bring in a plan which includes many of the additional benefits we have always advocated.

I ask, first of all: Why is this resolution before us? I believe that on a previous occasion—I do not recall whether it was in reply to a question by myself or not—the minister indicated that there were preliminary administrative costs which were being borne out of the general revenue prior to the actual inception of the plan? Am I right in that supposition? In other words, all the administrative expenses having to do with the Canada pension plan, present and future, are being met out of contributions. If that is the case I do not see why this resolution is before us at all—there is no expenditure involved by the government—unless it is to

justify what might be considered another tax. I do not see any other reason for it.

I understood the minister to say that the committee is not going to be set up until after the bill receives second reading. I would plead with the minister to reconsider this course. I really and honestly believe that a proper consideration, examination and study of representations from people across Canada should be made on the Canada pension plan and on the bill which is coming forward, which I understand contains 125 sections, and that to achieve this it would be much wiser to send this bill to committee before it receives second reading. If we go through second reading the government becomes committed to certain clauses which may, in the long run, if this matter is sent to committee, be proven ineffective; it might be proven that the bill would be better off without them. I know the minister will say that if this is the decision of the committee she will be very happy to give consideration to possible changes. I think that right from the first time a pension plan was put before us on July 18, 1963, there were indications both from the Prime Minister and the minister that they would study recommendations made, and so on; but I think good faith would be proven if this bill went to the special committee before it actually received second reading and the government's position became hardened and more difficult of adjustment. I would like to ask the minister —she may reply now or at any time—whether she proposes to have this committee set up and operating before Christmas.

The minister gave some of the history of the Canada pension plan. I believe the history she gave started with the conference in Quebec and I would like to give a little of the previous history. We all recall that on July 18, 1963, the first version was brought before us, and we also recall the very political approach taken by the minister at that time.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Partisan.

Mr. Monteith: Yes, a very partisan approach. She has been much more reasonable and humble today. In fact, she was also much more reasonable and humble on March 17 last. I am sure she learned her lesson.

An hon. Member: She is mellowing with age.

Mr. Monteith: Maybe it is that she is mellowing with age, or office. However, Mr. Chairman, I would like to recall one or two phases of the plan that was put before us at that time. We recall that there was no funding in that particular plan. At the moment there is a complete reversal. It did include a possible $10 increase in old age security at some time in the future, but the minister was not sure just when that would be. We recall that later that day the right hon. Leader of the Opposition moved an amendment after having pointed out the election promises of the Liberal party prior to the April 8 election and the fact that they were not being fulfilled. One of those election promises was an immediate increase in old age security of $10 per month. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition moved that amendment, and of course we came to the end of the day and nothing was done.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Every Liberal member voted against it.

Mr. Monteith: Yes, I understand that every Liberal member voted against that amendment.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Against that increase.

Mr. Monteith: Yes, they voted against the recipients of old age security receiving this increase. There was a level of $4,000 maximum income. The blind, disabled and those receiving old age assistance were completely ignored at that time; and there was no opting out by provinces. There was issued a white paper giving a supplementary outline of the scheme presented to us. I could mention what I believe were some excellent advances made by the previous government in the health and welfare field, including the start of the actual Canada pension plan which we are seeing here today; however, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to do that because my time is limited.

I would, however, continuing the historical angle of this plan, mention that when we came back on September 30, 1963, the government had not prepared the business for the session. This matter first came before us on July 18, 1963, and due to our insistence it was subsequently finally agreed that an amendment be brought forward for an increase of $10 per month in old age security. However, at that time the blind, disabled and those receiving old age assistance were still excluded from the increase. We were certainly in favour of this increase and we voted for it. But what was the price to the taxpayer? The government had in their election literature indicated that this was going to be financed

out of the contributions to the Canada pension plan; but instead of that the taxpayers across Canada today are paying something over $100 million extra in taxes.

I mentioned earlier that the minister was very humble on March 17. That day the resolution preceding Bill No. C-75 was passed and the bill was given first reading. Then, as the minister mentioned, the Quebec conference took place and Quebec unveiled their plan. Apparently after the conference was over there was some really high pressured wheeling and dealing going on for a period of days at least; I understand there were several meetings. Then eventually a compromise was announced as between the Quebec plan and the government's plan. On April 20, 1964, the Prime Minister tabled letters to the provinces asking for consent to amend the British North America Act, and this was eventually received. Now we have the third version before us. On March 17 last I asked the minister whether those were to be the minister's last confident words on this pension plan. I did so because of the boastful but completely incompetent presentation which she had brought forward on July 18. Events certainly proved me to be correct in asking her at that time. I am sure she thought they were her last words, but events proved otherwise.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Two revisions since.

Mr. Monteith: I hope the future holds for this plan the very best of everything. We want to see it in committee and we want to get it there fast.

I have read, Mr. Chairman, all the material available, and in particular the white paper. I should like to ask the minister, because I do not doubt that this question will be raised later in the debate, whether she has given proper consideration to any conflict with the Hall health report and the extra cost involved in this pension plan. I do not suggest that she has to answer but I am wondering, had she received the Hall report concerning health services before having embarked on the pension plan, which one she would have chosen. Or would she have chosen both? Certainly it would be to the advantage of all Canadians to choose both; but at the same time I suppose the Minister of Finance has put some brakes on the minister, and I also expect that the finance officials will be before the committee when it is set up.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in referring to the white paper may I say that the necessary amendment to section 94A of the British North America Act has certainly made this a worth-while plan in comparison with the plans put before us before. You will recall that the government of which the Leader of the Opposition had the honour to be the head had attempted to get this particular amendment passed, but had not been able to do so. However, under this new plan widows under 65 years of age and their dependants, and the disabled, are going to receive benefits which were not possible previously. There is a section entitled "Main features of the pensions" on page 7 of the white paper. These provisions can hardly be recognized from the previous efforts. With regard to timing, retirement pensions will begin in January 1967. This is, of course, a year later than had previously been anticipated by the minister and promised on July 18, 1963.

There is one point which disturbs me, Mr. Chairman, and it is this. I am not prepared at the moment to say that this is not the correct thing to do, although surely study in committee will clear the point up somewhat. The self-employed will be compulsorily included in the plan. This means that an average of 3.6 per cent of all earnings by self-employed workers will be paid into this plan—not 1.8 per cent as with employed persons, but 3.6 per cent. I think this is going to be found quite a drain on the capacities of various self-employed people and I think it is a matter which will have to be looked at. With regard to adjustments for increases in the cost of living, as I said earlier we were very pleased to see that the minister has included a cost of living adjustment for those receiving old age security. This was a woeful omission from previous presentations.

However, there is one class of person who I think should be considered in this matter. I heard a young fellow of 18 years say the other day, Mr. Chairman: "I am going to pay into this pension plan for 52 years and not get one cent more out of it than the person who has been paying into it for ten years". I know there is a cost of living adjustment and so on, but that is the fact and I think our young people will look at this.

Then there is a section headed "Adjustment for earnings after retirement". It indicates that pensions can be reduced if a person has earned income of over $900 a year, no matter from what source it may come. For example, a person might retire from a job and then become self-employed after the age of 70 and make $900 a year. He will therefore have his pension reduced.

I see my time is up. May I say there are many changes for which we have asked earlier affecting disability pensions, widows under 65 years of age, disabled persons and so on. I should like to know how many provinces are actually committed to the scheme.

There is one other section I should like to mention in relation to other retirement plans. This whole section rather blandly assumes that integrating existing private pension plans with the Canada pension plan will not be a great problem. I suggest that it is in this area that most of our immediate headaches are going to arise. I suggest that consideration should be given to allowing public plans, such as the civil service superannuation plan and those private plans which are of exceptional standard, to remain out of the Canada pension plan. My purpose in suggesting this is because we do not want to see any individual's pension or pension arrangements suffer as a result of this legislation.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, we welcome the introduction of this resolution and we are prepared to welcome the bill which will be introduced at the end of this day's sitting. I confess that it gets a bit difficult to express one's welcome with the same warmth after he has done it two or three times already; but despite the tarnish that time may have put upon the proposed Canada pension plan it is still true that we are launching upon a piece of legislation which is extremely important in terms of improving the lot of all of the people of this country.

Some of the things one might say on this occasion need not be said because they were said on July 18 of last year or March 17 of this year. Therefore, perhaps the minister can take as read the fact that we are glad to have this plan back again. We are glad to have the improvements which were indicated in the white paper which was tabled in August, and we are glad to hear of the two or three additional improvements that the minister announced today.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the thing that needs most to be said at this time should be directed not just to the Minister of National Health and Welfare but to the government as a whole. What is most needed is that this legislation get passed at this session, and it has a long way to go. Thanks to the new rule under which we are operating, the debate at this stage can last only for this day. But the bill still has to go through second reading, to the special committee which is to be appointed, and it then has to come back to the committee of the whole house, and then go through the third reading stage. We are already away over time in this session, and no one knows how long it is going to last.

I am still relying on the undertaking that the Minister of Justice gave on July 6, at which time he was the government house leader. He made it clear that the government would see to it that the completion of the legislative process with respect to the Canada pension plan would be effected before the end of the present session. It was for that reason the leader of this party, earlier this afternoon, urged that second reading of the Canada pension plan be given priority above the motions for concurrence in the reports of the special committee on the flag. I suggest to the government that if it puts the flag debate—which may last for a number of days—

An hon. Member: Or weeks.

Mr. Knowles: —or weeks, someone suggests—ahead of second reading of the Canada pension plan, that might result in the Canada pension plan not getting to the special committee until well on in December. When one considers the delays that can take place there he must realize that we may find ourselves at the end of yet another session without this legislation on the statute books. Therefore, I urge not only upon the Minister of National Health and Welfare, but upon all members of the government, that top priority be given to getting this legislation through, and that means calling the bill for second reading soon.

I am afraid the hon. member for Perth has not assisted the minister in this regard by suggesting that the bill be sent to the special committee before second reading. After all, there is in our rules standing order 77, which requires that all bills be read a second time before they are committed. That being the case, we must complete the second reading stage first. We have to agree to the bill in principle before it goes to a committee. The government can co-operate in this regard by bringing on second reading stage at an early date, and we as members of the house can co-operate by limiting our debate at that stage to two or three days—surely that is enough—so we can get it to the special committee.

We have indicated on previous occasions that there are many things about this legislation that are good. It is not necessary for me to go into all the details, but I think it is not inappropriate for me to mention two or three of them at this time. What I like most of all about the Canada pension plan—about the

two stage plan which we are now developing for Canadians in their years of retirement—is that we are trying to reach a position where we are providing pensions that are adequate.

Long ago we accepted the responsibility of government to do something about old age. A decade or more ago we accepted the principle of universality. Now we are trying to do something to bring pensions up to the level of adequacy. I do not suggest that the levels which will be achieved by combining the Canada pension plan, at its best, with old age security, at its present level, are really the last words in adequacy, but at least we are talking about pensions of quite a different order from that which seemed to be accepted a few years or decades ago. I hope that, having accepted the principle that retirement security should be on the basis of adequacy, we will go on improving that basis, finding ways and means of raising the levels of our pensions so that all Canadians can look forward to a retirement in decency and dignity.

I am also pleased that this legislation has been broadened in scope from what it was in its first two versions. Particular provision has been made for survivors benefits and benefits to persons who are disabled. It is good to include that sort of thing in pension legislation. Because of those things that are in this legislation, and because they are good, as I say, I trust there will be no slips, legislative or otherwise—no action on the part of the government to bring other legislation forward, and no obstruction on the part of members generally—to delay the enactment of this plan. Let us see to it that we get this good legislation through.

Despite the fact that the legislation is, as I have said, welcome and good legislation, there are two or three things about it which are not completely satisfactory from our point of view. However, these are not reasons for holding up the legislation. Even good legislation, once it is established, can be improved later on, and I believe that is what will happen to our old age pension legislation generally.

One of the things I think is a weakness in this plan is that it is neither a pay-as-you-go plan nor a funded plan. It is something in between those two concepts of old age pensions. For my part, it is too close to the latter.

Another thing I feel is a weakness in this plan is that, in so far as it does aim at the provision of a fairly substantial fund for public investment or development, there are two flaws. In the first place we are in effect taxing people at the lower end of the income scale to provide such an investment fund. A portion of what people will pay as premiums into Canada pension plan will go into the investment fund. Investment funds controlled and administered by a public authority are good and we should have them, but something of the order of the Canada development corporation would have been a better way of doing this.

It is also true that this plan envisages the control and the planning of the investment fund to be entirely in provincial hands, and this is its second flaw. We feel that in the interests of unity and of building a strong nation, and in the interests of living and economic standards being at their best across this country, there should be more federal direction of the investment of public funds.

Another point I think is going to have to be worked on, to some extent, is the one to which the hon. member for Perth referred just before he resumed his seat, and that is the whole question of the relationship of the Canada pension plan to other plans. My concern is not the concern that the hon. member for Perth expressed. He wanted an opting out provision in respect of certain plans. I think that rather than that, a great deal more has to be done in terms of making clear the relationship which exists between this plan and other plans.

I know that the white paper tries to deal with this. The only paragraph in the white paper where capital letters are used to emphasize a word is a paragraph under the section dealing with the relationship to other plans in which it says that the funds of other plans "will NOT" be taken over by the Canada pension plan. That is a good use of capital letters, but it is still true that many people are being misled and some of them quite deliberately.

I know that certain organizations that have a vested interest in their plans or certain companies that do not want to improve the pension plans of their employees are spreading the notion that somehow or other the government, through the Canada pension plan, is going to take over their reserve funds and actually weaken their pension position. I have had people write me to tell me they can now retire at 60 or 62 under their plan and who want to know whether the situation is going to be worse, whether they are now going to have to work until 65 because of the Canada pension plan. That of course is false.

Maybe what I am asking for is a much better job of public relations, but I think it is more than that. I think it is a case of

making it crystal clear what the relationship is between the Canada pension plan and the other plans. It may be, Mr. Chairman, that this will turn out to be one of the principal advantages of our sending this measure to a special committee. I assume that everybody and his uncle will appear before that committee, including many of the companies, corporations and organizations that have these plans, and maybe as we have these people before that committee we can make this particular relationship clear.

I want to say a word, Mr. Chairman, about the welcome announcement that the minister made in her statement today to the effect that the bill we will get by tonight will provide that once the bill becomes law pensions paid under old age security will, including those now being paid, be subject to an increase in relation to the increase in the cost of living index. This is welcome news, and the applause the minister got when she made this announcement was well deserved. I hope that before the day is out we can get some details as to what will be the percentage of increase in the pension for a percentage point increase in the cost of living index. Will it be a percentage increase or will it be a flat dollar increase? At any rate, let it be taken as a fact that we welcome this improvement.

But, Mr. Chairman, let me say as strongly as I can to the Minister of National Health and Welfare and to the government as a whole that they must not think they have done the last job they need to do with regard to old age security because they have provided for this increase in relation to the cost of living index. The whole story of pensions over the years is one not just of raising pensions according to the increase in the cost of living index but of trying as a decent society to do the decent thing for our old people.

We have recognized that we have also had to increase pensions because of the increase in the standard of living, because of increased productivity. It is not good enough to say to people who are drawing $75 a month today that ten years from now their pensions will be $75 a month plus a percentage for the increase in the cost of living. In the meantime our productivity will have increased, our gross national product will have increased, the standard of living of Canadians will have increased, and those people will deserve to share in the increase. I say to the minister, I say to the government and to whatever government may follow the present government, that you have not finished with old age security because you have arrived at $75 a month plus certain percentage increases. You are going to have to go beyond that, and the contention I have been making that we should aim at $100 a month for old age security by our centennial year, 1967, I suggest still stands.

I say again that we welcome this announcement. The only thing that could be wrong with it is that it might lull some people into the notion that we have now fixed up old age security for all time. This is not so. The minister has been in this field long enough now to know that that really is not the case. Not only is it insufficient to provide for these percentage increases so far as the future is concerned, but it is still true that unless something more than this is done for the people who are now 70 years of age and over and who are today drawing $75 a month there is really nothing in it for them. To tell us about the $10 that was given last year is old history by now. In the meantime the cost of living has gone up, in the meantime our productivity has increased and in the meantime other people have had their pensions improved. We have go to do something for people already on pensions as well as making things better for those who will do not too badly when this concept of a two stage pension plan is in full operation.

We also welcome the statement of the minister about the money that a person may have in the fund being available as a payment to his estate, and it may be that when we get the bill there will be two or three other improvements in it compared with what we had in the white paper that was distributed in August. All told, Mr. Chairman, we are making progress. I thought it was a good measure that was placed before us on July 18, 1963. I thought it was a better measure that we had on March 17, 1964, and it is a better measure still that we are now getting on the 9th of November, 1964. But, Mr. Chairman, at the risk of being a pessimist, may I point out that the original plan of July, 1963, envisaged people starting to draw pensions under the Canada pension plan on January 1, 1966. The present plan at its best envisages people starting to draw pensions on July 1, 1967. Already since this government has been in power senior citizens have lost one year of what they might have got and many others are having to take a reduction of 10 per cent or more from what they might have got because of that loss of one year.

I come back, therefore, to what I said when I first rose. I see that my time is up, Mr. Chairman, and I am ready to sit down. Whether it is the government's responsibility because it brings the flag before us before second reading of this bill, or whether it is the opposition's responsibility because it takes too long and does not let the bill get to the special committee, any such delay could soon compound itself into the kind of delay which will result in another year being cut off the pensions that our people could get under this legislation. If we agree that the legislation has been improved, and I do, if we agree that this is a good piece of legislation, and I certainly agree, then let us get on with it and get it on the statute books as fast as we can.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Chairman, upon undertaking the study of the resolution which introduces a pension plan on a national scale, it is well to realize that this measure will probably be the most important the present parliament will be called upon to study, for probably many years to come. It is important, due to the fact that it will bear directly on the income and the savings of the vast majority, not to say more simply of the whole nation, particularly of all Canadian workers.

As I come from Quebec, it might be well for me to mention that my province has decided to adopt a similar plan which its government will manage itself, in co-operation with the national plan.

One might be inclined to think that the representatives of the province of Quebec in this house should refrain from discussing the federal plan.

But I think that this is not so, since residents of the province of Quebec just as those of other provinces have to move sometimes in order either to go and work in other provinces or simply to stay there but change employment.

If, therefore, I deemed it advisable to participate in this debate in order to give you my personal views as well as those of our group, I may say, at the very outset, that like the majority of Canadians, we welcome quite optimistically this project.

To mention a single proof that this project has the support of the Canadian people, I might say that Telepoll made public a survey which it had undertaken across Canada on the appeal that such a project might have for Canadians. According to the data compiled at that time, it seems that 72 per cent of Canadians preferred a federal pension program to a private or provincial pension scheme.

I think it is a clear indication of Canadian public opinion in this regard.

We may question the manner in which investigations were made when we consider that the bill will affect each individual and, in view of its scope, a most vital element: his savings and his financial administration.

I wonder why we did not think of holding a referendum in this respect, as some were suggesting in the case of the national flag. It is not that I want a referendum to decide on a pension plan, far from it, but since the pension plan will affect each and every individual in the country, we must give such a plan serious consideration and listen to representations which will be made by every organization in the country, so that we may be sure to know the prevailing opinion of the Canadian people.

Of course, we may find that by this bill we will once again be encroaching upon the freedom of the individual; however, the purpose of the bill is to help retired citizens.

How much will the plan cost and what effects will it have on the economy?

Press reports published since the plan was introduced show that some groups are against it. Of course, those groups are no doubt against it for personal reasons only; they know that the plan will affect them and that they may lose certain financial benefits they have been enjoying since the introduction of private pension plans.

I know it will be rather difficult to judge accurately the implications of such a hoarding of funds by the governments to finance the pension plan in question. But I sometimes wonder whether, during the first years of application of this plan, we will not have to undergo financial difficulties in this country, with regard to the development of our industries.

Up to now private companies, which were the only ones concerned in that field, have been accumulating large amounts for some years. These amounts were used for the industrial development of the country in a great proportion. Companies having pension plans for their employees placed the money collected with trust or insurance companies which, in return, granted loans to the industries in order to enable them to develop.

The workers who are not contributing to any pension plan but who will be called upon to do so tomorrow, will experience, in a

certain way, a reduction of the savings they used to deposit in the caisses populaires or in the banks or that they used to purchase private enterprise bonds.

I think that during the first years of implementation of this plan, our industries will have to look to other sources to finance their development and, during that period I think that we shall witness an increase in unemployment in Canada.

In the various studies made on that matter and in the reports I have, such a result is anticipated.

In 1960, private companies covered some two million workers.

The proposed plan will cover over six million workers. Of course, the sources to be drained into those pension funds, whether they be provincial or national funds, will be used to re-finance other government projects.

We are told that a great part of those funds will be re-loaned to provinces for their own requirements. In what fields will the provinces be able to invest those amounts? In the social field, or in public development? Very well. But will the provincial governments be in a position to withdraw from the public bonds market? As far as I am concerned, I do not think so, because their needs are continually increasing and knowing that they have at their disposal this new source of credit, they will certainly make full use of it.

Consequently, we will face strong competition on the public market to get the required money for industrial development. The consequences will certainly be numerous and very serious.

We have here the results of a study which was initiated at the request of the Quebec provincial government with respect to the implications of this proposed pension plan. In their report the economists say that it will make practically impossible the task of some small industries which now can barely make ends meet, because any increase in their production practically means bankruptcy for them. That will also bring about an increase in production costs, that is, an increase in the price of the finished product.

Again, Canadian producers will be in an unfavourable position to compete with the production of other countries. On the other hand, the result will be to encourage industries to turn to automation earlier in order to eliminate as many workers as possible in their plants, with a view to counterbalancing the increase in production costs. That will result in a taxation increase in various fields.

It will be very difficult to compensate over a short period the drawbacks which small and sometimes even large industries will have to suffer following the implementation of this pension plan.

According to the study by William and Mercer Ltd., which is recognized as one of the most important actuary firms in Canada, the creation of pension funds necessarily opens the door to inflation. Unfortunately, in their election campaign the political parties will try to outbid each other. One will promise more than the other in order to draw the votes of the electorate. Then the benefits will increase and we shall have, like in the United States, a 7 per cent charge, which it is intended to increase soon to 9 per cent, in order to finance a $65 monthly pension.

Just like in Sweden, which is a country regularly cited as an example and where the rate of contributions levied upon salaries has more than tripled during a short period in order to enable it to finance the cost of its pension plan, we shall see our own rates increasing sharply.

It is clear that we must help the aged to live decently, but on the other hand we must take into consideration the requirements of the younger generation to face its numerous and costly responsibilities. It is not at 60 that a man needs all his income, but rather between the ages of 21 and 50, at which time family responsibilities are onerous. I feel that, by imposing this contribution, we are simply adding to his burden which, I hope, he will be in a position to bear. Still, it will be necessary to explain to the young people, this generation of 20 to 35 or 40 years of age, the advantages of the system for, at this point, they see nothing except what they will have to pay, and as expenses tend to accumulate constantly, in my opinion we will have a hard time to convince them of the value of this plan.

We must also examine the problem from another angle. Will companies find it as easy to take in employees who frequently move from one plant to another, in view of the cost of administering that pension plan?

For instance, since Quebec will have its own plan, will not workers from Quebec wanting to work in Ontario or in another province for an indefinite period see the objections increase? Will employers in Ontario or another province not find it more difficult to hire people coming from another province? Will that not create or encourage to a certain extent discrimination against workers from this or that province?

These are all the points which will have to be considered.

Many people are wondering what is going to happen to the amounts already invested in private companies? What assurance will they have that they will not go bankrupt now that they are losing that income? None, actually. What assurance will they have that those company pension funds will not be nationalized by governments? There again, absolutely none. Time alone will tell.

I believe that at the present time many questions are being raised among the workers. Will private companies be able to provide pension plans which will supplement those proposed at present by governments? This is again an area where clarification is in order.

I shall limit myself to these few remarks at this stage and since it was agreed that the bill will be before the house later this evening, we shall then probably be in a better position to appreciate its implications.

In conclusion, however, I should like to quote the following recommendations submitted in a brief by the chamber of commerce of the province of Quebec:

> The result of this pension plan will be to give rise to certain problems with regard to the liquid assets used at present by companies to finance their development. In addition, this situation might delay the economic development and affect the creation of new jobs.

In my opinion, that is one aspect of the bill which should be given careful consideration, because our economy is already quite weak and we should be most wary in that field. Indeed, we need social security but what we need even more, what Canadian citizens want before anything else is the right to employment, that is the assurance of being able to find work from the age of 21 approximately until retirement. If we do provide them with that opportunity, I am sure most Canadians will be, to a great extent, able to look after their own needs—and ensure their own security. At any rate, we will wait until the bill is introduced before making more detailed comments.

Mr. Perron: Mr. Chairman, the proposed resolution which is submitted to us this afternoon has a wide scope, because social security, today, deals with one of the most important problems facing any government.

Since they entered parliament the Créditistes from all provinces have always led the way in favour of a healthy social security system.

The members of the Ralliement Créditiste have often and justly claimed for the aged an income which would allow them to live according to the means which the natural resources and industry of Canada can offer.

Mr. Chairman, mere desires, mere wishes, mere recommendations or paternalism can no longer be the sources of social security.

Today, the right to social security is universally recognized since December, 1948 when the universal declaration of human rights was proclaimed by the general assembly of the United Nations.

The first paragraph of article 25 of that declaration reads as follows:

> "Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control".

In the April, 1950 issue of a monthly bulletin published by the confederation of Christian syndicates of Belgium, the following question was raised: "What is social security?" And the following answer was given:

> According to modern concepts, social security means the payment to workers of a replacement income when normal income resulting from work is lacking and in addition a supplementary income intended to achieve a satisfactory balance of family responsibilities.

The bulletin explains in this way the scope of the replacement income:

> When a worker cannot be self-dependent, because of sickness, old age or for any other reason, he is granted a replacement income.

A replacement income: such is the meaning and scope of the resolution now under discussion.

By the way, I would like to make a remark with respect to the difference with what was said from the social view point during the last election campaign. A pension plan was mentioned then, but now old age assistance is spoken of, which is more in keeping with the existing needs; social assistance was also mentioned in the various provinces of the country.

Today, this is all being replaced by an old age and social insurance plan. What will be the limit of the government's responsibility? A bureaucracy required by the administration of private savings? Care will be taken to provide social security under a social insurance plan. That is not necessarily something close to the concept of the Christian

workers confederation of Belgium, about a replacement revenue.

A replacement revenue, when a man loses his job, also includes an income when he suffers seasonal or permanent unemployment. That also means to face automation which is developing more and more in the modern world, and help to widows must also be included in the social insurance plan we are advocating today, as well as assistance to disabled and other people.

At this stage, I should like to quote another report presented to the President of the United States, Mr. Johnson, on April 6, 1964. Here is a quotation from that report.

> As a first step, it is vital to recognize that traditional relationships between employment and revenue are discarded. The economy of wealth can provide for all citizens comfort and economic security whether they are engaged or not in so-called labour. The wealth produced by machinery rather than by human labour remains just the same a wealth. Consequently, we recommend that society, through government and appropriate legal measures, clearly undertakes to provide every individual and every family with a sufficient income which shall be recognized as a right.

That was a recommendation of a recognition of rights through legislation in accordance with the needs or the wealth. Also:

> Such recognition which we consider as essential to the social, political and economic order of the nation, we also consider as the only policy through which one quarter of the nation now being dispossessed or on the point of being dispossessed because of the lack of employment, can be associated with an economy of wealth. Such undeniable right to an income will replace all the patchwork of the present social measures, from family allowances to direct relief, in order to assure that no citizen in the United States will remain in the present stagnation.

That was the recommendation of a committee specially commissioned to look into the problems of society and the economic and political implications in the United States. That committee was made up of experts, actuaries, sociologists, presidents of private firms, thinkers, financiers. Those were the recommendations they had made in the light of those facts during their study of the basic legislation dealing with well-planned social security.

In the bill which will be introduced tonight, and which contains 125 sections, I find glaring discrepancies between the government's way of thinking or that of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) a year ago and today. At that time she said she was not in favour of a cumulative fund which would be administered by public officials. I wish to quote here the very words spoken by the Minister of National Health and Welfare and reported in an editorial published in *Le Devoir* on September 28, 1963 Here is what she said then in Toronto:

> And then, I am far from convinced that it is desirable for a government to dispose of such investment funds. This would be withdrawing too much money from the hands of individuals. The power of a government with so much money would be frightening. By controlling investment capital, the government would be in a position to control business. We would then be threatened with a kind of national socialism, as practised in nazi Germany; free enterprise would soon be stifled.

Those were the words of the hon. minister on September 28, 1963. She feared the accumulation of funds under a plan such as that of the province of Quebec. Today, the hon. minister, in her preamble, advises that in view of transformations made in federal-provincial relations with regard to the almost marvelous plan, so to speak, which some experts of the province of Quebec submitted at the time of the conference, the federal government has changed its plan entirely. In fact, it has changed its old age pension into a social welfare scheme which even required amendments to the constitution, under section 94A, so as to enable the federal government to apply it in the other provinces with their consent.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize, as the minister admitted a little over a year ago, that is, in September 1963, that it is to be feared that too great a concentration of powers, representing private savings, in the hands of the state, could surely lead certain governments to go against the interest or the normal and legitimate aspirations of individuals. Such concentration of discretionary powers mentioned by the minister when she referred to national-socialism in Germany at the end of the last war might very well also, in a few years from now—in five, ten or 15 years—when some other government than the present Liberal government or a Conservative government would be in power, or some other government than the Liberal government in the province of Quebec, enable some dictator to direct the country's policy according to priorities established in government circles, thanks to capital accruing from personal and compulsory savings, priorities quite contrary to the aspirations of the people who will have provided the state with the necessary funds.

Therefore we are against this contributory pension principle, because we believe in social security in line with the tremendous

resources of our country and with its production potential.

Nobody in the ten provinces, has any doubt about the possibility in the year 2002 of providing with his daily bread at age 65 a person now 30 years old, whether he contributes or not to this pension fund, because nobody has any doubt about the tremendous production capacity that our industry, and therefore our country, will then have reached, thanks to the ingenious work of Canadians and to constantly developing technology in the field of productivity.

I understand that the minister says that most governments will probably welcome this decision with pleasure and joy, since the pension plan meets with the needs and aspirations of the Canadian people.

I would say it meets much more the needs of governments which have to resort to indirect taxation nowadays to get the money they urgently need because of a system under which a government must levy taxes or go into debt. As a matter of fact, under the guise of social security, our system forces governments to reconsider programs which just deprive Canadian taxpayers of part of their social security.

Mr. Chairman, a contributory pension scheme is nothing more than the nationalization of private savings. The government intends to make the plan compulsory for anyone who earns $600 or more when a family absolutely needs a minimum income of $4,000 to survive.

An income of $600 or more will be taxed under the pretext of ensuring in the year 2002 the social security of a family man who is 30 today. This pretence is a growing administrative burden in the field of social security and represents, when all is said and done, a burden for the small wage earner.

This burden may, of course, as the hon. member for Lake St. John (Mr. Lessard) pointed out, fall back upon private enterprise. Indeed, the latter will feel its effects, and more particularly the small businessman, because their sources of revenue will be dried up, and they will have to turn to the state or to the public fund when in need of money. As I pointed out earlier, such danger leads to totalitarianism.

According to the contents of the resolution, the funds accumulated by private savings will have to be invested in government bonds, in public administration according to the needs of social development.

Why always entertain the belief that private savings or capital are to be used to improve social capital? Government bureaucracy serves to drain off savings in order to strengthen the state power.

While a resolution is submitted presumably to help the individual, the family, the orphan, the widow, the aged worker, more and more discretionary powers are given in the field of financing the private enterprise.

In its April 29, 1964 issue, *Le Soleil* gives a serious warning to those who preach this pension plan or a social insurance system. At this stage I would like to quote an extract from this editorial:

> No contribution of 3 or 4 per cent is levied on the salaries of workers, independent or not, of small and large wage earners and of employers to finance a pension fund supposedly generous, without that affecting small enterprises which must already lay out money for unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, round table committees and other services, including the levying of taxes, etc. Consideration must be given naturally to the social aspect of a program approved in principle by everyone but which must be developed and applied with caution. Services (all social) must be paid for and the person with money can secure such services more easily than the one who has not.
>
> The small enterprises will be more affected than the large ones by the new pension plan. The well established and more automated industries have already set up an annuity plan for their employees, while many small enterprises have been able to stay away from them for different reasons. For them, the contributions to a pension fund will represent an additional expense.
>
> Now, a rise in the cost of their products could greatly affect small businesses and even destroy some of them, and that would increase unemployment at least for some time.
>
> The introduction of a national pension plan can, just as if taxes were raised, affect certain vulnerable industries, such as clothing, lumber, leather and the shoe industries and small manufactures. Contributions to the pension fund will affect, at least at first, revenues of small businesses which cannot increase the price of their goods as readily as big industries. In the long run, the increase in cost will be transferred to consumers, workers, everybody, through higher prices. As far as private pension funds are concerned, we may assume that they will not improve and that many of them will probably be integrated in the retirement fund.
>
> Before the new retirement plan designed to further protect older persons, widows and disabled persons is put into force, we would be well advised to make a thorough study of the plan in order to remove its negative elements. It should not affect other means of saving money, private retirement funds or life insurance. We should always take a second look at all the implications involved in any large scale project, especially

when it concerns the welfare of the people and our economic independence. If we lay more emphasis on the public rather than the private sector, we might sap the source of energy and vitality of our economy. That should be borne in mind when considering the various opinions of experts on the industrial consequences of a retirement fund.

That is the opinion, Mr. Chairman, not of a person engaged in politics, but of the editorial writer of one of the ten most important dailies in Canada.

Once this social insurance plan is established, there is no way out, because we establish there in the field of social security, what has been established in the field of labour security, a plan called unemployment insurance or subsidies paid by the state when there is a depletion of funds and increase in the contribution—

[*Text*]

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I must advise the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mr. Foy: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I was very surprised at the remarks made by the hon. member for Perth, the very ungallant remarks, regarding our minister's age.

Mr. Monteith: I am sorry.

Miss LaMarsh: I am sorry too.

Mr. Foy: I want to say that I admire greatly the minister's determination and strength, despite the opposition encountered, in bringing this very intricate bill to completion.

Mr. Knowles: Completion?

Mr. Foy: I should like to direct my remarks to an area of old age security on which, by virtue of my experience as a life underwriter or, more specifically, as a life insurance salesman, I feel qualified to speak. I feel I am in a good position to know just how the average Canadian feels about all phases of security. I am familiar with his hopes and fears, his dreams and ambitions.

Mr. Chairman, a man in his early productive years is concerned with the care, maintenance and education of his children. He is also concerned with adequate provision for his family in the event of the loss of his income through death or disability. The inescapable demands of the present must take precedence over the requirements of things that might happen tomorrow. It is not surprising therefore that far too many of our citizens reach old age, or the age of 65 in dire financial straits.

[Mr. Perron.]

The life of a man has been prolonged far beyond the traditional three score years and ten, and yet we have not achieved a realistic solution to the problem, up until now, of sustaining him through these extra years of longevity. It was for the purpose of removing these inconsistencies that this government proposed the Canada pension plan. It is also the considered judgment of government actuaries and economists, who have been studying the proposed plan for months, and even years, that the Canada pension plan will not produce any adverse effects upon existing private plans. The ten year transitional period will give ample opportunity for integrating the Canada pension plan with existing private plans. The responsible parties to each one of the private plans will be free to decide (a) where contributions are relatively high, that the over-all contribution should not be increased. The adjustment is very simple. The existing private plan contribution rate would be reduced equal to the contribution required under the federal plan, and the benefits would be adjusted accordingly. Further, the responsible parties would be free to decide, (b), that the private plan may remain unchanged, if desired, and the benefits would then be enhanced by the benefits from the Canada pension plan; or to decide, (c), that the private plan benefits may be used to provide level combined benefits for early retirement, say at age 65 or perhaps even at 60; or to decide, (d), which is more important, that reserves built up by private pension plans shall not be disturbed or taken over by the Canada pension plan. The same applies to any rights to benefits already acquired under private plans, and integration will not be compulsory.

In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, it will guarantee the hopes and aspirations of all Canadian people by assuring them of happiness, contentment without fear, and adequate security in their retirement years. Surely old age should have certain compensations for what has been lost—peace and comfort, freedom from worry and financial independence should be among them.

The Canada pension plan is not the total answer to old age or to retirement, but it is a foundation upon which our citizens can build as they themselves deem fit, and they will build additions with the help of alert life insurance companies.

When a firm decides to instal a retirement plan for its employees, the group between 50 and 65 years of age are not able to benefit to a sufficient extent because they cannot contribute enough in the space of time left to them to provide for an adequate pension. There are those who will say that Mac, Harold and Waldo will really cash in because they will collect their pensions by only having to contribute for a few years. Yet, when hospitalization was introduced there were patients already in hospital who received benefits. There were people who went into hospitals the day the legislation became law. Those people had contributed nothing in the way of payments, yet they benefited. Was this wrong? In the case of the unemployment insurance plan there were those who became unemployed soon after the plan came into force and were not denied benefits.

This legislation will guarantee Canadians two of those freedoms declared in the Atlantic charter—freedom from fear and freedom from want. We have the means and the method of providing for all, from the very commencement of this plan.

It is a recognized fact that thousands of Canadians continue to work long past the age when they should, and not because they want to but because they have to. They have to cling to their jobs as their sole source of income, without which they would sink into debt and into the depths of despair. They are on a treadmill and cannot get off, so they cling to their jobs. Younger men coming into the work force must wait for job openings which are not in existence, because the lack of proper pensions forces the older worker to answer the whistle long past the day when he should have been allowed to take a well earned rest by retiring. The Canada pension plan will eliminate the day when a man is forced to stay at his job until he drops. Legislation which eliminates situations such as this is good legislation.

Through the development of the Canada pension plan the government will have a source of development capital that could work wonders for Canada in the next ten, 20 or 25 years. Projects now on the drafting boards gathering dust, because of the lack of funds, will become a reality. This will in turn provide further employment across the nation, and further employment will mean growth in the fund.

As to the details of the pension plan itself, they are now well known. The benefits are not grandiose. A single man retiring at age 70 will receive up to $179 per month. A married couple will receive up to $254 per month. These figures of course include the present old age security.

After 1970 a substantial number of pensions will be available at age 65. Pension for widows and dependant children, including the orphans' benefits, and pensions for the disabled will be of great benefit to all Canadians.

I was most delighted to learn from the minister's remarks that in future the Old Age Security Act will allow people to apply late, which many of them do, and be able to collect back payments up to 12 months, and also about the change involving the automatic adjustment of pensions after 1967. I believe this is a move toward modern thinking. The pensions of the aged will increase from $75 per month, upwards, with changes in the cost of living index. I am particularly pleased about this because in the future elder citizens will not be harassed at elections. Future increases in their monthly cheques will be automatic according to the formula.

A man earning $5,000 a year or more will receive the maximum pension payable under the plan and this money will allow him to retain the dignity he deserves in his sunset years. He will not be forced to sell his home and move into a more humble dwelling. He will not have to curtail his eating and other things as some elderly Canadians must do now. He will not look threadbare to his neighbours. He will not have to do any of these things. This is as it should be, for a man who has worked most of the days of his life should be allowed to retire and retain his dignity. I cannot stress too strongly the sentiments I hear expressed in my riding with reference to this bill. The people there let me know at every opportunity that they favour this legislation, and they favour it now.

Pensions today must be portable, Mr. Chairman, for a great number of Canada's working people. Automation and major construction projects are the real factors which necessitate portable pensions. All major construction projects do not take place in one spot, nor is all building done by one construction firm. A man must be free to move from project to project, from employer to employer, if Canada is to benefit from his skills through the growth of the gross national product. I believe this is why major construction firms, to single them out as an example, cannot provide adequate retirement plans. Their workers change to a large degree with each job. A portable pension is the only answer for these workers. No other will do. Because they work here and there, today building the St. Lawrence seaway, tomorrow the Saskatchewan dam

and then moving on to the Columbia river project, they must carry their retirement plans with them.

It should be noted that construction workers do not work the year round every year. They, like so many others, have their excellent years and their bad years. Therefore I believe it is fitting that the retirement benefits will be based on average earnings over a lifetime, with adjustments being made for the lean years and the overly good years.

Construction workers are just one segment of the working force of Canada that must face the problems arising out of being highly mobile men. Automation too is going to change the picture and location of many in the labour force of this nation. As more and more jobs become automated the need for skilled technicians to move in and get a project started is going to increase. These technicians are going to be a highly skilled mobile training force and their number will grow. They will need portable pensions.

I should like to digress for a moment to point out that the city of Sarnia in my riding is regarded as the most highly automated city in Canada. As the major petroleum and chemical industries located there automated, men were gradually processed out of jobs. I do not mean to imply that they were fired, to be replaced by machines. They continued on the job but as they reached retirement age they were pensioned off and quite handsomely too. The point I am making is that the city of Sarnia has automated and the phasing out of the labour force was handled without any major dislocation.

But as the process of automation is speeded up, so will be the phasing out of older workers and in some cases they will not be as fortunate as the people in my riding who worked for firms that provided pensions. They will find themselves out of a job with no visible means of support. They will swell the unemployment rolls. They will become the ancient mariners of our land, stopping passers-by to tell their tale of woe.

The Canada pension plan could forestall this by assuring them of an adequate income. They would not have to seek full time employment. Their many skills would be available to fill the gaps where part time help is needed. I think it is only right that this bill should contain provisions enabling a retired person to take on a part time job if he or she feels it is worth while. None of us likes to feel he is not needed. We all like to feel we are required and that we are useful and can do something meaningful. The legislation under debate here recognizes this fact, with its provisions to allow a retired person to continue to contribute his skills to a limit which he himself can determine.

For all these reasons, for the dignity of old age, for the reward of a lifetime of toil, to enable the generation even now moving into the work field to find employment, to help ease the transition to automation, to make all Canada a market for a man's skills, to create capital for the further development of our resources but, above all, Mr. Chairman, because we all know we have a duty in conscience to care for the aged and the elderly, I urge upon the house the necessity for the speedy passage of this legislation.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at ten o'clock p.m. this day are as follows:

The hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp), re feeder cattle prices; the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler), re the depressed position of eastern farmers.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. McCutcheon: Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to compliment the minister on finally getting this compulsory, contributory pension plan before us. I am sure it has been a trying period for her in being held back so much in her attempts to bring forth this major piece of legislation. I should like to tell her I enjoyed listening to her this afternoon, and may I say her reasonable, quiet approach became her.

I was also pleased to listen to my close personal friend, the hon. member for Lambton West, who painted a beautiful picture of this plan, and I compliment him on a worthy presentation. Now I know why he was so successful in his previous business. I am in agreement with much of what he said, but in my opinion there are certain areas of this matter which should be examined under a bright light.

We all share the hope that this plan is more realistic, more palatable and a little more down to earth than were the previous ones. The white paper gives us a brief outline of the plan but of course it is couched

in the language of a well prepared sales brochure. In other words, it does not give too much actual detail but concentrates on glowing, descriptive features of the plan. I look forward to seeing the actual bill and to examining it very soon.

I was delighted to learn of our flat rate pension scheme being tied in with the cost of living index, but in my discussion of the resolution tonight I would like to examine it in the light of priorities. What should we do first? What are the social requirement priorities of Canada at present? What is the most important social action at this time? Is it on pensions? Is it on health or education?

The royal commission on health services has pointed out that by 1971 we will be spending $466 million annually on health services, and in addition that we will need $400 million for expansion of and additions to medical schools. In the light of this I propose to discuss what priorities should be undertaken.

So far as I am concerned the role of the federal government in social security should be to provide a floor for universal retirement, to provide a level below which no Canadian is forced or allowed to go. In this connection I pay tribute to our flat rate plan. It is expensive in its cost but it is cheap to administer. It is not related to status in life but is universally available.

I suggest improvements could be made in it. So far as old age security is concerned I believe our most effective step at this time would be to update the present plan, and as the minister mentioned this is being done to a certain degree. I believe it should be modernized, modified and overhauled. I believe the qualifying age should be reduced from 70 to 65 years, but the plan should be administered on an actuarial basis. I even go so far as to suggest that at normal retirement age of 65, when a husband proves he has withdrawn from the work force, his wife should receive her pension, and her pension could be easily adjusted to take into account any great disparity in age.

Quite a case can be made for the proposition that the older a person is the larger his pension should be. A bigger flat rate pension should be provided for those aged 80, and 85 years, because in many instances older people have had to spend their savings for extra help in the home and extra doctors' bills. In many cases the needs of people in this age group are greater than the needs of people aged 70 or 75 who may be able to look after themselves better.

I would favour a pension commission or board completely removed from politics, a board set up to administer the flat rate pension related to average earnings or, as the minister has already announced, related to the cost of living index.

There are great variations of conditions between the vast areas of this great country and in my opinion local conditions can best be met by local or regional governments. Therefore I propose that a modernization of our flat rate pension plan be considered first. I do not think I am completely alone in this view. For seven years the Canadian welfare council has said that other social schemes have priority. I do not say this is necessarily correct, but let us discuss this question openly and find out. We have only so much by way of resources to dispose of, and the setting up of a list of priorities should, I believe, be considered. I submit that the real order of priority in this country would probably be: education, medicare, and then pensions.

I personally favour a pay as you go scheme, a plan which does not build up huge funds to be administered by politicians. These pension funds are trust funds; I might even go as far as to say they are sacred trust funds, and they should never be under the control of politicians. Look at the list of investments for which these funds may be used. The provinces have the right to use these moneys and if they do not need them the remainder can be invested in dominion government securities. I deplore this method of looking after trust funds. I pay tribute to our life insurance companies and insurance companies generally for having done such a good job in this regard. I would prefer that trained, highly skilled investment experts removed from political considerations should have control over the investment features of any pension fund in which I was involved.

I am also concerned about the very high cost of administration which this plan will necessitate. The career of every citizen from the age of 18 to the age of 70 will have to be followed in the minutest detail. It will be a repetition of the experience of the business community—the Department of Industry at the front door and the department of inland revenue at the back door. Just look at how the numbers of civil servants have increased in recent years. I submit that the benefits flowing from this plan are not commensurate with the cost and will not make up for the ill effects of the disruption of existing plans. As I see it, the plan subsidizes those who are in least need; its greatest benefits accrue to

those who need them least. A welfare plan should take care of those who really need assistance. I think the people should be told the truth. All that a pension plan is, is money —money for future delivery. The government has no magic formula for administering pension funds better than anyone else. As far as I can see there is no economy which can be effected by federal administration as opposed to existing facilities. The only thing a government can do is to make it compulsory for everybody to belong.

According to the white paper, this plan provides nothing for people who are now over 70, though many of these people really need additional help. Further, it provides little for those who are over the age of 65. Finally, it does not look to me like much of a bargain for those who are 25 or under, because they will be paying for many years and getting no more out of the plan than a man who is 55 years of age.

I further suggest that those who need pensions most, as a class, are those who are engaged in seasonal pursuits—trappers, fishermen, construction workers, and so on. Taking into account their limited incomes, this plan offers little real benefit to them. Farmers and the self-employed are, I submit, being penalized. It is true that farmers can participate, as can other groups of self-employed people, but they must pay the whole shot. Groups of employees in industry pay approximately one half of the contribution made in respect of them; the employer pays approximately the same amount. This is, in truth, a payroll tax. The extra cost of doing business, the extra cost of production brought about as a result of the employer contribution must in large measure be passed along to the consumer. So I submit the farm people and the self-employed who constitute a large segment of the economy of this country will be paying their full share, plus a bonus to the others in the form of higher prices for goods and services. I think this is unfair. I am not alone in this belief, because a former minister of transport, appearing before the joint committee, had this to say about the same question:

> I think it is pretty clear that a tax on wages and salaries would have a very direct effect on cost of production. I would think if there were a payroll tax, paid by the employer, the tendency would be for it to be passed on in prices almost immediately.

Rest assured, this is a payroll tax. I suggest the self-employed and the farm people would be much better off under a modernized, up to date flat rate plan. This I submit would go a long way toward alleviating hardship in the depressed areas.

[Mr. McCutcheon.]

On the basis of irregular earnings the pension, as I mentioned a few moments ago, amounts to little or nothing. On the whole it provides for those who are not in dire need. Let us consider one or two other points. In industry, contributory pensions have been a matter for union bargaining. Several union leaders have already stated that they would not consider the integration of existing plans with this new, compulsory Canada pension plan. I foresee labour-management disputes which will put an additional burden on business and on the economy in general. Some of our provincial governments are now concerned with legislation covering the portability of pensions within and between provinces. This is a matter which comes under provincial jurisdiction. If such arrangements are made, what excuse is there for imposing this scheme on a company which can prove that it has a plan equal to, or better than, the one proposed by the government? In 1950 the type of plan now put forward was turned down and the committee advocated a flat rate plan. Conditions change, I know, but by and large the same situation prevails today as prevailed then.

I deplore the fact that there is no factual actuarial report presented with this white paper—just an anonymous opinion that the economy can take the cost. It assumes a pension plan standing by itself and I submit the cost of the plan must be considered in toto, together with all the other costs of government. I quote Mr. John B. Meyer of the Montreal *Gazette* who on August 14, 1964 asked:

> Can we really afford the claim upon income represented by the pension plan on top of present and future claims, particularly that represented by the recommendation of the royal commission on health services? This should be the starting point for any examination of the plan. It is ignored completely in the white paper.

Again, may I say a contributory compulsory plan is definitely worthy of consideration. I do not feel it is all bad; I think it can be overhauled and made to work. But I submit that, as usual, this government has given it the wrong priority. I suggest that a more appropriate priority would be to update and modernize our present plan, remove it from politics and then consider education, medicare and a contributory, compulsory pension plan, in that order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Chairman, today there is a tendency in this house and elsewhere, to men-

tion at every turn "the government's capitulating to the provinces" and, more particularly " to Quebec", as there is—I am sorry to say, on the other hand frequent talk of "Quebec's yielding to Ottawa" in some Quebec groups.

These detestable expressions of "yielding", or "capitulating" will, I hope, not be used in respect of the pension plan which the Minister of National Health and Welfare introduced this afternoon.

If there is to be any talk of "capitulation", it will be, I hope, to common sense, a yielding to the need of compromise which should necessarily govern the solution of political problems and to the new spirit which marks federal-provincial relations at this time.

Mr. Chairman, how did we arrive at the present situation? How did we come to the pension plan such as it is today?

At the time where inevitably, fortunately and dangerously also was developing the technique of opting out and contracting out a new technique appeared, which I could called the contracting in formula, an agreement between the central government and one or several provinces upon the passing of similar legislation.

In order to remind you of these facts, Mr. Chairman, in July 1963 the central government initiated a pension scheme; it was certainly its right. Some provinces indicated their interest in moving into the same legislative field; it was also their right. Then complex and lengthy negotiations started; all the Cassandras of the country uttered a unanimous opinion: confederation is in danger; it is even already dead, assassinated, as the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) would say.

After months of work during which politicians and federal and provincial officials did their best, a compromise was reached on a pension plan. In this atmosphere of optimism, a constitutional amendment was approved providing for benefits to survivors and disabled persons.

The provinces have two alternatives: they may either have their own plan or they may accept that of the central government. Essential parts of both plans are identical.

In short, those are the facts, Mr. Chairman. The proposed plan is a national plan, with all the benefits that this involves. It is a national plan without being exclusively a federal plan. It is national because it can be either a federal or a provincial plan; provinces can choose the federal plan or have their own provincial plan if they so wish.

For those who would be tempted in this debate to speak of concessions to provinces, to Quebec particularly, I would like first of all to reaffirm the priority rights of the provinces in the field of pension plans and, in the second place, indicate improvements to the federal plan following its merger, so to speak, with the Quebec plan.

For the others, that is those who would be tempted to say that this is a Quebec concession to Ottawa, I would like to mention the improvements made to the Quebec plan resulting from the merger with the original federal plan.

First, the constitutional aspect: as I said earlier, both the federal and provincial governments were perfectly entitled to introduce their own pension plan.

Section 94A, arising out of the amendment of 1951, and amended in 1964, reads as follows:

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time make laws in relation to old age pension in Canada, but no law made by the parliament of Canada in relation to old age pensions shall affect the operation of any law present or future—

I emphasize: present or future.

> —of a provincial legislature in relation to old age pensions.

Because of that 1951 amendment the legislation on old age pensions had become a joint field like agriculture and immigration.

However, while in these two latter fields, section 95 grants a priority, a "paramountcy" to central legislation, section 94A recognizes the paramountcy of the provincial legislation, not only for the existing law, but for any future provincial law.

As soon as the provincial legislation is affected in relation to pension plans, the federal government must withdraw. This is provided by the constitution.

Therefore, I think it was impossible to have federal and provincial plans, both being government comprehensive plans.

I conclude and I think that this conclusion must be kept in mind during this debate: the federal government was not free to do as it pleases as regards pension plans. It had, and it has to agree with the provinces. It had and it has to do so in order to give the pension plan all the desirable scope, stability and efficiency.

An agreement was therefore achieved through the constructive will of the central government and through the good will of the provinces and of Quebec particularly.

The minister will be accused—it was done already this afternoon—of having attacked,

of having retreated, having amended, having altered. This afternoon, the Leader of the Opposition grumbled: Two revisions, two revisions.

The minister would have been accused of the opposite if an agreement had not been reached.

It would have been said then that she had lacked flexibility. It would have been said then that she was in favour of centralization.

The people will take all that into consideration and that is why they will not take away from the Minister of National Health and Welfare the popularity she now enjoys.

What has been the influence of the Quebec plan on the evolution of the final federal plan, a summary of which was given to us this afternoon? You understand that it would be necessary here to compare the two original plans, the Quebec plan and the final federal plan. I do not have enough time and I will limit myself to a few points.

First, in addition to remaining a social security plan, the present plan also becomes a source of capital. It has often been said that for the people of Quebec who want to have a hand in their own economic development, capitalization was essential, and I think we must congratulate the federal government and the other provinces for having understood that. I feel that the other provinces will also benefit from this change.

Second, "coverage", that is the number of assessable persons, has also grown. Such exceptions as the dependent workers, originally considered, have been set aside. Participation of self-employed workers, optional in the original plan, now becomes compulsory, as it is in the Quebec plan. Revenue will obviously be increased, as will the benefits. Had self-employed workers been free to join the plan or not, only those with fairly high income would have done so and the social security aspect would have suffered therefrom.

Third, the assessable income is set at a minimum of $600 and a maximum of $5,000. You will remember that the original federal plan foresaw from zero to $4,500, while the Quebec plan provided for $1,000 to $6,000. The compromise of $600 will have for effect, we must say, to benefit the less fortunate people, since a person who, for instance, is paying benefits or contributions on $1,400 will receive an annuity based on $2,000, since the exemption will not be deducted for the calculation of benefits.

Fourth, the contribution rate has been increased. In the first federal plan it was 2 per cent at the beginning. It must be pointed out also that it increased up to 4 per cent for salaried people and up to 3 per cent in the case of self-employed workers. Under the provincial plan, the basis was 4 per cent indefinitely. Under the present plan, the basis is 3.6 per cent of the contributive revenue of the self-employed worker. It is 1.8 per cent for the employee, and 1.8 per cent for the employer in the case of dependent workers.

But take heed. Because of the basic exemption of $600, the rate is, in fact, less than 3.6 per cent. Especially, the rate is a progressive one. It is very low for the small wage earner, i.e., 1.4 per cent in the case of an employee earning $2,000; the rate increasing as the earnings increase. I think the social security aspect will greatly benefit from it. As far as the economic aspect is concerned, it is also worth while, because the small employer will pay less than large industries, their employees receiving ordinarily smaller salaries than those employed in larger industries.

Fifth, the expected retirement benefits of 20 per cent are raised to 25 per cent and will be adjusted, as in the Quebec plan, according to a formula which is a compromise in itself. Its advantage is obvious.

Sixth, the original federal plan could not, in the absence of a constitutional amendment, provide for payments to "non-old" survivors. With regard to the transfer of the pension to the disabled, to the widow, to the orphan, as far as death benefits are concerned, the final plan follows—improving on it at times—the Quebec plan.

Once again, I must say that undoubtedly, without the compromise arrived at, the provinces, especially the province of Quebec, would not have approved the constitutional amendment obtained last summer. I feel that must be recalled.

Seventh, an adjustment formula concerning the minimum and maximum of the assessable income and the benefits themselves is added to the original federal plan, taking into consideration the cost of living to begin with and later on the index of salaries.

That formula is itself a compromise, but the idea to adjust benefits comes, I have been told, from the Quebec plan. The idea is of undeniable value since its result is to maintain the purchasing power of the pension, in periods of inflation, obviously.

Finally, a last improvement: the administration of the plan is improved; all sorts of compromises concerning, for instance, the appeal procedure, the inclusion of federal and provincial civil servants, have also been secured. Is that convincing enough? I believe

so. The federal plan benefits from its association with the Quebec plan. I would like to add also that the Quebec plan gains a lot from its association with the federal plan.

First of all, the date when benefits will be available is moved ahead, the transitory period is reduced from 20 to 10 years. Thus the services rendered the country by the persons who have now reached somewhat advanced maturity can be recognized.

Second, the amount of exemption is reduced to $600 from $1,000. This will allow participation to this pension plan by a greater number of those in the low-income bracket.

Third, benefits to the disabled, which were reserved for persons of 60 years of age or more in the Quebec plan, will not be available, after five years of contributions, to anyone 23 years old or more.

Once again, and I now conclude to allow the member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Moreau) to be recognized, this is a compromise. In a compromise each party loses a little, but each also gains more.

Both the federal and the provincial plans are better than before April 1964. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) admitted that fact only a few hours ago.

And above all, Mr. Chairman, the whole of Canada is better off after the events I just mentioned. First, we have at last a pension plan. Then—and I think it is important—I feel that a new technique has been invented in the field of federal-provincial relations, which I called a while ago "contracting in," namely the agreement of the federal government and the provinces in order to pass together identical legislation.

Finally, this pension plan, which is another great achievement in the realm of cooperative federalism, proves once more the maturity of Canadian political leaders.

[*Text*]

Mr. Cantelon: Mr. Chairman, there is hardly a person in this house who does not approve of a pension plan which will support those who need that support in old age, or in the cases of need that precedes old age. This being so one wonders why there was so much opposition to the plans previously suggested. The minister says that there are important new dimensions in the plan now. We are glad to hear this. It is hardly necessary to repeat that the opposition originally was not to the basic principles of a pension but to the failure properly to implement these principles in the first two schemes. Now that this scheme has been hammered out by the opposition and been refined in the furnace of controversy, it begins to be a good plan. However, I think there are certain warnings that still need to be given and certain facts that it would be well for the people of this country to know and understand.

The basic principle of the plan is indicated in this quotation which I take from the government's white paper of August 1964, page 7:

> Adequate levels of pensions cannot be realistically achieved, in a country like Canada, simply by increasing the flat-rate pension. Living costs vary greatly between town and country, and between different regions of Canada. What people need, if either retirement or the death or disablement of the head of the family removes their regular income, is related in part to the level of earnings to which they have been accustomed.
>
> The Canada pension plan will therefore provide a retirement pension related to the earnings on which people have contributed. The scale of this pension will rise during a ten year transitional period to a level of 25 per cent of these earnings.

This is a good principle and one, I am sure, with which we all agree. However, we should not be carried away by this statement. It leaves the impression that a retiree will get 25 per cent of his earnings when he retires. This is only true with certain important qualifications. Some get more and some get less.

In fact, those whose earnings are below $5,000 yearly will at the end of the transitional period of ten years, and if the person retiring is 70 years of age, be paid 25 per cent of earnings on the earnings related pension, and on that alone. They will as well receive a further $75 a month from the old age security pension. A man then who earns $200 monthly would receive $50 earnings related pension plus $75 old age security pension, a total of $125 a month. This is 62 per cent of his previous monthly wage, and it is not a bit too much. The man earning $5,000 a year gets $416.67 monthly wage. His earnings related pension would be $104.17 monthly plus the old age security pension of $75, a total of $179.17. This is only 43 per cent of his previous monthly wage. The man earning $10,000 a year gets $833.34 monthly wage. His earnings related pension and old age security pension are the same as the man earning $5,000 a year, or again a total of $179.17. This is only 21½ per cent of his previous monthly wage.

Thus this earnings related pension and the old age security pension are providing, as a little further calculation will show, at incomes below $8,600, a pension which is 25 per cent

or better of earnings prior to retirement. This is little enough since many pension plans strive to provide 70 per cent to a certain arbitrary maximum, at earnings based on that figure of $8,600. This pension then provides a pension which in many cases is below 25 per cent of earned income.

However, since this is a minimum plan, this is not surprising, and I do not think we should criticize it on that basis. It was not my purpose to do so, but I think these facts should be brought out. In fact it is a good thing that a pension scheme should pay higher percentages to low income groups so that these people may have enough money with which to live in reasonable comfort. It is necessary for those who are now in other pension schemes to keep these variable percentages in mind when considering what course they should follow with their present schemes in relation to the Canada pension plan.

For many years I was much concerned with the pension scheme for my profession in the province of Saskatchewan. When that scheme was introduced it was a good scheme related to earnings, but the depression of the 1930's almost wrecked it and had to be drastically revised on other principles in 1942. With the rising cost of living and rising salaries after 1945 there were years of struggle to have major increases introduced into the scheme. In 1957 major increases were obtained, but as the cost of living and salaries continued to increase another major redrafting was done in 1963 and the pension plan went back to the principle of relation to income. I mention this only to emphasize that thinking in the pension field changes, with the hope that a flexible attitude will be taken by the government when the bill is referred to committee for detailed study, and also the hope that the government will willingly accept the necessary revisions that are almost certain to come out of that study.

I mention it as well for another reason, and I think a very important one. There are a great many very good pension schemes in operation in this country. They have been hammered out through the years with much debate, and not always good humoured debate, until today they tend to do what they set out to do—protect the employees they cover and provide adequate pensions. The costs to the employees and employers are quite appreciable, and are distinctly noticeable in the reductions they produce in the salary cheques of the employees covered, as anyone who has been covered by such a plan and who has had deductions made from his salary cheque will realize.

The Canada pension plan is going to upset all the carefully planned arrangements these schemes have evolved and tested throughout the years, and I think it is going to be a great deal more difficult to talk to the government than it was to talk to the employer, when modifications were desirable. I hope that by providing pensions for those who were not covered before, the Canada pension plan is not going to upset these plans. I am very suspicious about this because we hear that the federal civil servants and provincial civil servants are not going to be covered by the Canada pension plan. At least that is what the Calgary *Herald* of October 20 stated, and I should like to quote from that newspaper as follows:

> When the federal government first broached the idea of a Canada pension plan, it emphasized that that it would be a universal scheme to which all Canadians would be required to contribute.
>
> Yet, at the very outset, an exception was conceded—federal civil servants would remain outside the federal scheme, and their own plan would remain in effect.
>
> Now, it has been revealed that provincial civil servants will be able to opt out of the plan as well. This seems most unsatisfactory. By what right should only provincial and federal civil servants be permitted to opt out and carry on with their own schemes? If this has to be a universal, compulsory plan, there is no justification for giving favoured treatment to any section of the Canadian public...there are many other Canadians who are not public servants who also have been contributing for many years to private and company schemes which are far superior to that which Ottawa is determined to foist on the nation.

The minister said today that the act is to be "truly national in its provisions" and that it "will operate uniformly across the country". These are strange statements indeed, if the newspaper is correct. Are these people then not to be in the plan? If they are not, then why are they not? Is it because they know that their own plans are better? What then about all the private plans that are good, are they to opt out completely, as the civil servants are allowed to do? If they are not able to do this then why, if civil servants can, are others not allowed to do the same? What about the broad base needed to carry the plan? I hope that in the negotiations carried on with the administrators of these plans the government will not be dictatorial and arrogant. Perhaps I am unduly pessimistic, but if I am, this government has only itself to blame. Its mistakes have been legion and its arrogances obvious. If the government is to continue this attitude, they may find that the

Canada pension plan is not the vote catcher they think it is.

The self-employed and the small businessman, in which group I include the farmers of my constituency, are going to have trouble with this scheme. The self-employed has to make the employer's contribution of 1.8 per cent, and also the employee's contribution of 1.8 per cent, so he will be paying 3.6 per cent for coverage for himself under the plan. He is going to notice this, just as the salary pensioner is going to notice his increased payments. Most self-employed create an estate which they expect will maintain them when they retire. Creation of that estate will be more difficult, due to this loss of income to the pension fund. It may be argued that the businessman or farmer will get it back as pension. This is true, but will the government make that money produce for the farmer as well as he would make it produce for himself? We all know it will not. The government will probably just sit on it or put it into bonds, which is nice and safe but not very productive, especially for the small businessman.

And are we sure that the rate will not be increased? My experience with pension plans suggests that it will need to be increased and the experience of the United States with a very similar plan resulted in the rate there having to be increased. I will never forget how I listened with amazement when the minister told us in August, 1963 what the benefits of the then Canada pension plan would be and what the rates to pay for those benefits would be. We all know what has happened to the benefits and rates, the one down and the other up. In the Canada pension plan they now seem reasonable but if any pension plan is to continue to fulfil its function of adequately supporting the pensioner with some relation to income its benefits and its rates will have to rise as the country goes forward.

There is a cost of living clause built into the Canada pension plan now, which will help. Then the minister tells us today that a cost of living provision will be attached to the old age pension too, and so it should be. But I am as certain as a man can be that the rates will need to be raised if we are going to get better benefits, and we will need better benefits in time. Yet the minister says that there are restraints in the present plan to prevent changes in the rates and benefits. This seems to forecast a battle. However, if the rates do rise the farmer and the businessman as well as the employee are the people who are going to feel the increases.

These are the comments I should like to make at this time. I am all in favour of a good pension scheme and so is my party. They had a study under way when defeated in 1963. My party showed its concern for the pensioner, with the assistance of the other opposition groups, by forcing the government to meet its promise to pay $75 a month to the old age pensioners. This government had tied that increase to the Canada pension plan. The old age pensioners would still be waiting for it and would have been $120 poorer today if the government had carried out its intentions.

Mr. Cashin: Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct honour for me to participate in this historic debate today. We know that for the past decade or so this country has been noticeably unimaginative in its attitude toward social security. Since universal old age pensions were introduced in 1952 we have had only one major piece of social security legislation introduced in the House of Commons, namely the hospital insurance legislation introduced some years ago.

During this period successive governments did increase the benefits, of course, available under existing programs but this required neither great courage nor imagination. However, there was little evidence, and there has been little evidence up until now of an evolution of a sound philosophy of social security. The nineteenth century attitude which from time to time prevails in criticizing social security has left a legacy of myths about social security and the welfare state which are not only erroneous but, it would seem, have restricted governments in the past from taking a more imaginative and realistic approach toward the social and economic problems of modern society.

The lack of a sound, balanced approach to social security is admittedly complicated by the federal nature of our society. It is this very set of circumstances which has in the past and will in the future present some severe tests to the federal government. The present administration is to be congratulated for surmounting some of the difficulties inherent in our federal system which complicate the problem of attaining national standards in pensions and in other fields.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the achievement of bringing forth a national contributory pension plan which is truly portable is a testimonial not only to the progressive spirit of the present administration but also to its ability to cope with the problems of a federal

state. This is all the more remarkable when we note that this was brought about by a government in a minority position in the House of Commons and at a time when there is a great deal of controversy centered around the House of Commons and around confederation itself.

In the past decade Canada had two governments which enjoyed overwhelming majorities in the House of Commons. Yet neither of these administrations took this very fundamental forward step of providing this very basic part of Canada's social security system, a step forward, Mr. Chairman, which more than any other is in my opinion a realization of the need for a sound philosophy of social security. In the past year or so the matter of a Canada pension plan has been discussed at four federal-provincial conferences. In view of the constitutional division of powers it was impossible for the federal government to proceed as completely as it now has in this field. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, what we have seen over the past year has been co-operative federalism at work. Because of the sound and reasonable approach taken by this administration to the matter of federal-provincial relations we now will have a national pension plan which provides for portability between all provinces, and we also have the necessary constitutional amendment to provide for supplementary pensions for widows, orphans and disabled contributors. Therefore this government has not only introduced a great social security measure but in doing so it has brought Canadians of all origins closer together by crossing what seemed a year ago to be insurmountable obstacles. It is a great tribute to this administration's ability to cope with the difficulties inherent in our present political environment. It is also a great rebuke to those purveyors of pessimism and proponents of instant wisdom who have severely criticized our democratic institutions.

That these are times of controversy no one will deny. It seems to me, however, that in times of great change one hears all too much of the negative side of things. It is perhaps easier to succumb to fear than to summon the courage to cope with the situation. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, we pay far too much attention to the prophets of doom.

The events of the past year which led to the introduction of today's resolution can only confirm our conviction that the present administration is providing us with calm and reasonable leadership that refuses to be deterred from its course by extremism from any quarter. It represents a great triumph for moderation over extremism and gives one confidence that men and women of reason can, with patience and understanding, arrive at a common consensus. It is a great lesson in the art of government.

The white paper on pensions tabled in August gives us a good indication of the scope and the magnitude of this legislation. There are two significant features which represent an improvement over the original plan and which were achieved through negotiations with the provinces over the past year. These negotiations, as I have said, are a vivid example of co-operative federalism at work. First of all, this is now a truly national plan which provides for complete portability from province to province. This is an important step in providing greater mobility within the labour force. Workers must be free to move from job to job anywhere in Canada. Now they will be able to change jobs without losing their accumulated pension rights.

In our increasingly technical society change comes rapidly. It is not enough that we provide trade and technical schools for the training and retraining of workers; we must also ensure that change of employment will not jeopardize the security of the workers. The labour force should not be penalized by the changing nature of industry which requires a great mobility of the working force. A man ought to be free to change from job to job, to change from trade to trade, to change from area to area without severely risking his future security.

A compulsory, national pension plan which is completely portable is a significant step in insuring greater mobility of the work force. Of course, we realize other measures will have to be adopted at various levels in order to give a greater mobility to the labour force. The supply of skilled labour will require greater flexibility than hitherto has been the case, and in this age of technological change, as new skills come into demand, there will have to be qualified men and women to fill the jobs that will be vacant. This mobility not only means mobility from one area to another but it also implies workers having to change their types of work as older skills become obsolete. A proper environment must be developed in which the working man will be able to cope with these changes and reap the benefits from technological change along with the rest of society.

The second major accomplishment of co-operative federalism which is prominent in this plan is the inclusion of supplementary pensions for widows, orphans and disabled

contributors. This is a field which, prior to the recent constitutional amendment, was enjoyed entirely by the provinces. The white paper points out that those under the age of 65 who will be eligible for supplementary pension will also draw a flat rate of $25 a month because these people will not, of course, be eligible for old age security. However, I think it is important to note that these supplementary pensions would be small if, in the early years of the plan, they were subject to the same ten year build-up as retirement pensions, and the government is to be commended on not including this ten years build-up as a provision applying to supplementary pensions. In a sense, therefore, supplementary benefit pensions are more generous, especially for those in the lower income brackets, than the new retirement pensions. This approach is justified because of the special need of widows, orphans and disabled contributors, and is certainly warranted on both humanitarian and economic grounds.

This plan at best can provide only minimum levels of retirement benefits. Because of the nature of their circumstances, widows, orphans and disabled contributors will not be in the same position to provide for themselves as well as able-bodied members of the work force can. These reasons justify the special way the government has approached this particular category. The approach is also justified because for the first time we will be making an attempt to have national standards in the case of widows, orphans and disabled contributors.

In the past great anomalies existed within the framework of our social security laws, and the greatest anomaly has been in this particular area because it is exclusively provincial and some provinces do not have the same resources as others to take care of orphans, widows and disabled contributors. This is particularly true of the Atlantic region, and therefore I think I can say the people of that region are very grateful the government has shown the wisdom of including these supplementary pensions. They are also grateful that this was able to be accomplished during the past year because, with the continuation of the existing approach undertaken by the respective provinces, this can lead to a more enlightened approach than has hitherto been undertaken with respect to this neglected group.

A number of members have commented on the inclusion of the self-employed in the plan. I would like to point out to them, and in particular to the hon. member for Perth who seemed to be taking issue with this, that they are overlooking the fact that an abnormally high number of the self-employed are in the low income group. This is particularly true in the Atlantic provinces. For example, in Newfoundland some 20,000 people are employed in the fishing industry, the biggest single employer in the province, and the vast majority of them are self-employed. It is significant to note that, according to the white paper, the way the plan is to be administered will mean a more generous treatment of the low income group.

This is only as it ought to be because it is good economics. The people in the low income group have a greater struggle to meet the basic expenditures required to provide bare subsistence, and therefore they do not have great resources to provide for their retirement years.

There is another reason why it is a good thing to include self-employed people. There are so many of them in the lower income group, and I would hope this legislation will not be held out as the end-all and be-all of any administration's approach to the problems of the people in that group. I hope there will be a vigorous attempt made to create an environment in which these people, particularly those in the Atlantic provinces, can work to move into higher income groups. It would be a mistake to exclude them from this pension plan because we are hopeful that in the not too distant future the earned income of the average fisherman, logger and farmer in eastern Canada will be considerably higher than it is now.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre also dealt with the position of the people in the low income group. I did not completely understand what he said but I rather got the impression that he was ignoring the fact that there is something of a transfer of income in the present administration's approach to the inclusion of people in the low income group. This is a significant step forward to the realization of the goal of equal opportunities for all Canadians.

The benefits to be provided under this plan will be of great significance to all the people of Canada because the government of Canada is in fact providing a service which otherwise would not be provided. In the 1960's we talk about our great industrial progress, yet two thirds of our work force are without adequate pensions. It is obvious to all but the most narrow-minded nineteenth century thinker that this is the only way and the best way to go

about helping to provide security in old age. This is especially true in the case of those people who will benefit from the supplementary pensions because, as I mentioned earlier, this is a group which has been passed over in the past.

Though we talk about $75 a month being inadequate for people aged 70 years, this is a fortune compared with what is paid to some widows in parts of the country. If we have a sound philosophy on social security these anomalies can be ironed out, and I believe the introduction of this pension plan is the most significant step taken by any government in the realization of the need for such a philosophy.

As I said earlier, the one third we hear so much talk about, the one third who live on a bare subsistence level, cannot purchase for themselves through private insurance companies the pension plans that would provide them with some security in their old age. The benefits that they may be able to buy for themselves at present are not as great as we would like them to be, simply because of the fact that these people are in the low income group. I believe we cherish the hope, however, that after 30 years of acceptance of the government's role in the economy we shall reach a point where there will not be many people living at mere subsistance levels in this country. By including these people in the plan now, at a time when they do not have the resources to join private plans, we shall, as their incomes rise in the years ahead, have provided them with an opportunity to prepare for their years of retirement.

This pension plan is significant for many reasons, but the one I have tried to talk about is the mobility it will give to the Canadian labour force. It will not solve completely the problems caused by lack of mobility, but it is a step forward.

A second feature of the plan which appeals to me and to the people of Newfoundland is the inclusion of supplementary benefits. What this government has attempted to do in the Canada pension plan is consistent with what Abraham Lincoln had to say 100 years ago about the role of government:

> The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities.

I think this succinctly explains what the government is seeking to do in bringing forward this pension plan. I do congratulate the Minister of National Health and Welfare

on her achievement, one which must be all the sweeter in view of the bitterness which surrounds so many of the other things we do in this House of Commons.

Mr. Enns: There have been so many excellent contributions to the debate this afternoon that many of the points I wish to raise have already been covered, and covered well. There have been some references to the reasoned and reasonable statement made by the minister when she introduced this measure and made her initial statement in the house, and I am not at all surprised when I remember that within the last seven days she has visited the keystone province of Canada; the moderating atmosphere of Manitoba may have had something to do with the moderation of her statement this afternoon. She mentioned that there may be honest differences over various facets of the pension plan. I am glad she does recognize that there are different ways of looking at this question and different ways of viewing the needs of the people who will be involved. I am impressed by the gigantic scope of this scheme. When this plan was introduced initially, I believe the minister told us it was the most far-reaching legislation to have been placed before the house for many decades. This being so I feel we should be cautious and careful in our approach; we should seek to devise the kind of plan which is the best we can muster.

I am pleased to note that in the house today there has been no rancour, but rather an atmosphere of unity in recognizing the need for a Canada pension plan. The hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska spoke of the ways in which this plan illustrated the new phrase "co-operative federalism" we hear so often. The very fact that this is an example of an area where a province could actually opt out, as the phrase is, yet still be part of a national plan is perhaps a particularly good illustration of co-operative federalism. The only feature I am worried about in this connection is standards. The speaker who preceded me said this was a grand national plan, and that it would be raising standards in all the provinces. However, if the other provinces choose to invoke the privilege of opting out of a national program, is there machinery in this plan which would ensure that there will still be the national standards at which we have aimed in devising this scheme?

In my general endorsation of this plan I wish to inject some words of caution. I do so, not for the sake of making carping criticism but because I think we need to look

very carefully at the effect this plan would have on our people and on our economy in general. I know that in Manitoba our premier, Mr. Duff Roblin, has spoken of the crisis of priorities. The hon. member for Lambton-Kent has already touched on this question of priorities. I feel justified in making further reference to it, however, because of the fact that the federal system under which this country operates makes it possible for both federal and provincial governments to impose taxes in the same tax areas. Personal income tax, for example, is a legitimate field for taxation by provincial governments as well as by the federal government and the same is true of corporation income taxes. In other areas, there is a separation—I refer to provincial sales taxes, for example, and on the other hand to excise taxes, which are purely a federal concern. But whatever the method of taxation used may be, the tax is always levied on the same resources—the only wealth generating power in the nation, namely the taxpayers.

It should be stated frankly that the combined taxation forces of the provincial governments and the federal government already take almost 25 per cent of the gross national product and I think common sense begs that we should look carefully at just where we are going. Are we getting the best value for our dollar? I share the anxiety of previous speakers over these expenditures. I think the Canada pension plan is a grand design. It is part of a further mosaic in our whole social security design. Earlier I spoke of the need for pulling together the various social security measures we already have and which have grown up piecemeal to deal with various areas of need, disability, old age, and so on. Here we have another piece added to the mosaic in the form of the Canada pension plan.

I am still hopeful that somehow we shall evolve a plan which will make one large social security parcel, whether we call it that or not, designed to meet the needs of people in all the various categories. The plan as introduced goes part of the way. It deals with benefits to survivors, to disabled people and to orphans and in this sense it is a great step forward, not just a piecemeal measure but an encompassing measure. It will certainly cost a great deal of money. If we are to demand revenue to meet this kind of expenditure from the public purse, I must say I share Premier Roblin's concern about priorities and I sometimes wonder whether we have placed the demand in the proper area. For my part I feel that expenditure on our younger citizens pays by far the greatest dividend, and expenditure on the young must, naturally, be aimed at improving education. I know this is a field which is not within the federal sphere. But we are witnessing increasing examples of education being interfered with as a result of the mobility of our population. As they travel from one province to another families must adapt themselves to changes in educational programs. Families of members of parliament are among those who encounter this difficulty. All of us run up against this vast problem of different standards in education. I think if we devised some way of channelling the spiralling costs of education in proper perspective with other demands on public money, this would certainly serve us well in the apportioning of public expenditures, which we seem to have to do in every session.

A pension makes reference to the fact that there is an incentive to keep persons employed; that is, if you keep on working until you are 70 years of age, your pension benefits will be larger than if you choose to retire and take your pension at age 65. This is somewhat at variance with what automation does to the labour force, because surely all the indications are for earlier retirement and fewer opportunities for employment for the older individual. This is just one area of contradiction that I point out. I do not think this is necessarily a fault of the plan, but this will be one of the things we will have to fit into the scheme as automation takes its unending course, which course we cannot alter.

The fact that the lowest income group, those persons not earning $600 per year, is not covered may be an area of concern. I have no suggestion to offer as to how these people can be included; but we ask ourselves, is it fair to eliminate a group here, even if they wish to participate in benefiting from this plan? Perhaps it will still be possible to do this when we are considering the bill at the clause by clause stage; but it seems there will be a significant number of individuals who will not be able to become part of this scheme, even if they elect to do so.

There will be one very obvious defect which other hon. members have already pointed out. That is the fact that those persons who are at the present time 70 years of age will of course not be helped at all, and those persons of 55 years of age and over will not be able to benefit to the maximum degree from the scheme because of the diminishing returns

if they have not worked the full ten years. On the other hand there will be windfalls to those persons who began contributing exactly or approximately ten years before their retirement. This windfall will be in the nature of receiving benefits far in excess of the amounts they have contributed. For example, very roughly I suppose a person who retires ten years from the date the plan comes into effect will have contributed an average of perhaps $900 toward the plan, but he will benefit to the extent of $1,250 for every year he lives. So this is an obvious windfall to those persons who are in the fortunate age group of about 50 or 55 at the time this plan comes into effect.

It has already been pointed out that younger persons will have contributed for as long as 52 years and will still only receive the same benefits. These are difficulties which perhaps cannot be solved in the plan, so there will be greater equity; but none the less, rather than saying we must have something that will fit everyone, it just will not be possible to develop a general scheme to fit everyone, and perhaps we will have to accept the plan with these difficulties. I believe another area of greater concern will be the problem of integrating private plans. I am sure that many, many workers are worried about how this plan will affect their present superannuation plans or schemes. I can see no way in which iron-clad rules can be developed to fit the integration of the private plan in the Canada pension plan, and it seems to me to become a large problem of examining and adapting each private scheme to the Canada pension plan. This in itself will prove an added difficulty.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a brief reference to a comment the Porter royal commission on banking has made about the plan. Certainly this is a thoughtful study to which I am making reference. They make the comparison of the Canada pension plan, attempting to provide benefits far greater than the American social security measures even though our national per capita income is something like 30 per cent below the American per capita income. Mention is made of the fact that the average contribution will be something like 3 per cent, perhaps 3.6 per cent for those in the higher income groups and the self-employed. But we must not forget the fact that we are already paying 4 per cent on our old age security tax; so actually when we speak of drawing a pension of $179, it will be paid for by having levied on us a tax of not 3.6 per cent but generally 3 per cent, for a total tax of 7 per cent. This comes quite close to the current cost of the American plan, and it is threatening to go higher. I am just wondering, in view of the fact that we are hoping to benefit more than the American social security measure with paying 7 per cent, whether we will not also be faced with an increasing levy on this 3 per cent plus 4 per cent. These are just some of the reservations that come to mind about this scheme. Generally I must endorse it and say that it is a very welcome measure. I am, with other members, looking forward to seeing the details of the bill and to this end hope that before long it will be referred to the joint committee to which the minister has already made reference.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that a very great deal has been made of the fact that we are now entering into the No. 3 version of the Canada pension plan. The hon. member for Perth made reference to some previous, ill-fated efforts, it seemed to me in an attempt to show that this government had no clear idea what we were trying to achieve. Therefore I would like to review some of the events that led up to introduction of the present plan. The hon. member for Perth also mentioned action taken by the previous administration. I noticed he was very brief in his references to that previous action; as a matter of fact, he seemed to skip over it very hurriedly, and I can certainly understand that.

First, Mr. Chairman, while we realize this is a field of joint federal-provincial jurisdiction, no contributory, portable pension legislation had been proposed by any jurisdiction up to the general election of 1962 and 1963. While the Liberal party and the New Democratic party campaigned extensively on such a platform, no objections were heard at that time from any of the provincial governments. On July 18, 1963, when the Minister of National Health and Welfare outlined in this house what hon. members opposite like to refer to as the first version, we had had at that time the introduction of the Ontario pension plan, which in fact was a plan which regulated private plans in those companies that had 15 or more employees. No one has tried, seriously at least, to argue that the Ontario plan was a solution to the problem, and in fact I think one could say its objectives rather complement the objectives that the present Canada pension plan embodies.

What were the essential features of the July proposals of the minister? The plan was compulsory for employees. It was voluntary

for the self-employed. It provided for portability of pensions anywhere in Canada—as universal a coverage as was administratively possible. It provided for a relatively short maturity period of ten years in an attempt to make some provision for the middle aged and older workers. It provided for a level of benefits varying from between 20 to 30 per cent of earnings, dependant on the retirement age. If we consider the average retirement age at 67½, the benefits proposed were 25 per cent. These rose to 30 per cent at age 70. The maximum pension at age 70 was to be $100 a month plus the $75 flat rate old age security.

The contributions were to be applied to the national average of earnings and were initially to be 1 per cent from the employee and 1 per cent from the employer. These contributions were also to be used to finance the $10 increase in the old age security program. They were also designed to make the plan essentially a pay as you go scheme. We had further protection against inflation by relating benefits to the average level of earnings at the time of retirement. We also had some provision for retirement at age 65 although at a reduced level of benefits. This applied both to the flat rate and to the contributory schemes.

There was also some provision made for survivor benefits after age 65, and the minister at that time offered full co-operation to the provinces—in fact, invited the co-operation of the provinces—in extending this to widows and orphans allowances, as well as disability benefits under the plan.

We all recall, Mr. Chairman, the initial storm that these proposals raised, mainly amongst individuals in the insurance industry. A number of arguments were made to the effect that the plan was too generous, that there would be an interference with the capital formation of our economy, and so on. In addition to this, last September the government of Quebec announced that they were going to set up their own plan and would not participate in the federal scheme. Premier Robarts of Ontario also indicated that he was not too satisfied with the plan, but it seemed to me that his objections took a somewhat different tone. It was my own impression that his objections sounded remarkably like those which emanated from the insurance industry. Other provinces also raised a number of questions, but it became apparent that, with Quebec out, Ontario was essential to the plan. These two provinces represented two thirds of the population in the country and their exclusion would mean violation of one of the fundamental principles of a contributory national portable plan.

Therefore, because of the provinces, and primarily because of Ontario, the pension plan was modified. In an attempt to meet the criticisms particularly of Ontario, the level of benefits was reduced to 20 per cent of earnings at age 70. This was to answer the charges of extravagance and to leave additional room for private plans. The second change was that although the contributions remained at 1 per cent plus 1 per cent, the income ceiling was raised to $4,500. This was frozen, however, for five years in an attempt to facilitate the integration of private plans. Because the $10 increase in old age security had been separated and was to be financed out of other revenues, partial funding was possible. An estimated $2.5 billion was anticipated in the initial ten year period, 50 per cent of which was to be invested in provincial securities. In spite of considerable pressure the maturity period was maintained at ten years, which was a very important feature of the plan.

This was the mark II version, if you will, which was introduced in March 1964, and which was to be the basis of discussion at the federal-provincial conference in April of this year. It was at that conference that the Quebec government revealed the outline of what became known as the Quebec plan. Hon. gentlemen opposite refer to somersaults and retreats. Certainly Premier Robarts of Ontario made in my opinion one of the most spectacular somersaults in recent times. After one look at the Quebec plan's benefits, and more particularly at the funding, he suddenly forgot his basic objection to our original plan and came out for a plan which was in many respects more generous than the original, that had a higher level of contributions and was therefore harder to integrate with existing schemes, and a plan which interfered far more with the flow of savings into private institutions, a fact which he had been very concerned about a few months previously.

I should like to quote from an article by Bruce Macdonald which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of April 14 last concerning this change of attitude on the part of the Ontario government. He said:

> For many months, Premier Robarts pressed to have the Canada pension plan scaled down to a more modest program. Primarily as a result of his adamant stand, the federal government agreed earlier this year to trim the size of benefits and to modify the rate at which the scheme would go into effect.

Canada Pension Plan

Having put legislation before parliament providing for a more modest scheme than originally envisaged, Ottawa now finds the Ontario leader seriously suggesting the possibility that his government will follow Quebec's lead in establishing a provincial pension program that is larger in almost every way.

Then he goes on to quote from a statement by Premier Robarts, as follows:

"One of our main concerns throughout has been the impact of the Canada pension plan on existing private pension plans in this province and the adverse effect on the formation of investment capital upon which the growth of our economy so greatly depends", the premier declared—

"In view of the need for stimulating the growth of private investment capital in Canada, a careful assessment should be made to determine whether the Canada pension plan will swell or diminish the springs of investment capital which are essential for our development", he said.

These were some of the remarks which we were hearing from the government of Ontario up until the federal-provincial conference. I do not want to appear to be involving Premier Robarts on a change of principles. As a matter of fact I should like to commend him. I welcome the change and I think it was very commendable of him to admit error, perhaps, than to stick to a position for the sake of consistency. One essential that Premier Robarts did hold out for from the beginning was a national plan, and for that I think he has many marks due to him.

We had reached therefore in April a point where both Ontario and Quebec were going to set up their own pension schemes, and one of the fundamental requirements, that of portability, was virtually being abandoned as far as nation-wide portability was concerned. It was with these considerations, in mind that our Prime Minister took the initiative in reaching a compromise between our plan, that is the mark II, and the Quebec plan. It must be recalled that these were the only plans which had been produced. Therefore charges that more than one province must be consulted in these matters, such as we have heard recently, are not valid in my opinion.

The hon. member for Perth also referred to "wheeling and dealing" between the federal government and the government of Quebec. I should just like to point out that those were the two plans, or the outlines of the plans, which we had before us at that time, and certainly the negotiations to standardize these had to take place between those two governments. The result of these negotiations, it seemed to me, was a plan which was acceptable to the Ontario government as well as the other provincial governments, and this is the plan which the minister of health outlined today.

[Mr. Moreau.]

There are those who would argue that these negotiations should have been carried out before the introduction of any plan. I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that such a process would have been a very lengthy one indeed, and I feel the course which was followed has produced quicker results and has revealed that this government was prepared to negotiate differences of opinions and to accept changes consistent with the principles originally laid out.

What were these principles which have consistently been adhered to? They are as follows:

1. Nation-wide portability and universal coverage as far as administratively practicable.

2. That the pensions apply up to an average level of earnings.

3. That they be in combination with the O.A.S. flat rates and provide modestly adequate pensions for those who cannot make other provision for their retirement.

4. That they leave scope for further provision for those who can and wish to make their own provision.

5. That they have a moderately short maturity period to include middle aged and older workers.

6. That they be available at age 65.

7. That they provide security in real terms by relating pensions to earnings levels at time of retirement. The minister has announced today that the principle will also be extended to the old age security added bonus.

8. That they provide safeguards so that the benefits cannot be expanded without proper regard to future costs.

In my opinion the present plan meets all of those requirements and indeed bears a striking similarity to the original plan. The level of benefits is back to 25 per cent of earnings and the maximum pension is $104 as against $100, mainly due to the change in the earnings levels to which we are going to apply contributions. The maturity period remains at ten years and the benefits are available at 65.

The essential difference is the initial level of contributions during the first ten years, which has been raised from 1 per cent plus 1 per cent to 1.8 per cent plus 1.8 per cent on earnings between $600 and $5,000. The rate of contributions on the entire income will average out to approximately 1½ per cent plus 1½ per cent. This change in the initial rate allows for a much greater degree of funding than in the original plan, and it

also allows for the inclusion of widows and orphans allowances, survivor and disability benefits. These additions were aimed at in the original plan, but could not be included without provincial agreement and a constitutional amendment.

There are those who will criticize this plan as another give-away scheme, or as being too generous. I should like them to weigh the consequences of doing nothing in this pension field. Governments of Canada in recent years have been exposed to considerable pressure for continuing to increase old age security flat rate pensions. While I certainly endorse any increases that have been made, we must realize that retired couples living in some parts of Canada are not faced with the same living costs, particularly in respect of rents, as others living in some of our more urbanized centres. Therefore, it seems to me essential that we obtain a wage related plan as quickly as possible, so that pensions can be related to the average income of a region.

We now have a plan which I believe meets all our requirements and which will allow Canadians to look toward retirement with confidence and security. I hope that this parliament can overcome our past differences and difficulties and give this far reaching piece of legislation speedy passage and clear sailing through this house.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes left before the conclusion of this debate I should like to make one or two points. A great number of questions that have arisen in our minds have been covered by various hon. members of this committee during the past few hours, and I certainly do not intend to repeat them.

In this party we do feel that the Canada pension plan, and all the details of what is going to be the plan, to be presented to parliament after this resolution stage is passed, in many respects has moved a long way from the original intention; that of having what one may call a universal portable pension plan for Canadians. I note there is a lack of reference to the Canada pension plan as being a portable pension plan. About two years ago the great concern expressed in this house was in respect of pensions being portable, particularly as between industries. There seems now to be a completely new concept of what a Canada pension plan should be.

During those days there was great concern because of the movement of workers from one industry to another, and from one area to another, because of automation and other factors. We are now discussing a Canada pension plan which really has nothing to do with portability from one job to another, and from one area to another.

Mr. Chairman, that being the situation, there are many questions which have arisen in the minds of hon. members which have yet to be answered. In spite of the fact the Minister of National Health and Welfare has been asked on a number of occasions whether or not the province of Ontario has agreed to participate, we are still not aware of the situation. We know that there have been indications that provision will be made for any province to opt out and set up individual plans. On October 22 I asked the Minister of National Health and Welfare whether or not all the provinces with the exception of Quebec had indicated either to her or to the government that they were prepared to participate. She did not give a straightforward answer. She said that all the provinces were represented at the last meeting at which this matter was discussed and that there was no indication from any province of non-participation. I reminded the minister that that was not the question I had asked, and that I had asked her if any province had indicated it was not willing to participate—other than the province of Quebec, which we know is not going to participate. Again she hedged by saying a number of things; she did not answer the question that was asked.

I think we have now reached a stage, by the introduction of this resolution preceding the bill, when we as members of this House of Commons have a right to a forthright answer as to whether or not the province of Ontario is going to participate in this plan. The reason I say that is that the province of Quebec is, not participating, and if the province of Ontario decides not to participate the plan cannot be considered as being national in scope.

By and large I am in favour of having laws passed by the federal government applicable to all Canadians in all parts of Canada. We realize of course that the amendments which were sought to the British North America Act, so that a pension plan could be brought in, require endorsation by all provinces. One of the conditions of agreeing to seek that kind of an amendment was that the provinces would have the right to opt out, if they so chose. It seems to me if we are going to have the two most populous provinces, Ontario and Quebec, representing something in the neighbourhood of 12 million of the 19 million

people, not participating, this House of Commons is wasting its time in dealing with a so-called national pension plan. I say that because if that happens we will have approximately only one third of the population covered by the plan. Perhaps the federal government has been negotiating with the province of Ontario to find out what their position is going to be. Perhaps the federal government has been seeking an indication from them whether or not they are going to participate. In any event, now that we have reached the stage that the resolution has been introduced in this house I think we have a right to know.

There are a number of reasons why I say this. If the province of Ontario is not going to participate I suggest to the Minister of National Health and Welfare that there will be other provinces in addition to Ontario and Quebec which will have very serious reservations about being included in this plan, rather than setting up their own. There is more than one reason for that. One is that we will have lost the national coverage feature. A second is that no answers have been given to the provinces as to how the Canada pension plan is going to be reconciled, for example, with the public service pension plans that some of the provinces are now operating. If there is to be no clearcut reconciliation between these public service plans and the so-called Canada pension plan, then certainly some of these other provinces might just as well set up their own pension plans because they will be in the business of operating and administering a pension plan anyway.

The undesirable feature of belonging to the so-called Canada pension plan and having to operate these other pension plans is that the provinces would then be subjected to the responsibility of administering a plan with regard to which the legislation and the regulations would be under the control of another body than their own legislatures. So it becomes very obvious that, unless there is a clear statement very soon that, first of all, Ontario is going to participate and, second, that there is going to be a reconciliation with some of these other plans that provincial governments are obliged to administer now, many of the desirable features are lost and some of the inherent complexities are perhaps too great for the effort required.

I am going to conclude my remarks now with the hope that the Minister of National Health and Welfare will rise in her place in the next few minutes, take the members of the committee into her confidence and tell them whether or not the province of Ontario is going to participate, and also whether or not there is going to be a general plan with regulations attached to it so that it will be possible for these other public service pension plans to be reconciled with this plan, in order that the provinces will not be in the awkward position of having to operate their own pension plans and also having to do those things necessary to carry out a law enacted in another place.

[Mr. Olson.]

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Miss LaMarsh thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-136, to establish a comprehensive program of old age pensions and supplementary benefits in Canada payable to and in respect of contributors.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): When shall the said bill be read the second time? Next sitting of the house?

Mr. Knowles: Tomorrow.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Next sitting of the house.

DISCHARGE OF BILL ON ORDER PAPER

On the order:

Second reading of Bill C-75, an act to establish a comprehensive program of old age pensions in Canada payable to contributors and survivors—The Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, now the bill concerning the Canada pension plan has received first reading it will be seen that the existing order No. 13 on today's order paper, second reading of Bill No. C-75, an act to establish a comprehensive program of old age pensions and so on, is no longer of great interest to the house—

Mr. Monteith: That is the understatement of the year.

Mr. McIlraith: —and I would ask for unanimous consent for that order to be dropped.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Is it agreed that order No. 13 be dropped?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Order discharged.

AMENDMENT OF MOTION TO APPOINT JOINT COMMITTEE

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the new order in substitution for the order just dropped and referring to the bill which has now been

given first reading will be on the order paper tomorrow. In item No. 17 on today's order paper, the resolution to set up a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to consider the bill, the reference is to the former bill which was introduced some time ago and has now been dropped. I would ask the permission of the house to make a change in the first paragraph of the item so that instead of "Bill C-75" it will now read:

—Bill C-136 to establish a comprehensive program of old age pensions and supplementary benefits in Canada payable to and in respect of contributors.

That is merely substituting the new number for the number of the earlier bill and substituting the exact terminology on the face of the new bill for the terminology that was on the face of the former bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Does the house agree that order No. 17 as it now appears on the order paper be changed to read: "That a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons be appointed to consider Bill C-136 to establish a comprehensive program of old age pensions and supplementary benefits in Canada payable to and in respect of contributors"?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the house leader to tell us what we will be taking up tomorrow and, if possible, on Thursday and Friday?

Mr. Knowles: Did we pass that resolution?

Mr. McIlraith: Not the resolution to set up the committee. I have been asked not to bring it forward for passing tonight.

Mr. Knowles: Why not?

Mr. McIlraith: In any event there is plenty of time to have the committee set up by the time we get second reading.

Mr. Knowles: That is just what I am afraid of.

Mr. McIlraith: I do not think any such suggestion is in order. In any event, the business for tomorrow will be the redistribution bill. While it is true I indicated to the house leaders of the other parties that when that was finished tomorrow we would proceed with the hours of labour bill, in view of the expectation that the redistribution bill will take the greater part of the day I wonder whether we could not proceed with the C.N.R. financing bill, which is order No. 51 on today's order paper. Possibly if that is finished we could take order No. 32, the second reading of Bill No. S-10, to provide for the establishment of harbour commissions, and then order No. 68, second reading of Bill No. S-33, to incorporate the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company. Those are three small bills and I think that arrangement would probably be more agreeable to the house.

Mr. Starr: Is the house leader in a position to give some indication what we may be doing on Thursday and Friday?

Mr. McIlraith: It is the present intention to proceed with estimates on Thursday and Friday. We would propose starting on Thursday with the estimates of those agencies for which the Secretary of State is answerable to the house, namely the C.B.C. and other agencies. I reserve the right to change the order of business on Thursday if there are any new developments tomorrow.

Mr. Grégoire: I wonder if the house leader could also indicate the results of the two by-elections held today?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

AGRICULTURE—REPORTED LOSSES ON CATTLE

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, today during the question period when I directed a question to the Minister of Agriculture asking him to inform the house of the reason why returns to feed lot farmers for feeder cattle have been lower this year than since 1962, he gave me as an answer the prices for choice dry feed cattle instead of for feeder lot cattle, which was incorrect and not based on my question at all.

I take as my authority the information contained in the magazine, *Canadian Cattlemen* in its November, 1964 issue. In it there is a table headed "Estimated Returns from Feeding" which gives the comparison prices for the years 1960-61, 1961-62, 1962-63 and 1963-64. From the last column in this table for the year 1963-64 it is seen that the return to the farmer, after all expenses counted, was a loss of $14.08 per head. This is based on a 700 pound feeder steer which the farmer buys in the fall and on a 1,000 pound steer which he markets in the winter or spring.

In 1960-61 his profit was $28.63 at a time when the cost of the feeder steer was $196 and when he could sell it for $225. In 1962-63 the farmer lost 0.24 cents but in the previous year, 1961-62, his profit was $23.84.

When the Minister of Agriculture contradicts these tables presented by the *Canadian Cattlemen* magazine he either does not want to admit that farmers during the last two years, since he became Minister of Agriculture, have sustained severe losses in the cattle market—and this applies also to chickens and turkeys—or he is not familiar with what is going on in these markets. Perhaps he figures that the farmers cannot calculate for themselves when they sustain losses or when they make profits. He should pay more attention to what is going on in these markets and should help bring about a situation in which the farmer can make some profit out of his farming enterprise.

That is all I have to say at the present time, but I am sure it will not be long before I have something else to discuss with the Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): I wonder sometimes where hon. members opposite get some of the information they try to peddle in here. The facts are available to anyone, even to members of the opposition who are really interested in facts and not partisan fancies.

Earlier today the hon. member claimed that feeder cattle have been selling for $14 per head lower than last year. I quoted him the actual market figures which showed that there was less than a cent a point difference between this year's prices and last year's prices. I do not want to suggest that everything is perfect in the beef business today: I would like the hon. member to show me any business anywhere, where everything is perfect.

I have a few facts which indicate beyond any argument that our beef business, like virtually every other business in Canada lately, is enjoying one of the best years in a long time, certainly better than any year between 1957 and 1963. In the first half of 1964 our gross national product was 8 per cent higher than in the first half of 1963. The index of industrial production for the first seven months was 9 per cent higher. All of this has contributed to a 13 per cent reduction in unemployment during the first nine months of this year. Agriculture and the beef business have enjoyed the benefits of this unprecedented prosperity along with other sections of our national economy. It now appears likely that Canadians will use over one and one quarter billion pounds of beef this year. This is about 9 per cent more than last year and 27 per cent more than during the six years from 1957 to 1962. We have achieved this in spite of obstacles which even the miracle men of the Diefenbaker administration would have had trouble overcoming.

This has been achieved despite the fact our cattle population was 4 per cent higher than in 1963; despite the fact our feeder cattle exports for the first nine months were only 20,000 head compared to 54,000 head during the same period in 1963, and despite the fact our imports of beef were almost double our exports. These are the facts, and I think it is dangerously close to being irresponsible to try to paint a picture of disaster for our beef producers when this is simply not the case. I can think of nothing that would bring trouble to our beef industry faster, in fact, than if our producers should take this kind of wild statement seriously. Fortunately they know better.

But I do not want to suggest that the government is not concerned about the beef industry today. We are well aware that because of the present large beef population in the United States our prices are once more being influenced by the price for Canadian beef on the American export market. Because of the health of our economy, for the first time in many years our beef prices earlier this year were higher than the American price. Our beef market has now returned more nearly to normal. Export prices once more are tending to determine the price on our domestic market.

I can assure hon. members that the government is very much aware of the situation and that it has every intention of taking steps to keep our beef industry in a healthy condition should the situation deteriorate. But a lot of loose talk is not going to help one bit.

Mr. Rapp: Tell that to the marines, not to members of parliament.

AGRICULTURE—STEPS TO IMPROVE POSITION OF EASTERN FARMERS

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): I was very interested in hearing the minister's prepared statement, particularly as he began by saying he wondered where we were getting "the sort of stuff we were peddling". I only have to remind him that a week ago or a little longer—as a matter of fact it was on October 27—I put on record a letter from a

beef producer in my constituency. This letter I think supports in no uncertain terms the point of view put forward by my hon. friend.

The minister made a very definite statement out west about what he intended to do about this. He said a lot about the new agriculture policy he intended to bring in. But today, in the question period, the only people he mentioned were the milk producers. Well, we know they are doing all right. But how many farmers can get milk contracts? Very few.

The minister says things are much better now than they were between 1957 and 1962. That seems strange. This is in the Toronto *Star* of October 30, 1964. The minister said:

I think the last Liberal government had forgotten the farmers during its declining years—

Then he said:

I'll even go further—I think that on the basis of its record with our farmers—

If I may paraphrase it, Mr. Speaker, he thought our policy was a very good policy. Those are the minister's own words. But that is not why I rose this evening. The minister referred to my hon. friend's statement as being vile; he used that very word. Let me quote from the d.b.s. figures published by its agricultural division, where it is stated that six out of nine provinces—and mostly eastern, of course—were all lower in income at the end of 1963; and I understand the situation has deteriorated this year. If that is an improvement, he is going to have to show me where the improvement is—and if I am peddling trash he had better get in touch with d.b.s. and make that statement to them.

I have been responsible for raising the question of turkeys in this house on many occasions. I had the turkey producers at my home this past week end, and they told me that if the minister and the government do not take some action by the middle of November, their market to make anything whatsoever this year is lost—that is in connection with the importation of turkeys from the United States—because, as the minister will know better than I, around the middle of this month the freezer stocks are put on the market for the year-end business that is apt to accrue to these turkey producers. I will read their statement into the record. The minister has these publications; there is no question about that. In their summing up the Canadian turkey federation had this to say to the minister:

Due to the hardship being experienced right now by many of our growers due to the unprofitable market, we strongly urge the implementation of some measure—

Anything; they will grasp at any straw:

—as above or within the scope of the government, to bring immediate market improvement during the balance of the fast approaching main marketing season of 1964.

Then the last sentence reads:

Otherwise, later help developed from the foregoing recommendations may be too late to save many of our growers.

They said the same thing in a previous petition to the government. Surely the minister is well aware of what the situation is, and we are not exaggerating it; we only want to bring to his attention that it is deteriorating and the income of the eastern farmers is declining. I went on to say in a previous statement—I do not know whether the minister was here—that ever since his party has been in office the income of the eastern producers has been going down, down, down. I said it at that time and I meant it. I have this letter here. I do not want to read it again, but there is no question about the situation; the income of this farmer is down in every phase of his operation. The figures are here and the minister can read them if he wants to do so. This is caused by the increase in price of the things the man has to buy, compared with the profit he makes, which is diminishing. He concludes by saying:

With prices like this and the high cost of labour, machinery, taxes (etc.), which you know as much about as I do, how in the world is the farmer going to exist?

This man is a very good, knowledgeable farmer; he belongs to all the organizations that can assist him—and he is complaining bitterly about the lack of government action to support the eastern producers. If the minister is not convinced he should go directly into the rural areas of eastern Canada and western Ontario, where my constituency in fact is, and they will tell him. If he does not know this, there is no sense talking to him any longer.

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, to start with I am a little tired of all the doom crying we keep hearing from the opposition about the plight of the eastern farmer. If the Tories are really as seriously concerned as they try to make out, why did they not do something for eastern farmers? After all, they had six years and the biggest majority in history. We have only had about 18 months to work on these problems, but in going through the record I find it would be impossible to do justice to

what has already been achieved by the present government, in the limited time at my disposal.

In the dairy industry, for example, our policies have reduced the exorbitantly expensive surplus of butter to normal supply levels. The skim milk market has been stabilized and producers prices have been pushed to near record levels. We are having the highest production of cheese in eastern Canada that there has been in 15 years and more of this than ever before is quality cheese. We managed to get a 20 per cent increase in the American quota on Canadian cheese exports. As the president of the national dairy council, Mr. J. M. Hartwick, said recently, "The dairy industry is enjoying the strongest sales position in many years."

Yet while our dairy farmers' incomes have increased we have reduced the cost of the dairy stabilization program. For the first six months of this year returns to eastern farmers from dairy products were $10 million higher than for the first six months of last year. Here are the figures for the dairy products for the first six months in 1963 and in 1964:

	1963 $ Million	1964 $ Million
Prince Edward Island	1.6	2.2
Nova Scotia	5.7	5.8
New Brunswick	5.1	5.4
Quebec	72.6	74.6
Ontario	93.4	100.4

It is widely recognized that one of the big problems in eastern agriculture arises from the fact that many of our farms are too small to be economic. The government has recognized this pressing need for our eastern farmers to expand their operations by greatly increasing the credit facilities our farmers need for this expansion. We have doubled the amount available from the Farm Credit Corporation. We have doubled the amount available under the Farm Improvement Loans Act. And we have introduced a totally new form of farm credit under the Farm Machinery Syndicates Act, an unsubsidized program that makes it possible for farmers in every part of Canada to reduce their machinery costs by two thirds or more. It is the direct responsibility of provincial governments to provide farmers with crop insurance. But we have done everything we could by providing crop reinsurance, or disaster protection, for the provinces, to encourage provincial governments to provide this important income stabilizer for farmers in all parts of the country.

We have heard a lot from opposition benches about the need to do something about eastern feed grain. The previous government had six years and did nothing. But within three months of taking office the present government introduced a policy of supporting winter storage costs which has stabilized both the supply and the price of western feed grain used by eastern producers. I could go on but my time is running out.

What disturbs me most about the distortion and misrepresentation which we hear so often about our eastern agricultural problems is that this sort of approach can only make the problems of eastern farmers worse. This can only confuse eastern farmers and mislead them into thinking their problems are one thing when they are really something else. This may very well make the problems worse than they are by convincing the farmers that they are worse off than they are. Any suggestion that eastern farmers are at a disadvantage as compared to western farmers just does not hold water when you look at the facts. Farmers in Ontario and Quebec are from 1,500 to 2,500 miles closer to the main markets of Toronto and Montreal, which gives the eastern farmer a natural advantage. Farm machinery prices are lower in the east than the west. For example the freight rate on a ten-foot heavy duty cultivator from Brantford is something like $50 to Regina, $55 to Swift Current but only $18 to Montreal. I think discussion and criticism of government policies in this house can be very helpful in letting the people know what is going on. But it should be informed and factual discussion, not misleading partisan wrangling which can only confuse the people.

Mr. Winkler: Now tell us about the turkeys.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.21 p.m.

APPENDIX

COMMUNIQUÉ FOLLOWING OTTAWA MEETING ON PEACE KEEPING OPERATIONS

A meeting of military experts to consider the technical aspects of United Nations peace keeping operations took place in Ottawa from November 2-6 inclusive at the invitation of the government of Canada. Commodore R. W. Murdoch of Canada acted as chairman. Representatives from the following countries attended: Brazil, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, Ghana, India, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Liberia, Malaysia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Tunisia, United Arab Republic. Major-General Indar Rikhye, military adviser to the secretary general of the United Nations, attended the meeting as an observer.

Three working groups were established. Group 1, under the chairmanship of General Kittani, Morocco, (vice chairman Major General Kaldager, Norway) studied the questions of composition, command, control and liaison, training and operational problems. Group 2, under the chairmanship of Major General Ankrah, Ghana, (vice chairman Colonel Amati, Italy) studied questions relating to environmental operating information and logistic support. Group 3, under the chairmanship of Mr. B. C. Mishra, India, (vice chairman Mr. O. Bierring, Denmark), studied personnel administration, public relations, accounting procedures, and legal problems.

The chairmen of the working groups reported to the delegates on the work of their groups at the final plenary session, following which there was discussion of some of the points made in the reports.

The meeting did not attempt to reach formal conclusions on the items discussed. However, delegates hoped that the exchange of views, both written and oral, would contribute to the effectiveness of such national forces as might be made available to the United Nations in the future and had therefore served the general purpose of strengthening the capacity of participating nations to support the United Nations to engage in peace keeping operations.

The meeting expressed its gratitude to the government of Canada for its invaluable assistance in the operation of the meeting.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 10, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. KNOWLES—PEGGING OF OLD AGE SECURITY PENSIONS TO COST OF LIVING INDEX

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege affecting not only all the members of this house but more than a million Canadians. It may be that my point of privilege is due to a misprint in a document which I have in my hand. If so that can be corrected without delay. On the other hand, if what I have in my hand is correct I think other steps should be taken. Yesterday in the course of her remarks to this house the Minister of National Health and Welfare used these words:

> —all future old age security pensions will be pegged to the cost of living index and will increase automatically if living costs increase.

Later she said:

> —this will provide not only a greater measure of security but will also protect the real value of the pension dollar for Canada's million-odd pensioners.

We were given no details, but what the minister said was spoken in the present tense. When we got the bill last night after the debate was over we learned that the possible increase due to this adjustment cannot be received by any person drawing old age security until 1968, and that the possible amount of increase in 1968 is 75 cents.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Knowles: It might be $1.50; it might be nothing; probably it will be 75 cents. I submit, from looking at the bill, that this could well be a misprint. If so I trust it will be corrected. If not I trust that the Liberal party, which found out that six bucks was not good enough in 1957, will not try six bits in 1968.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, on the particular point I should hasten to say to the chamber that this is not a misprint; that the address I made yesterday was on the resolution preceding Bill No. C-136, and this was known by all hon. members to be the case. All the remarks I made at that time have reference to that particular bill. Since last August it has been known by the members of this chamber and members of the public that the initial coming into effect of the bill was not anticipated to be until January 1, 1966. Within the bill there is provision for commencement, on a number of dates subsequent to that date, of benefits which will accrue to contributors and survivors; that also in the bill is indicated the initial tying to an index figure, something to take into account the increases, if any, which take place over a certain period of time which are then calculated for a two year period. There was no attempt to mislead the chamber or the public at large; that the amendments to the old age security act which are incorporated as part of Bill C-136 would come into effect at any point of time earlier than the main provisions of the Canada pension plan.

In so far as my hon. friend's suggestion that the original increase would be 75 cents or $1.50, it should be noted that use of an index is a departure, and it is the first time an index has been used for any payment in this country. My hon. friend and his party, as well as other hon. members opposite, enthusiastically accepted this last night, and indeed have heretofore urged such an inclusion in government legislation. My hon. friend now sounds as if he is unhappy that one of the matters which he himself has urged has been adopted by the government.

It should not be forgotten that the index which is to be attached to the old age security payments is to bring them into line with the index which is attached to pension payments under the Canada pension plan proper. Nothing in the proposed old age security amendments deals with the base rate of $75 a month which this government introduced a year ago and which was unanimously approved by the house. Nor is anything in this bill intended to exclude any future action by any parliament with respect to that base.

This is a very major, very far reaching and sweeping change in social legislation in this country, Mr. Speaker, and indeed commences

in a responsible way by tying the plan to the index at the time at which it comes into operation. I suppose my hon. friend in the flush of yesterday's by-election victory, which he should regard really as a victory against the Conservative party and not otherwise, now seeks to make political capital out of something which he has generously, and I think sincerely, long since accepted as a really major step forward. I would ask my hon. friend and all hon. members of the house to bear in mind that in the usual spirit of Canadian fiscal responsibility we are beginning this experiment in a relatively modest manner.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, for obvious reasons I will not attempt to debate this matter at this point.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Knowles: But, Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, the Minister of National Health and Welfare made one statement concerning me which is not correct. I have not been an advocate of pegging the old age pension to the cost of living index. I have been an advocate of raising the absolute amount.

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, since the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre apparently had a copy of the bill to which we gave first reading last night, may I ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare if she will undertake to make sure that the other members of the house are supplied with copies before the day is out?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I had about 100 copies here last night, and I assume those have gone somewhere. I believed each member would have received one this morning, but some members tell me they did not get them. I have just checked and I am told it was not possible to print more than the original 100 until a number was given to the bill, and by virtue of its length it is not likely members will have copies before Thursday.

There are 100-odd copies in existence, but I apologize to the house because the rest will not be available before Thursday morning in either language.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): As a supplementary question, would the minister give consideration to having this cost of living bonus for old age security pensioners brought in by amendments to the old age security legislation so it could become effective immediately and could be based on the cost of living as of October, 1963, when the last increase was granted? It seems to me this would be a much more rational approach to the whole problem rather than having to wait until the Canada pension plan becomes effective.

Miss LaMarsh: Well, Mr. Speaker, the last 20-odd clauses of the Canada pension plan bill are an amendment to the Old Age Security Act, and as this bill has received first reading it is further advanced than any other legislation which could possibly be introduced.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister of Veterans Affairs was able, after consultation, to amend his announcement, would the minister have similar consultation to see if she cannot get this bonus amended and back dated?

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, my colleague did not amend his announcement. He simply did not disclose in the first part the effective date, but he did so subsequently in response to a question.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INCREASES IN PENSIONS AND ALLOWANCES

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on October 30 I informed the house that there would be an announcement of government proposals to increase pensions and war veterans allowances. In conformity with that statement I am now able to make the following announcement.

There will be brought before the house at the earliest opportunity a supplementary estimate that will enable an across the board increase in disability pensions payable under the Pension Act of approximately 10 per cent, and a similar increase to pensions awarded to widows and dependent children. I am sure the house will agree that this increase in pension rates is warranted.

I am pleased to announce that the supplementary estimates will include an amount which will permit an increase in the attendance allowance from the present maximum of $1,800 a year to a maximum $3,000 a year. There will also be increases in the allowances such as for wear and tear of clothing, which are also authorized by the

Pension Act under certain circumstances. It is estimated that the additional annual cost of these pension increases, based on the present number of pensioners, will be about $17 million, and the annual cost of increasing the attendance allowance will be some $500,000.

The other important matter to which I wish to refer is the proposal of the government to increase war veterans allowances. In reaching a decision on the appropriate amount of these increases we have taken into consideration the recommendations that have been made by veterans organizations. It is proposed to increase the maximum monthly rate of war veterans allowances for a single person to $94 and for a person paid at the married rate to $161 a month, with corresponding adjustments in the rates paid to orphans.

In considering appropriate adjustments in the maximum income ceilings under the War Veterans Allowance Act we have also considered the recommendations received from organized veterans. We have decided that any adjustments in the ceilings should remove the anomaly that at present exists with respect to the ceiling applicable to veterans and widows below age 70 and the ceiling above age 70, where the recipient is in receipt of an old age security pension. At present a recipient over that age is in effect allowed a ceiling, if payment is at the single rate, of $240 a year higher than if he or she were under age 70 and, if payment is at the married rate and the husband and wife are both over age 70, the difference is $480 a year.

In order to provide a ceiling in accordance with the recommendations we have received, and to remove this anomaly, but nevertheless ensure that every recipient will enjoy some increase, including the proposed disability pension increase, we are proposing that the annual income ceilings be raised to $1,596 for a single recipient and to $2,664 where the recipient is paid at the married rate.

I should also mention that corresponding increases in rates and changes in income ceilings will apply as well to those who are in receipt of allowances under the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act. These increases and changes under both acts will also be accomplished by means of a supplementary estimate. It is estimated that these proposed increases in rates and the ceiling adjustments under the War Veterans Allowance Act and the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act will result in an additional expenditure of about $16,250,000 a year.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, this statement will be welcomed by members of the house as an indication of the recognition that the welfare of Canada's veterans is of responsible concern to all of us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, this is a much delayed announcement on the part of the minister with regard to a proposed increase in disability pensions and war veterans allowances.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: It has taken the minister and the government a year and a half to come to this decision, although representations were made to them frequently over the period to get busy and do something for the veterans.

An hon. Member: Why didn't you do something?

Mr. Churchill: Somebody says why didn't we do it. We gave two increases with regard to pensions and war veterans allowances, each to the extent of 20 per cent, making a total 40 per cent increase in these pensions and allowances. This is only a 10 per cent increase. What puzzles me is why the minister did not have this ready when the standing committee on veterans affairs was examining the estimates of his department. Why did he not have this ready when his estimates were before the house a few days ago? We were put off and delayed, but now his statement reads that a supplementary estimate will be brought before the house at the earliest opportunity.

What is the earliest opportunity? It is right now. Why does the minister not say when this will be brought forward? Does this mean next January or February, or now in the month of November? This is what should have been said in his statement, not this ambiguous phrase "at the earliest opportunity."

On many occasions we have indicated our interest in such an increase for war veterans, and we are certainly glad that the government has finally moved in this direction. However, I am sorry it has taken it so long simply to make this announcement without setting an actual date when the increase will come into effect. If the supplementary estimate is brought before us this week we will pass it this week and thus let the veterans have their cheques before Christmas.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Veterans Pensions Increase

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying, "Once bitten, twice shy". Therefore I am not going to hasten to welcome the government's announcement until we know when the government proposes to implement it. Are these increases going to be effective on January 1 or December 1? When will they be effective?

The minister says he is going to bring in a supplementary estimate to cover the increases. So far as this party is concerned, if the minister will bring in that estimate we will undertake to see it is passed, so far as we are able, the same day it is introduced. There ought to be some date mentioned in this statement. There is no reason why the increases should not be payable at the end of November, but this announcement without any supplementary estimates accompanying it leads us to suspect that there may be further delaying tactics. Therefore we would like a great deal more information.

If I could have the minister's attention I would like to ask him when this additional payment in both veterans pensions and allowances will become effective, and when does he intend to bring down the supplementary estimate? If we had that information the house would be more satisfied, and certainly the veterans and the widows who will benefit from this increase would also be more satisfied.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this party may I say we welcome the announcement that there is to be some upward revision in war veterans allowances and disability pensions, but we are concerned about the fact that the effective date was omitted from the statement the minister has just made.

Without going into a lot of detail on whether or not this is a satisfactory increase I simply say we welcome the fact that there is to be one and that it has been announced at this time, despite the fact that the minister has been promising it for something like 18 months. Again may I say we would be very interested in knowing what will be the anticipated effective date.

Mr. Teillet: If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I can indicate to the house the date of the introduction of the supplementary estimate, but I can assure the house that the recommendation in it will be to make these rates effective as of September 1, 1964.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Churchill.]

Mr. Peters: That is a pretty sloppy announcement, if you are just making it now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I preferred waiting for the answer of the Minister of Veterans Affairs before making remarks on this question, on behalf of our group, after the objections which were raised by the spokesmen of certain opposition parties.

We were happy to hear the minister state that this increase would be retroactive to September 1, 1964.

Under the circumstances, we must congratulate the government for announcing increases in favour of veterans. However, I wish to add that the veterans must really benefit from those increases. At the present time many veterans are applying for pensions. They are examined by Department of Veterans Affairs' physicians or in hospitals maintained by the department, they are granted a very low rate of invalidity, and thus, despite the increases they will receive, their pensions will still remain very low.

On the other hand, if veterans are examined in other hospitals than those maintained by the department, by physicians holding the same qualifications as those of the department, then their rate of invalidity is higher than the one which was determined by the Department of Veterans Affairs' physicians or hospitals.

In fact, a physician who is a member of the War Veterans Allowance Board told me that the laboratory material used in the Chicoutimi hospital was not sufficiently modern, while we know very well that the Chicoutimi hospital is one of the most modern in Canada.

I would like to point out to the minister and his officials, and more particularly to those who determine the rate of invalidity of veterans, that it is not sufficient to allow increases to veterans, but that one must also be fair toward them.

They must accept the advice and recommendations of Canadian hospitals and doctors, so that the veterans may get decent and honourable pensions. They should at least be permitted to benefit from the increases announced today, and no attempt should be made to reduce the amount they are receiving by reducing the percentage of disability, as it is regularly done at the present time.

[*Text*]

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed

to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and arises out of the statement he made today regarding amendments to veterans legislation. Will the minister consider assisting that forgotten and neglected section of our society, the needy widows of deceased veterans who were drawing pensions and were classified as less than 50 per cent disabled? These widows receive nothing from the government, and are destitute.

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, may I advise my hon. friend that there are a number of further amendments in process of preparation, amendments which will require the introduction of bills, and we decided to go ahead with the increases announced today rather than wait for these others which will be introduced in due course in the normal way. The reason for proceeding in this fashion is to make the new rates quickly effective.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the minister, he has not given an answer to my question. May I have this debated at ten o'clock this evening?

LABOUR RELATIONS

RELATIONSHIP OF S.I.U. TO LIBERAL PARTY —MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, at what I consider to be the invitation of the Prime Minister yesterday with respect to making a motion to adjourn the house under standing order 26, I do so now in the light of the evident failure of the government to take the responsibility that is properly theirs by placing before the house the whole of the affairs surrounding the activities of the trustees of the maritime union; surrounding the circumstances of the departure from Canada of Mr. Banks and the failure of the government law agencies of Canada to locate him; the circumstances surrounding allegations made in national press articles which implicate Liberal members of parliament and the Liberal government as a whole, implications which if they are well founded may well cause the seats that those members are holding to be occupied improperly. I believe, under the provisions of the Canada Elections Act, that if offences have been committed of the nature implied in these articles, then the seats of these members today are void.

The tentacles of Mr. Banks and the S.I.U. seem to be involving ever more Liberal members of parliament. The most recent one, and the case which I think underlines the need for an urgent and immediate study of this problem by the government, is that of the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Basford) who was implicated by name and by riding in a news broadcast this morning. Since lunch time that hon. member has given an interview to Vancouver radio station CKNW and admitted that he had in fact received help from the S.I.U. This was following a story yesterday by CKNW reporter Ed Murphy. He is the first Liberal member who has had the courage to come forward and admit his complicity. This in itself emphasizes the need for a detailed and immediate investigation into such situations.

I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams)—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Grafftey: Why the nervous laughter?

Mr. Nielsen: Members opposite are obviously taking this matter very lightly. They are trying to cover up their sins. But I wonder who they expected to second the motion?

An hon. Member: Nobody.

Mr. Nielsen: I ask leave, therefore, seconded by the hon. member for Bow River to move the adjournment of this house in accordance with standing order 26 in order to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely:

That it is imperative in the public interest and in the interest of the maintenance of law and order in Canada to proceed forthwith into a full inquiry of the influence exercised by Hal Banks and/or the seafarers international union over the Liberal government and into the activities of the board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions particularly in the light of recent statements in the press that

1. "Certain people in the government made a deal with Hal Banks to get him out of Canada". (Toronto *Star*, October 2, 1964)

2. The questionable allowance by former minister of citizenship and immigration, Hon. Walter Harris of an appeal by Hal Banks against a deportation order made June 30, 1964. (Toronto *Star*, October 2, 1964).

3. The payment of moneys by Hal Banks and/or the seafarers international union to Liberal candidates and/or Liberal members of this house and the acceptance of such moneys by Liberal candidates who subsequently sat or are sitting as Liberal members of this house. (Toronto *Star*, November 6, 1964).

And in the light of the continued obvious reluctance and refusal of the government to allow these and all matters affecting the relationship of the government with Hal Banks and the seafarers international union to be exposed to the scrutiny and judgment of the people of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Time.

Mr. Woolliams: May I, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Pearson: Are you going to permit intervention in this discussion by the hon. member before you take cognizance of this motion, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Under the new rules of the house as given to me it is my duty to ask for comments from a few members who may wish to speak to this motion, as to whether the house should be adjourned under standing order 26. After I have had the advantage of listening to a few arguments both for and against, it will be my duty to reach a decision.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The hon. member who moved this motion was permitted to go into great detail as to the substance of his alleged charges. I can understand the hon. member raising the question of the S.I.U. today because today, of all days, for them it is any port in a storm.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What about the union candidate?

Mr. Pearson: Of course the motion has no urgency attached to it, and it is doubtful whether it has any importance. But if hon. gentlemen opposite wish to take it seriously and have a discussion and really go into this matter, I suggest we call motion No. 82 at once and pass it without debate. Then we shall have the opportunity to call the trustees as witnesses before the committee and the whole question can be gone into. This would be the best test of the good faith of members opposite.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): I think the only problem the Chair might have concerns the question of urgency; and "urgency" means urgency of debate. It is a question whether we should postpone the usual business of the house and discuss something urgent or not.

I have heard the Secretary of State for External Affairs, when he used to sit on this side of the house, quote Beauchesne on occasions such as this. It might be refreshing to quote from one of the English authorities. I have here Erskine May's treatise on the law, privileges, proceedings and usage of parliament. The following appears on page 300 in reference to standing order 9 of the British house, which is the same as our standing order 26:

> Under special restrictions laid down in standing order No. 9, a motion for the adjournment of the house may be moved by a private member "for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance". The rule is designed to give the discussion of some recently occurring matter of emergency precedence over the program of business arranged for the sitting.

Why is there urgency of debate in connection with this matter? The last time such a motion was moved—today, of course, we have new facts and it is a brand new motion—the Secretary of State for External Affairs was acting prime minister and he promised us that the estimates of the Department of Justice would be brought in on the following Thursday. I am not being critical of the hon. gentleman personally, but they came in on Wednesday after a long question period, with the result that we were denied the privilege of discussing this topic adequately. This was the reason you gave in the course of your judgment setting the motion aside; that we would have the estimates before us on Thursday. Instead we got them on another day, on Wednesday. We have called upon the Minister of Labour, the Prime Minister and others in the government asking that the trustees for the S.I.U. be brought before a committee, but we were never given a real answer in this regard.

This is a further reason why there is urgency attached to debate. I say to the Minister of Justice there is a definite erosion of the rule of law. There is a breakdown of the whole moral fibre of the government as far as this matter is concerned, and on this ground I say there is urgency, that there is an emergency, and that this question should be discussed. I think it is more important than the question of redistribution, more important than the flag; because if the rule of law is eroded the fundamental principle of democracy is eroded.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to give this motion very careful consideration and to rule in the affirmative.

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Before I comment on the question of urgency, let me say this. I assume the Prime Minister has made a serious offer with regard to motion No. 82. I believe, by virtue of his position as leader of the government, he has the opportunity to have this motion moved if the house gives unanimous consent. We are certainly prepared to give that consent.

There is a qualification which I would make. I took it from the Prime Minister's statement that he thought this whole matter of political contributions could be aired in this committee. I suggest the terms of reference would not allow this to be done, nor

would it seem to me a very fruitful field for a parliamentary committee to get into.

As to the question of urgency of debate as it relates to the contributions to Liberal candidates which have recently been revealed, we feel in our party that this is a problem for the government and a problem for parliament. In so far as the facts are concerned, I would say that almost everyone in our group has been aware of this information for some months, and it hardly seems to us that there is the kind of urgency that our friends on the right are putting forward.

We would like to suggest, therefore, that there is not urgency of debate in regard to this matter; although having said that, we feel there is still a problem—and, we think, a moral problem—for all of us in politics in the revelations with regard to these contributions.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, the question before the house and for your consideration before making a decision is whether there is urgency of debate respecting the matters that have been raised in the motion moved by the hon. member for Yukon. It seems to me it would be a very useful exercise for a committee of this House of Commons to consider the whole matter of the disclosure of election campaign funds, and I would certainly support that kind of exercise undertaken by a committee of the house. Whether we should single out alleged wrongdoing or misfeasance by accepting this motion, and leave all the other matters out, is another question.

I think, too, we will have to take into consideration that there has already been at least one, and I think more than one, day of debate in this house on the estimates of the Department of Justice, when all the matters that are now included in the motion before the house could have been debated. Whether this matter had been drawn to the attention of the mover and seconder of the motion at that time, I am not sure; but I do believe that all these alleged acts about which hon. members now seem to think there is urgency of debate were in fact known prior to those days when there was debate in this house on those estimates. Therefore in so far as urgency of debate on this particular day is concerned, I really do not accept that as a valid argument. We know, for example, that citation 100 of Beauchesne, paragraph 2, says:

> The "definite matter of urgent public importance", for the discussion of which the adjournment of the house may be moved under standing order 26, must be so pressing that public interest will suffer if it is not given immediate attention.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if that argument is valid today certainly it must also have been valid on those days when the estimates of the Department of Justice were called; and I do not believe that the allegations now made in the motion were aired at that time. I would like to say, in addition, that in so far as this party is concerned, we would like to take into consideration the suggestion of the Prime Minister in asking for unanimous consent to debate item No. 82 on the order paper, when all these matters could be raised. As far as we are concerned we do not see that there is urgency of debate on this particular day with regard to the allegations made.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, as far as the adjournment of our business is concerned, the subject of this motion should be important and urgent.

Is the subject important? It certainly is. However, not to the extent of foregoing a whole day's discussion of other bills in order to deal with it. The importance of the debate should be related to the general source of the money made available to the old political parties rather than to the amounts allotted to individual contenders for parliament.

To my mind, it is more important to investigate the source of election funds, not only with regard to the Liberal, but also to the Conservative party, because we might discover some interesting facts on that side too. It might be in order also to find out where the New Democratic party gets its funds because it is said that the labour unions support that party financially and the members of those labour unions might be surprised to find out that they can afford to give large amounts to the Canadian socialists.

As far as we are concerned, Mr. Speaker, our election funds come from the hat passed at election rallies.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Grégoire: Now, Mr. Speaker, is such a debate urgent? In my opinion, a debate becomes urgent when those who want to discuss a matter have all the facts. Well, we do not have the facts, all we have is a statement to the effect that some hon. members allegedly received $6,000 from a labour union and that other labour unions allegedly gave other amounts to other people. But we still do not know the names, nor do we know the

facts. This is why I believe the Prime Minister's suggestion to refer this matter to the committee on industrial relations, under order No. 82, would be a generally acceptable solution.

However, I believe there is an even better solution. Yesterday, in reply to a question put by the Leader of the Opposition, the Prime Minister stated that Wednesday, that is tomorrow, we would have the opportunity of discussing a motion for the production of papers; but since the house will not sit tomorrow, and thus debate on the production of these documents will be delayed for eight days, would the Prime Minister be willing to request unanimous consent of the house to vote immediately and without debate on the production of these documents? The members would then have all the documents before them immediately, which would facilitate matters.

Since members of the house are involved, a third method would be to refer everything to the privileges and elections committee, inasmuch as they are being charged with having accepted $1,000 from the S.I.U., and it is because of this electoral contribution that they are now trying to protect Hal Banks. Therefore, the third solution, which would be preferable to a debate on a matter of urgent public importance, would be to refer the matter to the committee on privileges and elections.

Those are three methods which would be preferable to the motion of the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). I feel that it is now the duty of the Prime Minister to take the initiative and decide which one of these three solutions should apply to the problem facing us at the present time.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to decide whether the motion as presented by the hon. member for Yukon under standing order 26 should be accepted. It is alleged that there is urgency in this matter. It seems to me that mention in the newspapers during the last few days, weeks or even months does not make a matter that much more urgent. It is not made more urgent just because it is mentioned in the newspapers. I do not see that there is that urgency which demands that the business of the house be set aside and this matter be debated at this time. My opinion is confirmed even more if one takes into account item No. 82 on the order paper at the present time, which in any event should certainly provide an occasion for airing this matter if that is the intention.

It seems to me this matter is more in the nature of a question of privilege, but under standing order 26(6) (e) the motion must not raise a question of privilege. Therefore in my opinion it is faulty on that ground. I must come to the conclusion that there is no real urgency in this question and that opportunity to debate the question in an effective way will be provided in due course. Therefore, with regret, I cannot accept the motion.

Mr. Nielsen: May I rise on a question affecting the order of business of the house. Since the Prime Minister has made the offer and since all parties appear to be in agreement, can the house now be asked by unanimous consent to proceed—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member is raising a question or asking a question at this time he is completely out of order; he must know that.

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the offer made by the Prime Minister and the apparent unanimous agreement of the house in this respect, will the Prime Minister request His Honour to revert to motions or adopt other procedure which would allow the house to proceed forthwith with motion No. 82 on the order paper in order to permit discussion of this whole matter?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if the house agrees unanimously that motion No. 82 should be called now and that it should be passed without debate so the standing committee on industrial relations are empowered to hear the board of trustees, I would be very glad to bring it forward. But I would not bring it forward to have it used by the opposition as an excuse to spend the rest of the day talking about their allegations and charges at the expense of important legislation.

Mr. Nielsen: A further supplementary question. Would the Prime Minister personally inquire into the admission of the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard with respect to the so-called allegations?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to discuss that matter with my hon. friend. I would also be very glad to discuss

with my hon. friend who raised the question the matter of campaign funds in his constituency.

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): A supplementary question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the house will not be sitting tomorrow, and in view of the fact that the Prime Minister mentioned yesterday that notices of motions for production of papers which are on the order paper would be dealt with on Wednesday, would the Prime Minister now consider approving the production of papers asked for in motion No. 186 today?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, that would, of course, be completely out of order. I regret that when I mentioned this matter yesterday I did forget that tomorrow the house will not be sitting. However, this matter will come up a week from tomorrow and can be dealt with then. As it concerns a matter which has been under consideration now for a couple of years, perhaps one week's delay will not be fatal.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the Prime Minister would consider that there are other motions under that heading which might be a little more urgent than this red herring which is being dragged across the trail now.

Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do agree with that.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—SPEECH BY FOREIGN AFFAIRS MINISTER RESPECTING UNITY

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs regarding a speech delivered to the public relations society in Montreal yesterday and the strong warnings the minister gave against those who would impair—and I quote—the "integrity or unity of NATO". Were his warnings and threats, if I could so interpret them, directed against General de Gaulle, or whom did he have in mind when he made the strictures in question?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I stated last Friday in answer to a question by the right hon. gentleman, there have been some discussions to the effect that because of differences that have arisen nations, or a particular nation, might take a position which would cause a reconsideration of their position in the alliance. I made no reference to any particular country, and I feel that because of discussions which are going on it is better that the question be left in that way.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister this question. Has General de Gaulle or the government of the republic of France given any indication that it has in mind withdrawal from NATO? Otherwise for what reason was the speech made?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions here last week and there were good reasons for the observation which was made. Since yesterday the prime minister of France, M. Pompidou, has made a statement to the general effect that it was not the intention of France to withdraw from NATO.

REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION OF DEPARTMENTAL ESTIMATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether, in the light of the indicated crisis in the United Nations as between the United States and the Soviet union over the payment of dues to the United Nations, and in view of the reported crises over membership in NATO, the Kennedy round of talks and the common market, would the Prime Minister consider setting aside one day, or preferably two days, next week for the early discussion of the estimates of the Department of External Affairs so the house can have the benefit of the government's views on these very serious crises which beggar description of Canada's own domestic problems?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it will be possible shortly to call once again the estimates of the Department of External Affairs, and perhaps at that time these very important matters could be considered instead of the presence in Africa of the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Lambert: A supplementary question. I am sure the Prime Minister is fully aware that the Secretary of State for External Affairs was willing the other day to discuss the change in Soviet leadership and the explosion of a nuclear bomb by the Chinese rather than these other problems. Therefore does he not think he is merely drawing a red herring across the trail?

Inquiries of the Ministry

REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING STATUS OF QUEBEC HOUSE IN PARIS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has Premier Lesage of Quebec informed the federal government that he will be making representations to either General de Gaulle, or other members or officials of the French government relating to the status of Quebec house in France? If so, can the minister inform the house of the nature of the representations Premier Lesage will be making?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any representations in this particular context. That, of course, would be a matter between the government of France and the government of Canada.

Mr. Grafftey: May I ask a supplementary question. Has Premier Lesage informed the minister that he will be making some representations to the French government relating to the status of Quebec house in France?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): We have made representations ourselves, and we are carrying on consultations with regard to this matter.

Mr. Grafftey: May I rephrase my question. Has Premier Lesage told the minister that he too will be making further representations? This is a simple question that I ask.

Mr. Monteith: You will never get a simple answer.

VISIT TO CANADA BY U.K. PRIME MINISTER —SUBJECTS TO BE DISCUSSED

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): In view of the welcome announcement of the visit of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom to Canada, will the Prime Minister say if there has been any decision about the subjects to be discussed, and in particular will the question come up regarding the recommendation by the Canadian government that the surcharges should be withdrawn at the earliest possible date? Have any representations to that effect been made to the British government as yet, and if so, what has been their reaction thereto?

[Mr. Lambert.]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I was hoping to announce to the house today, in somewhat more detail than was in the press statement, that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom would be visiting Ottawa on December 9. This statement was issued at once because we understood a statement had been issued in Washington and in London. Meanwhile we are trying to ascertain exactly how long he will be here and what will be the opportunity for talks with him. At the moment our information is that he will be here only in the late afternoon and evening and will be returning to London the next morning.

I can give the house at the moment no information on the nature of the talks we will have, since we just completed arrangements this morning for his arrival.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have not seen the announcement in question, but does this mean that the Prime Minister is going to visit Washington before he comes to Ottawa? Usually it has been the other way around. Second, I would ask the Prime Minister if he would answer my question regarding the surcharges? What representations have been made.

Mr. Pearson: In answer to the first question, the United Kingdom Prime Minister will be coming to Ottawa on this visit after he has visited Washington. It will be very interesting for the government to get from him at first hand the nature of the talks he has had with the United States government.

In reply to the second question, we are in touch with the United Kingdom government on the matter of surcharges, or their emergency economic measures, and have made clear to them our hope that these will be of a temporary character.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTION EXPENSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the statements which have been made with reference to contributions by trade unions to various political parties and their candidates, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he would give consideration to extending the terms of reference of the commission which is being set up to look into the question of election expenses, to give them the necessary

authority to look into the sources of all campaign funds of all political parties in Canada over the past five or ten years.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to do that. I have not before me the terms of reference, but I do recall that those terms refer to "related subjects", and perhaps they are wide enough at present to deal with this matter. However, I will be glad to look into the matter.

LACK OF FRENCH SPEAKING OPERATORS ON LONG DISTANCE CALLS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I had a question to put to the Minister of Public Works, but in his absence, I will direct it to the Prime Minister. It has to do with two or three complaints I received quite recently, that is today at 11.15 a.m., to the effect that when we make long distance calls in parliament, it is impossible to find French speaking operators, or they refuse to speak French.

Would the Prime Minister check this fact and correct the situation as soon as possible?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I will be glad to look into it, Mr. Speaker.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

STATEMENT ON GRANTING OF PAROLE IN COMMUTED DEATH SENTENCES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I deal with a question which was raised yesterday and previously, and make a statement about parole in the cases of commuted death sentences both in regard to what is known as the Meeker case and in the wider context of such cases generally.

I can now inform the house that the government proposes to take steps for the enactment of a regulation under the Parole Act which will have the effect of providing that every person who is serving a sentence of imprisonment, to which a sentence of death has been commuted, shall in no case be released on parole without the prior approval of the governor in council. This will have the effect of giving general application to the restriction which, under section 656 of the Criminal Code, may now be imposed on a case to case basis.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question arising out of that statement. Does the Prime Minister not think that is putting a heavy responsibility directly on the executive?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, that responsibility is now already put on the executive when it passes an order in council commuting a death sentence.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I know it is not quite proper to mention this, but observations were made by the Prime Minister which went quite beyond what would have been proper under the circumstances. Does the Prime Minister not think this is a matter which should be looked into more carefully in order to assure the Canadian people that those who are dangerous and will continue to be so are not released, and that the action taken in the Meeker case will not be carried forward to cover all cases? I think the Prime Minister will agree there is nothing heavier than the responsibility which rests on the governor in council in murder cases. Making the rules so wide in order to cover a case which has attracted national attention I think is going pretty far.

I wonder whether he would reconsider that, because he is going a very long way beyond anything that has been contemplated before, and I am saying this in a spirit of helpfulness because I know of the difficulties.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the right hon. gentleman has said, but I do not think, in view of the circumstances surrounding these cases and the seriousness of the matter involved—nothing could be more serious, or impose greater responsibility on the executive, as my right hon. friend is aware—we are going further than is desirable in the regulation which I have just mentioned. I assure my right hon. friend that we have spent a good many days since the development of this situation, and have had a great many consultations, in order to convince ourselves that this is the proper step to take under the circumstances.

LABOUR RELATIONS

STRIKE OF LONGSHOREMEN—FREEDOM TO JOIN UNION OF CHOICE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the

Minister of Labour. Could he report on the meeting he had yesterday with the presidents of the International Longshoremen's Union of Montreal, Messrs. Asselin and Tremblay, and could he tell us whether they have agreed to reinstate in their ranks those who had been expelled because they wanted to join another union?

Could he tell us also whether the presidents of the International Longshoremen's Union have agreed to respect in the future the freedom of workers to belong to the trade union of their choice?

[*Text*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the main question we discussed yesterday, which was an urgent question, was related to the resumption of operations at the three river ports. As a result of arrangements entered into with the longshoremen, work has resumed today. I hope it will be possible through the offices of the Department of Labour to set up meetings between the shipping federation and the longshoremen to settle the problem that occasioned this walk-out. As I promised yesterday in reply to the questions addressed to me by the hon. member for Lapointe, I drew his questions and comments to the attention of the delegation who were present in the gallery, and I asked them whether they had heard the questions and comments of the hon. member. That delegation assured me that they had listened to the questions and comments.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Did the minister get a favourable reply from the union leaders, the labour leaders, respecting the employees who were ousted from their union? Did he exert pressure on the chairmen of the union so that those workers might be taken back into the fold?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I did not make representations to the union officers with respect to a matter which is dealt with under the constitution of the union and for which there are several recourses, as I understand the situation, open to the members affected. I explained this in the house some weeks ago. I felt that I had gone as far as it was appropriate for me to go in drawing those representations to the attention of that delegation.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour, asking him whether he has received any assurance from the shipping federation that it is prepared to change its attitude in respect of negotiating the pension plan which was recommended by Judge Lippe?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I addressed messages yesterday to the president of the shipping federation of Canada, and to Mr. Gleason of the international longshoremen, suggesting that a meeting be held at an early date to discuss these questions. It is my expectation that the shipping federation, in accordance with the proposals they advanced yesterday, will be ready to undertake in good faith negotiations or discussions in respect of these questions.

Mr. Douglas: Will there be any conciliation officers of the Department of Labour present at these discussions?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I have asked Mr. Poirier and Mr. McRae, both officers in Montreal, to assist in these discussions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Did the representatives of the international longshoremen's union agree to have an inquiry made into the administration of the pension fund of the Montreal longshoremen in order to satisfy those who have been calling for such an inquiry for a long time?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to take this question as notice and attempt to reply later.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker—

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This matter has been under discussion for two or three days, and properly speaking is a question that should be placed on the order paper in order to obtain a complete answer.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me to set the record straight, I would say that is exactly the question I directed to the Minister of Labour yesterday, when the leaders of the union were in his office.

Yesterday he answered me that he would ask these labour leaders to have an inquiry

made into the administration of the pension fund. Now, the next day, that is today, he is telling me that he will take this question as notice and that he will answer it later, although he had the opportunity of looking into these facts yesterday.

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I regret if I misunderstood the question asked by the hon. member. I assured him yesterday that I would draw his observations and representations to the attention of the delegation, and I carried out that undertaking yesterday. I drew his observation and representations to the attention of the longshoremen and representatives who were in my office.

IMMIGRATION

WOLFGANG SCHILBACH—INQUIRY AS TO STATUS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration whether he will give consideration to investigating the immigrant status in Canada of Wolfgang Schilbach, at one time of 974 Bathurst street in Toronto, and now publicized as the personal bodyguard of one John Ross Taylor of Gooderham, Ontario.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice.

[*Text*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. MOREAU—INACCURATE "HANSARD" REPORT OF SPEECH BY LEADER OF OPPOSITION

Mr. M. J. Moreau (York-Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege affecting all members of this house. I should like to draw your attention to page 9877 of *Hansard* for Monday, October 9, and quote what the right hon. Leader of the Opposition is reported as having said:

> I think quite a number wish to express themselves on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, it is my recollection that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition used the figure 30, and said that 30 members wished to express themselves on this matter. In support of that recollection I should like to quote from page 9879 of *Hansard* for the same day where the hon. member for Lapointe, who rose immediately afterward, is reported as having said:

> When the leader of the official opposition states that 30 members of his party want to talk on that matter—

My recollection is further confirmed by an article in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of this morning. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in some way to correct the record so that it reads accurately, in view of the fact that the official record is not accurate.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I made no change in word, line or expression. I left what was recorded as said yesterday, as I do so often, unchanged and unrevised. If any portion of what I said was not heard by the *Hansard* reporter, who after all is the final arbiter, then I can only ascribe it to the fact that the noise and din opposite prevented the *Hansard* reporter from hearing everything I said.

This is the first time anyone has suggested that a challenge should be made of *Hansard*. I have always followed the course of not changing materially any matter—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Don't start me in that direction or I will recall $100 million that disappeared during the course of a debate. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that the *Hansard* reporter has been challenged for not having reported everything.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, with regard to that question of privilege, I notice that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition is not denying categorically that he has said "30 members" instead of "quite a number". I should like to ask the Leader of the Opposition, in view of what I stated later, namely:

[*Text*]

> —the leader of the official opposition states that 30 members of his party want to talk on that matter—

I would like to submit to the Leader of the Opposition that my sentence then has no sense.

Mr. Monteith: That is nothing new.

Mr. Grégoire: But if he said, as I understood him to say "30 members" and not "quite a number," then my sentence has sense.

When I said the Leader of the Opposition stated that 30 members of his party wanted to talk on that matter I believed he really

had said it. I do not accuse him of having changed *Hansard*. Maybe he did not touch it at all, but if he can remember what he said I think it would be only fair and honest for him to state today what he said yesterday.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has raised a very novel argument. He says that unless *Hansard* is now changed and the report given by the reporter altered, what he said was nonsense and therefore should not be in *Hansard*. If his argument were carried to a logical conclusion, there have been cases when I believe the statement he now makes would have a sound basis in fact.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition is trying to interpret what I have said. I did not say this has no sense, that 30 members of his party want to talk on that matter, because I know 65 out of his 95 members do not want to follow the Leader of the Opposition in the flag debate. That makes sense, and those who do not make sense in this house are those 30 Tories who want to follow the Leader of the Opposition. I congratulate the other 65 who do not want to follow him in the flag issue.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I rise on that same question of privilege. The hon. member for Lapointe talks about sense but what he has just said is complete nonsense.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, if it is nonsense—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Surely we have all enjoyed ourselves sufficiently on this important matter.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD

CELEBRATION OF 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State of which I have given him notice. Noting that the city of Kingston, in co-operation with other groups, is planning a commemorative dinner on the 150th anniversary of the birth of Sir John A. Macdonald, can the minister advise what preparations the government is making for national celebration of this historic event?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): All I can say at the moment, Mr. Speaker, is that a small interdepartmental committee has been appointed but we have not yet received its report or recommendations.

WATER RESOURCES

GRAND CANAL—INQUIRY AS TO DISCUSSIONS WITH QUEBEC MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources.

Could he tell the house whether he had any discussion with the Quebec minister of natural resources or any of his officials concerning the development of the Harricana river and whether the Grand canal project was also discussed?

[*Text*]

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): No, Mr. Speaker.

HOUSING

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONFERENCE FOR SOUTHERN ONTARIO

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Postmaster General. Some weeks ago he stated that he would be calling a housing conference for southern Ontario in November. In view of the importance of such a meeting and the need for preparations I wonder whether he has set the date and, if so, can he tell us it?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, the answer has already been given at an earlier sitting. I also tried to speak to the hon. member, when we found that of necessity we had to change the date. There was no hotel accommodation available, and the dates suggested were not satisfactory to many of the municipalities concerned, and the meeting will now be held in Toronto, on December 16 and 17. An invitation will be sent to the hon. member and to all the other members from the parts of Ontario included in the Toronto conference.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Chapdelaine (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister.

Now that English Canada has shown in no uncertain terms that it disapproved of the policy of the Leader of the Opposition on the flag issue, at yesterday's by-elections, particularly in Waterloo South, does the Prime Minister intend to place the flag issue immediately before the house in order that we may, once and for all, settle that problem which is undermining the confidence of the people in our parliament?

[*Text*]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

PROPOSED RATE INCREASES ON NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): I should like to direct a question to the Postmaster General. Is it still the intention of the Postmaster General to proceed with resolution No. 12, which appears on the order paper and has been there since April 30, relating to the increase in certain rates on periodicals and newspapers?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, there is no change in the government's intention to proceed with this legislation. Unfortunately there are other matters with a higher priority on the list. The Post Office Department would like to see the changes made, but we must recognize there are other items with higher priority.

Mr. Ricard: May I ask a supplementary question. Is it the intention of the minister to proceed as soon as possible?

Mr. Nicholson: It depends on the priority, but certainly we will proceed as quickly and as expeditiously as possible.

PUBLIC SERVICE

SUPERANNUATED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—REQUEST FOR INCREASED PENSIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister and relates to the assurance he gave two weeks ago today, that within a fortnight he would give an answer to those who saw the government with regard to increasing the pensions of retired civil servants. Has that answer been given, and can we be told the terms of the answer?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The letter is going out this afternoon. I signed it this morning, but I cannot disclose its contents until those who are concerned have received it.

AGRICULTURE

POULTRY—INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TO MAINTAIN PRICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Is the government going to give some consideration to the serious situation that now faces the poultry industry? I have a bill from one of my constituents who sold 59 fowl weighing 228 pounds for $13.35. Surely something should be done at once about this situation.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I shall be glad to discuss this serious situation with the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Nasserden: My supplementary question is, how long does the Prime Minister think the Minister of Agriculture can get away with sloughing off this problem by saying the problem does not exist?

HEALTH AND WELFARE

ROYAL COMMISSION—INQUIRY AS TO SECOND VOLUME OF REPORT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the widespread interest in the subject across the country, can the minister inform the house when volume 2 of the report of the royal commission on health services may be tabled?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I have received no information on this, although I have heard from time to time that the document is completed and in the process of translation. My office has not yet been informed that it has been signed, and I have not yet checked with the Prime Minister whether he has had any word of its completion.

TRANSPORT

INQUIRY AS TO CONSTRUCTION OF PETITCODIAC CAUSEWAY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): May I pose a question for the Minister of Fisheries in connection with the multimillion dollar Petitcodiac causeway construction which the minister just announced a while

ago. Will an opportunity be given to different groups to make representations regarding the location, and when does he expect construction will begin?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): This is a matter that has to be dealt with by the government of the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. Bell: In view of the fact that the minister made this announcement, and evidently took credit for it, and in view of the fact that we would have a large participation in it, does he not think the federal government has a responsibility to answer those questions I pose?

Mr. Robichaud: I was pleased to announce that the federal government was prepared to participate under the maritime marshland reclamation scheme.

Mr. Bell: Does the minister not think the federal government has some responsibility, and will he give an assurance that this is not another pre-election promise that will turn out to be a corpse a few days afterward?

Mr. Robichaud: It is an accomplished fact, Mr. Speaker.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

OTTAWA—CHANGE IN NAME OF PERFORMING ARTS CENTRE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): I should like to ask the Prime Minister if it was his decision that resulted in a change in the name of the national centre for the performing arts, which has now become the Canadian centre for the performing arts? If so, what significance can we read into this change in the name?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I can say that there is no real meaning to this. There has been no official name selected as yet for this centre.

REDISTRIBUTION

PROVISION FOR BOUNDARIES COMMISSIONS AND READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION

The house resumed, from Tuesday, October 20, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-72, to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions to report upon the readjustment of the representation of the provinces in the House of Commons and to provide for the readjustment of such representation in accordance therewith—Mr. Pickersgill (for Mr. Pearson)—Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

On clause 6—*Appointment of chairman.*

The Chairman: When the committee rose on October 20 it had reverted to a consideration of clause 6, with an amendment thereto by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. The other outstanding clauses are 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13.

Is the committee ready for the question on the amendment to clause 6?

Mr. Pickersgill: I should like to say a word or two before we vote on this amendment, if that is the desire of the committee. I know it is not strictly in order but perhaps you would permit me, Mr. Chairman, to say that I was very much impressed by the progress which has been made during my absence—wondering, perhaps, whether I should not have stayed away longer—

Mr. Churchill: You have taken the words out of my mouth.

Mr. Pickersgill: My colleague the Minister of Labour seemed to do so well the other day when this measure was before the committee. But I am hoping that the spirit induced by the hon. gentleman will carry over to our proceedings this afternoon. I think hon. members will recall that at the time we suspended discussion on clause 6 of the bill last April there had developed what might really be regarded as the only serious difference which has yet arisen with regard to this legislation. I should like to recall to hon. members in all quarters of the committee the spirit in which this legislation was approached. I think here I can speak for the government, although in most respects it is clearly understood that once the principle of this bill was adopted, there were no whips on it and every hon. member as far as this side of the house was concerned was considered in every way free, just as was the case the last time a similar measure was before the house, to vote in any way he pleased without any concern because the position of the government was not en jeu then, and is not now. This is a matter for the house, one in which all of us have an equal responsibility. I am, therefore, very conscious of the fact that I can speak only for myself except in one respect: I think I can say it is the view of the government that because of the far reaching, revolutionary character of this legislation it is preferable

that it be accomplished by a consensus rather than by sharp differences and votes.

It is true, as the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre pointed out, the last day when I was present in this committee when we previously discussed this matter, that there was a division over the question as to whether there should be one commission for the whole country or ten commissions. But there was no acrimony attached to the debate on that matter and there was the readiest acceptance of the view that once a reasonable discussion had taken place the question should be decided by the majority of votes in the committee. I hope this will be the spirit in the committee today. I did indicate during the last few days of April when this subject was being discussed that I personally was more inclined—"more disposed" was the phrase I used—to support the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre than I was to support the original provision in the bill. At the risk of repetition I should like to put on record again the words I used on that occasion, words which will be found at page 2320 of *Hansard*. I said then:

> If the house decided to accept the bill in its present form I would not waste any tears on the amendment. In fact, I would have a certain amount of satisfaction, but I really do believe we would have a better act with this amendment. Because all those in the country are not Liberals and Conservatives—

Perhaps I can say that today without dissent, at any rate from one corner of the house.

> —because all those in the country perhaps have not got the same highminded view of the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister as those of us in the house have, I think there would be a greater degree of general confidence in the commissions if we were to accept the amendment that has been proposed than if we were to take the bill in its present form. For that reason I am disposed to support the amendment.

Since that time I have not changed my view. But I cannot ignore the fact that the amendment of the hon. gentleman did arouse very strong antagonism in one part of the committee. I did not myself think that the antagonism was justified, but this is a free country and a free assembly. It was a fact. During the past four or five weeks while unable to be here to take part in the work of the house I have been pondering other possible ways of dealing with this matter. I wish to emphasize what I said on second reading and what I have said at every stage —that while we produced the best bill we were able to draft, we were prepared to accept from any quarter of the house any suggestion for improvement. That still goes. By "improvement" I do not just mean something which is academically better. I use the term to include something which is more generally acceptable to the whole house as long as it meets the basic requirements of the legislation.

I was somewhat impressed by having recalled to my mind the suggestion made in a bill introduced by Senator Power when he was in this house many years ago. It was not proceeded with because of the war, but in that bill there was a provision for the Speaker to make these appointments after consultation with certain hon. members in the house. I have been rather impressed by both parts of this suggestion and while I was elsewhere and not otherwise occupied I prepared two draft amendments about which I should like to say something—I have some copies, and when I get to them I will be glad to pass them around to hon. members so that they can read them. I am not going to move them now. I could not do so, in any case, because there is an amendment before the committee now. But so that we can take a general look at the whole question, before doing that—

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I suggest to the hon. gentleman that he pass them around now and let us look at them. Don't keep them secret.

Mr. Pickersgill: I have not the capacity of the right hon. gentleman for holding the attention of an audience; I would prefer not to make a distraction available. I would rather have hon. members listen to what I have to say until I get to that point. I know I need the assistance of the right hon. gentleman in making my speeches much more than he is in need of assistance from me, but I would really prefer to make my own.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I thought the hon. gentleman wanted co-operation, and we were giving him co-operation. I was trying to secure it.

Mr. Pickersgill: The right hon. gentleman is correct. But I do not spell "co-operation" "d-i-c-t-a-t-i-o-n". I hope the right hon. gentleman will not take the view that unless we agree with him there is no co-operation in the house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: A statement like that is quite in keeping with what we expect from the hon. gentleman. We have tried to practise co-operation. He claimed a moment ago that this was the desire. A moment ago I made the suggestion in the best of good spirits, but the hon. gentleman is continuing

the attitude he has taken previously with regard to the C.B.C.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I think the right hon. gentleman is quite right. I think I have behaved quite badly, and I apologize.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the hon. gentleman would answer a question.

Mr. Pickersgill: Certainly.

Mr. Woolliams: He said, "the Speaker, in consultation with certain members". I wonder whether he would now outline the members he has in mind. That would come to grips with the subject immediately.

Mr. Pickersgill: No, Mr. Chairman. I hope the hon. gentleman will not think this is offensive—

Mr. Woolliams: No.

Mr. Pickersgill: —but I would prefer to deal with this matter in the way that I think will make clear what I am hoping to make clear about a rather complicated subject. In other words, it is perhaps almost out of order for me to be doing what I am doing now, because we are really supposed to be discussing nothing but the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. It is perhaps almost a discourtesy to him, for which I should perhaps apologize, to be suggesting that it ought to be supplanted with something else. But I would like first of all to say a little more about the hon. gentleman's own amendment. There was one objection to it which was made by hon. members in certain quarters of the house and which I thought had some substance. That was, that apart from the representation commissioner, all three members of the commissions would be appointed by the same person. It is true that there were limitations on the kind of persons who could be appointed, but notwithstanding that fact, that is perhaps rather a concentration of power in the hands of one man, even though that man is the chief justice of the province.

Therefore it seemed to me that if we could find some other way to diffuse this power of appointment in some way that would be acceptable to the whole house, it ought to be done. One of the suggestions that I am going to put forward is that if the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was willing to withdraw his amendment, or if his motion should not be accepted by the committee when it is voted upon, we should then accept an amendment which would substitute appointment by His Honour the Speaker for the appointment by the leaders of the two major parties in the house. In support of that I could quote a number of—

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Knowles: From categories, or just anybody?

Mr. Pickersgill: My own view is that of course that would be a possibility; but I would think that after the debate we have had, in the light of all the experience, which is bound to be followed to some degree, in other commonwealth countries, and in view of the difficulty that the hon. gentleman himself recognized in his amendment, namely that these categories of persons referred to are not civil servants of the federal state but are provincial civil servants or persons in other categories whom we cannot order, it might be much better to trust His Honour the Speaker to do the sensible thing, and not to put any strings upon him except the obvious string that these appointments must be made from persons resident in the province.

In the course of the debate hon. gentlemen made a number of points. The hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings said, as reported at page 2291 of *Hansard*:

> We have a Prime Minister who is an officer of the house and a Leader of the Opposition who is also an officer of the house, and they are the only ones in this category. I agree that whoever occupied the office of prime minister or leader of the opposition would exercise the authority given to them under this provision in a manner which would be entirely creditable both to themselves and to parliament—

I think that will always be true. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, as recorded at page 2298 of *Hansard*, said this:

> I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre should correct his stand on this. What is required in this country is respect for parliament, and that carries with it respect for the leaders of these two great parties.

The hon. member said a little later on:

> Obviously some people in the left hand corner of the chamber have no respect for the leader of the Liberal party or the leader of the Conservative party, but there are millions of people in the country who have, while their supporters are not very numerous.

Mr. Knowles: It has changed since then.

Mr. Pickersgill: One could make some comments on that. The hon. member for Edmonton West said:

> I would say to the Minister of Justice that in discussing the qualifications, capabilities or impartiality of the Prime Minister or the Leader of the Opposition, one must not consider the personalities of the right hon. gentlemen who are

now occupying those positions. If you do this, you may be merely legislating for the next five years.

Then he went on to suggest that the amendment of the hon. gentleman was an implied reflection on the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition acting in a responsible manner as officers of the house and a reflection that they would not do a proper job. I could quote several other hon. members. There is a quotation of the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary as reported at page 2307 of *Hansard*—I am not going to read it —and several other hon. gentlemen opposite. The gist of all this is the same, namely that we should have confidence that whoever is the prime minister, whoever is the leader of the government, whoever is the leader of the opposition, would make proper appointments. I believe this would be true. But I also share a good deal of the feelings of hon. gentlemen in the other corner of the house who do not support either of these hon. gentlemen and who have pointed out, quite properly I think, that both the occupants of these offices are now, and as long as we have free government will continue to be, politicians.

If, however, hon. gentlemen opposite really believe what they said—and I do not say they do not; I believe they do—about the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition acting in this capacity, surely all of us in every quarter of the house would at all times be ready to trust the one officer of this house elected by us all, who is called the Speaker of the House of Commons because he is our voice when we go to the other place, the man who speaks for us, who has a duty to be impartial, who has that duty imposed upon him and who—I might remind hon. gentlemen—is the chairman of all four commissions in the United Kingdom. So it does seem to me that this would be an even better method of resolving the problem than any that has yet been suggested.

I would hope that this solution—which commends itself very much to me, I may say, as a good solution and one that would stand the test of time—might commend itself to all hon. members in every quarter of the house. I think there is one thing we can be sure of; that there would never be any criticism outside this chamber of the appointments that would be made by the presiding officer of this chamber. The only place where there could possibly be any criticism arise would be within our own ranks—and I would hope there would be none here. For that reason I am suggesting that if there was a consensus —I do not say universal approval, because you hardly ever get that in an assembly like this—on the part of hon. members that this would be a good solution, I would be very glad, if the hon. member's amendment should not carry, to put this forward as an amendment in the hope that it would carry. I am sure all hon. members will respect my feelings in this when I say that I would not wish it to be put forward unless there were a reasonable assurance that it would commend itself to the committee generally. I do not think we should do that in those circumstances, having regard to the office of the Speaker; and unless we are generally prepared to support this amendment I would not wish to put it forward at all.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, the minister mentioned a moment ago a suggestion from Hon. C. G. Power. What was that suggestion? I think the hon. gentleman was getting away from it.

Mr. Pickersgill: I think perhaps this would be an appropriate time to deal with it and perhaps the best way to deal with it would be to refer to it directly, just as did the hon. member for York-Sunbury some time ago.

Mr. Knowles: I think it was the hon. member for Royal.

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes, it was the hon. member for Royal; I thought of Fredericton and got just a little confused. The suggestion was that there should be two assessors for each province, one of whom should be appointed on the recommendation of the leader of the opposition in the House of Commons and the other on the recommendation of the leader for the time being holding the majority in the House of Commons. That was the suggestion made in this particular bill. There was also another suggestion in an earlier bill that there should be two members, one appointed by the leader of the government and one by the leader of the opposition after consultation with the leaders of other parties in the house. They were the suggestions.

This brings me to the other alternative which also occurred to me.

Mr. Woolliams: Before you get into that would you just answer this question. The minister did say that the Speaker in consultation with other members would make the appointment. Before the hon. gentleman leaves that phase of it, what has he in mind by consultation with other members?

Mr. Pickersgill: I did not have in mind that the amendment would contain anything about

consultation with anyone. I said, as is the case in the United Kingdom and elsewhere, I understand, that there would in fact be consultation, but that I did not think we should attempt to prescribe consultation in the legislation. I think we should leave to the judgment of the Speaker what he should do about this matter, knowing that he will exercise his judgment in a sensible and practical manner.

The alternative suggestion which I had put forward was this, that we should leave the present bill as it is so far as the appointment of the commissions go.

Mr. Thomas: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: But I suggested we provide —and I hope the hon. gentleman will continue to say "Hear, hear"—that the leaders of other recognized parties in the house should have the right to appoint witnesses or assessors to be present at all the meetings of the commissions. Personally, I do not like this nearly as much but I am trying to think of every possible way in which we can do this so that it will at any rate definitely be open and aboveboard.

I recognize the force of the arguments used by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and others associated with him, by the hon. member for Fraser Valley and by some other hon. members earlier in this debate. They, too, represent in this house large bodies of electors, and it is only natural that they should feel that the heads of other political parties should not have a power of appointment which, even if it did not give them any advantage, would seem to exclude other hon. members who were equally elected to this house by the people of Canada.

If the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is not acceptable, I would hope that one or other of the amendments or a variant of them will be acceptable. Personally, I think that if we really mean what we have said on second reading the neatest, the simplest and the fairest method to remove these appointments completely from the partisan arena would be to accept the suggestion that these two appointments be made by the Speaker. It seems to me there could be no criticism of that by anybody in any quarter. If we trust the Speaker to preside over our deliberations, to preserve impartiality and to do all these things which he takes an oath to do, we can surely trust him to discharge this function and to discharge it fairly. To me that would be the best way. However, I recognize the difficulty that we cannot do it—at least I do not think we can—if a large section of the house does not agree to it, because that would be a reflection on His Honour the Speaker before he even got started. I may say that I had heard, of course, of this suggestion and was aware of the practice in other jurisdictions, but that is what to some extent deterred me from suggesting that it be put in the bill in the first instance.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be desirable to have some discussion of these possible alternatives before we come to a vote on the hon. member's motion, and I think I should now take my seat.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, before the minister sits down would he entertain this question. In view of the fact that he has put forward two alternatives in addition to what we have already had and he has suggested that we should now have some discussion, I have always felt that discussion should take place after we have done some thinking. Would the hon. minister who is piloting the bill through be prepared to let us set this matter aside now for a short period so that we can get together as a group and see what we think of it? I think that is reasonable. It seems to me that the first thing is to do some thinking and analysing and then have some discussion.

Mr. Pickersgill: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have read in the public print somewhere some suggestions to the effect that discussions behind closed doors are not altogether desirable all the time, although that was in another context entirely unrelated to parliament. It seems to me that the proper place for debate is right here. I have copies of both these suggestions and some general principles are involved. For one thing, it is not really very difficult to grasp one of the amendments; it is simplicity and clarity itself. The other one, which I admit I do not like so much but which would be satisfactory I think, is somewhat more complicated, but not very much because it preserves essentially what is in the present bill and simply makes the additional provision for what are called in the draft amendment "assessors". In any event I have a few copies of both these documents, and if they could be passed around so that hon. gentlemen can look at them perhaps we might have some discussion at this time.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. I should like to follow up the suggestion

I made by way of a question. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat and who is piloting the bill through said that he did not think it desirable that we should sit down and analyse this matter behind closed doors. I think these propositions have some merit. They may be good propositions. Perhaps both of them are good. But surely the thing to do—and with his intellect I am sure the hon. gentleman will appreciate this—is to expose ourselves to the documents in question and analyse them to see whether they are good, and perhaps shorten this debate. I am not trying to get into an argument this afternoon by any means, but sometimes we are accused of filibustering this bill. Surely this is an opportunity to sit down and analyse this as a party. This is, after all, the official opposition. We want to speak as such, and as Conservatives.

Mr. Chairman, I see that the minister is busy with something else at the present moment. This is a very important question and I wish he would listen to what I have to say. This is the suggestion I am making. Perhaps he could set this aside and we could go on with some other business of the house, so that perhaps within 30 minutes or an hour tomorrow we could come to some agreement.

Mr. Pickersgill: We are not sitting tomorrow.

Mr. Woolliams: That is right, we have a holiday tomorrow and I have overlooked that fact. This item of legislation has been set aside since April. While it is true the minister has been in the hospital, it has been left in abeyance since it was set aside. Surely if it was all right to do that, my request that we set it aside for the purpose of analysing it is a reasonable one. The hon. minister has stated that he is not a lawyer, but I have often thought that he comes to grips with many problems as a lawyer might do, and I am sure he will appreciate that a lawyer would never defend an individual, or act for the plaintiff or defendant in a civil action, without briefing his case. You have put forward two propositions. Surely we should have time to analyse the situation, otherwise you will be encouraging talk rather than thought.

I thought the Minister of National Health and Welfare made a remark. I do not intend to reply or become involved in an argument with her, but it seems whenever I say something I do become involved in an argument with her and she then becomes annoyed with me. I do not like her to be annoyed with me. I do not like any lady to be annoyed with me.

The minister has been talking about reasonable things. Surely it is reasonable to suggest that we set this aside for a short period of time and go on with another piece of legislation. If the government is caught without having anything for us to consider this afternoon, that may be a source of embarrassment, but I suggest there are many other items that could be considered between now and eight o'clock, or ten o'clock, giving us the opportunity of looking into this matter and, analysing it so that we can come back and say that point A is good but point B is bad. Let us have the opportunity of preparing ourselves. You have hit us with a brand new argument, and a brand new disposition. This is quite a revelation and I am rather surprised. I am impressed by what the hon. member has said this afternoon and am inclined to go along with him, provided we have time to analyse the situation. Otherwise I am afraid I must be suspicious of the whole thing.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, at this moment I should just like to say a few words about the procedure that we might follow. First of all may I make it clear that we are prepared to make our comments on the various proposals immediately. I think there is some validity, however, to the request made by the hon. member for Bow River. If there is to be a postponement of this discussion, it might not be inappropriate to have at least an initial statement as to where we stand on these matters. I suggest there are several clauses which are standing, and if I took down the list correctly, the clauses yet to be dealt with are clauses 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13. I realize that the two most difficult ones are clauses 6 and 13, but perhaps we could go on with our consideration of clauses 7, 8, 9 and 12. I am not suggesting that we spend all our time until six o'clock dealing with those clauses, but they might well take some time. Following our consideration of those clauses perhaps we could deal with another piece of legislation.

As I have suggested, we in this party would like to make a brief statement about our view on the matter. I do not want to prejudge the possibility of a further discussion by individuals, but I am not in favour of negotiation behind closed doors.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact I was about to say that I do not think the suggestion made by the hon. member for Bow River is at all unreasonable. If it is the

desire of the committee to rise now and report progress we will take everyone by surprise, and I suppose the government is not supposed to do this, but there are several measures on the order paper that we would desperately like to complete. Two or three of them are in respect of things which come within my department, such as the harbours board bill and the Canada Shipping Act. This legislation does have to be completed. We must also put through legislation in respect of the annual financing of the C.N.R.

Mr. Chairman, I have just attempted to get in touch with the Department of Finance to find out whether there is someone immediately available to go on with that measure. It is such a routine measure I cannot see any great difficulty involved.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What measure is that?

Mr. Pickersgill: I am referring to the annual measure for financing the C.N.R. This is something we must get done before this session can conclude, and it would be very helpful to the government to have this done.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre suggested that it would be preferable to receive a brief statement in respect of the measure presently under discussion before putting it aside. I think it would be preferable to put it aside right away, have the consultation required, in one way or another, enabling hon. members to think over the position they want to take. If that is the wish of the committee generally I certainly would not be opposed to it, as long as hon. members opposite do not object to going ahead with some of the other items on the order paper of a non-contentious nature.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister, in regard to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, whether we could go ahead with some of the other clauses to be considered, leaving clauses 6 and 13 aside?

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that some of the clauses might be inter-related, and therefore, should be considered together. Perhaps we can go ahead with our consideration of something else at this time, and set our consideration regarding this measure aside until perhaps eight o'clock, at which time we will know whether or not we can make progress. With the hope that an agreement can be reached I think it would be advisable to follow that course.

Mr. Pickersgill: I thought someone would put a table in front of me as an indication that I might receive advice, but unfortunately that has not happened. I am very hesitant, in the company of so many learned gentlemen, being unlearned myself, to talk about these clauses without some assistance. I was afraid some hon. members would suggest that there are some ancillary conditions, such as has been suggested by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce. Clause 12 does not fall within that category, but stands on its own feet. We might consider that clause at this time, but I think it would be neater if we agree to set this measure aside for consideration later.

Before doing that, Mr. Chairman, and this is highly irregular, perhaps we could have some kind of an understanding as to what measure we will next consider. Unfortunately the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance has not yet arrived. Perhaps we could agree to second reading of the harbours bill. I do not think it is contentious.

Mr. Churchill: That would be agreeable.

Mr. Pickersgill: If that meets with the general approval of this committee I am prepared to move that we rise and report progress.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, before we do that perhaps we could arrive at one other point of agreement. I am willing to withdraw my suggestion about an initial statement, but I am advising the minister that he must have a better argument before we come back to this, but can we also fix the time when we will come back to it—for instance eight o'clock this evening?

Mr. Pickersgill: I should like the committee to consider this measure this evening, if the time left between now and eight o'clock is sufficient for hon. members to consider their positions. If not, perhaps we can agree that this will be the first item of business on Thursday.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should set this measure aside for a longer period of time than from now until eight o'clock. The first suggestion of the hon. member for Bow River was that he needed half an hour to consider it.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to get into an argument with the hon. gentleman, but what I did say was that we needed some time to consider our positions.

Mr. Douglas: Perhaps hon. members could consider these clauses in the three or more hours between now and eight o'clock. If we do not get on with it this evening, we will be

dealing with estimates on Thursday and Friday.

Mr. Pickersgill: We would only take estimates on Thursday if this is completed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am trying to speak in a spirit of co-operation. This is a most important matter and we are trying to leave our political considerations at the door. I would like to study these various suggestions and I think this would save a great deal of time. We would know exactly where we were on Thursday, but if we started in tonight I am afraid we would run through until ten o'clock.

I have not seen these suggestions before and am most anxious to assure that we produce something that will be generally accepted. No harm will be suffered by anyone in allowing this to go to Thursday and I would hope that could be agreed to by everyone.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder if that is the general consensus. The government feels we should get on with this legislation and get it passed. The right hon. gentleman suggests we would make as much progress on Thursday as we would this evening and Thursday but he cannot speak for the house any more than I can. However, if that is his opinion we shall have to take it into serious consideration.

Mr. Knowles: We felt it would be better to proceed at eight o'clock but we are prepared to have it deferred until Thursday provided it is the first item of business on Thursday.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is quite clearly understood. I may say I have put forward two new suggestions and have had some discussion on them with one or two hon. gentlemen, but there has been no formal consultation.

The parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance is present and he tells me he is ready to go ahead with the resolution regarding the C.N.R. financing, and perhaps we could agree to take that. Then, as soon as it is completed we could take the harbour legislation and then the bill regarding Newfoundland, which is merely a formal matter that has to be dealt with. After that there is the Canada Shipping Act.

Mr. Knowles: What about the Canada labour code?

Mr. Pickersgill: I understand the Minister of Labour cannot be here this evening. I expected to be here this evening and it would be a great relief to me if we could get all this legislation out of the way.

Mr. Churchill: You might take on some of the items for the Minister of Labour, who did very well for you in your absence.

Mr. Knowles: I happen to be one of the favoured few who received copies of these two drafts, and since we are deferring this until Thursday arrangements should be made for all hon. members to get copies. I do not suggest we should have them incorporated in *Hansard*, but they could be duplicated.

Mr. Pickersgill: I think there are enough copies for any members who are really interested, and I shall endeavour to have them circulated right away. I take it there is no objection in any quarter to going ahead with the program I have suggested.

Mr. Prittie: I would like a little more notice before the harbours bill is debated. This is a poor way to handle things.

Mr. Pickersgill: I understand the President of the Privy Council gave notice of it last night as one of the items which would be taken if redistribution were completed, and therefore I believe the government has fulfilled all requirements.

Mr. Winch: I do not remember the Canada Shipping Act being mentioned and I would like at least one day's notice of it.

Mr. Pickersgill: As there will be three other items preceding it I think it is unlikely we will reach it today. In fact there may be one or two other items of a non-contentious nature that we could clear off the order paper and so give hon. gentlemen in the other place something to do.

Progress reported.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

PROVISION FOR CAPITAL EXPENDITURES, ISSUE OF SECURITIES, ETC.

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 bring in a measure to authorize the Canadian National Railway Company to make capital expenditures and to supply the financial requirements of affiliated companies in the year 1964, not exceeding $155,000,000, and to make certain capital expenditures and enter into certain contracts prior to July 1, 1965; to provide for the financial requirements of Trans-Canada Air Lines in an amount not exceeding $5,000,000, either by means of loans from Her Majesty to the National company or by means of issues of securities of the National company, authorized and guaranteed as to interest and principal by

Her Majesty, the cash proceeds by either method to be used only for the financial requirements of Trans-Canada Air Lines, the capital needs of the National company itself being met entirely through the sale of preferred stock to Her Majesty and from reserves for depreciation and debt discount; to authorize Her Majesty to continue to purchase until December 31, 1965, Canadian National Company 4 per cent preferred stock in an annual amount not exceeding 3 per cent of the gross revenues of the company; to extend until December 31, 1965, the moratorium on interest on the loan of $100,000,000 to the company authorized by the Canadian National Railways Capital Revision Act of 1952; to authorize Her Majesty to make loans to the Canadian National Railway Company and Trans-Canada Air Lines to meet deficiencies in operating revenues to June 30, 1965, any such loans to be repaid from revenues of the railway company and Trans-Canada Air Lines or, if revenues prove insufficient, by subsequent deficit appropriation by parliament; and to raise the limit on the Canadian National Railway Company's authority to refund matured, maturing and callable securities from the present level of $480,000,000 to $680,000,000.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Chairman, the more experienced members of the committee will immediately recognize that this resolution is the one which usually precedes the introduction of the Canadian National Railways financing and guarantee bill. I may say that both as to form and substance the resolution is in keeping with the practice followed annually since 1952, with the exception of 1962 and 1963. As hon. members know, in those two years the annual financing and guarantee bills were combined into one bill late last year, but we are now returning to the practice of former years.

The bill which is foreshadowed by this resolution divides itself into seven main purposes and I shall attempt, with the indulgence of the committee, to explain those purposes briefly.

The first is to authorize capital expenditures by the C.N.R. in an amount not exceeding $155 million during the 1964 calendar year. As I understand it, this level of expenditure will run about the same as that incurred in recent years. There will be certain technical provisions within the bill authorizing payments not exceeding $72 million coming due between January 1 and July 1 1965, for capital expenditures incurred prior to 1965, and authorizing the C.N.R. to enter into contracts in an amount not exceeding $36 million for capital expenditures for the period January 1, 1965 and July 1, 1965.

The second main purpose of the bill will be to provide for the continued purchase by the Minister of Finance of the C.N.R.'s 4 per cent preferred stock through to the end of the calendar year 1965. The 1962-63 financing and guarantee act extended to December 31, 1964, the expiry date of the authority granted by the Canadian National Railways Capital Revision Act, 1952, for the purchase of such stock up to a limit of 3 per cent of the gross revenue of the railway. In future years this provision and the other provisions of this annual bill might be affected by general railways legislation and a recapitalization of the C.N.R. While these matters are pending the bill recommends that the expiry date of this provision be extended to the end of 1965.

The third purpose of the bill is to extend until 1965 the moratorium on interest on the government loan of $100 million to the railway company authorized by the capital revision act, 1952.

The fourth purpose of the bill is a provision to increase to $680 million the limitation in the Canadian National Railways Refunding Act, 1955, placed on the authority to refund maturing or matured securities of the railway company. The limit at present is $480 million and it is desirable to increase this limit in order to give the railway company the authority to refund 5½ per cent Canadian National railway bonds maturing on December 15, 1964. These bonds, I might add, were exchangeable at the option of the holders on or before June 15, 1964, into an equal par value of 5½ per cent bonds due December 15, 1971. Of these bonds, $190,445,000 were converted, leaving $8,555,000 still outstanding which are due to mature on December 15, of this year.

The last Financing and Guarantee Act extended the Canadian National's debt refunding limit by $250 million in view of the maturity of a like amount of Canadian National bonds on February 1, 1963. This issue was, in fact, refunded by a direct government loan to the Canadian National rather than by a bond issue by the Canadian National. I understand that there are no plans for a C.N.R. bond issue this year. However, it is considered desirable to have the added refunding authority equivalent to both C.N.R. issues in the event that debt management considerations ever pointed again to the advisability of C.N.R. bond issues.

The fifth purpose of the act will be to provide for the interim financing of Trans-Canada Air Lines during the first six months of the calendar year 1965 in an amount not exceeding $5 million.

Mr. Lambert: What body is Trans-Canada Air Lines?

Mr. Pennell: The hon. member for Edmonton West raises an interesting point when he asks me, what body is Trans-Canada Air Lines. I stand subject to correction, but in the interest of precision I felt I ought to refer to it as Trans-Canada Air Lines because I understand it will not become officially Air Canada until the first of the year. However, I stand to be corrected on this. In the meantime, the hon. member for Edmonton West may check the record, I am indebted to him for doing so because if I am wrong I welcome a correction.

The sixth purpose of the bill is, as in previous years, to provide authority for the government to make temporary loans to Canadian National Railways and Trans-Canada Air Lines to meet deficiencies in operating revenues up to June 30, 1965. Any such loan is repaid later from the revenues of Canadian National and Trans-Canada Air Lines or if these prove insufficient, then the loans are written off through parliamentary appropriation.

I come to the seventh, and final purpose of the bill, which is to provide for the appointment of the firm of Touche, Ross, Bailey and Smart, of the cities of Toronto and Montreal, chartered accountants, as auditors of the Canadian National for the calendar year 1965. I think, for the interest of members, I should add that last year there was a provision authorizing the auditors by a separate act, and this is just returning to the custom that had persisted for many years prior to that date.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that outlines briefly the main purposes of the resolution now engaging the attention of the committee.

Mr. Lambert: I want to thank the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman, for his explanation. It is necessarily brief so far as the resolution is concerned, but perhaps when we get to the bill we will be given more details. I am particularly concerned with the phraseology, "certain capital expenditures of the Canadian National". I think we should get an indication if there is a departure from a certain program that Canadian National Railways have undertaken. I feel the committee is entitled to know the nature of this capital spending program and what would be the type of complex it intends to enter into prior to July 1, 1965. An additional consideration is this $5 million for Trans-Canada Air Lines, or Air Canada. I am not going to indulge in a legal dissertation on the name because perhaps the corporation is riding two horses at the moment. However I think we should know why it requires this $5 million.

One matter of concern, and perhaps the parliamentary secretary can tell us this, is whether, in the light of the proposed amendments to the Railway Act before the house at the moment, there have been any discussions or possible decisions regarding the refinancing of the whole Canadian National Railways debt structure? We are now getting up into the astronomical figure of $680 million as the limit for refinancing. I know it may be premature to discuss this question, but I think our attention has been drawn to what has been advocated by the railway management for some time, that is that the position of the Canadian National in relation to its debt structure should be subjected to a practical examination to ascertain whether or not it should be completely overhauled, and the railway given a chance to operate on the basis of current operations without having the albatross of these great losses of past years around its neck, which are related to the time when the system was welded together from a number of bankrupt lines. It is true that we have had this condition existing for 45 years, since Canadian National was organized. There must come before parliament a realistic appraisal of Canadian National Railways financial structure in order to eliminate this past debt.

Now, with regard to the appointment of auditors, that was gone into at some length last time. I do not suppose it really warrants anything being said on this occasion. I believe the auditors who have been appointed are competent people and that they were competent at all times. The less said at this time about what happened last year, the better. Unfortunately, I believe it left a nasty taste in the mouths of a lot of people, and I suppose was a matter of political retribution. We look forward to seeing the bill. Perhaps at that time the parliamentary secretary will be in a position to give more detail about some of the things that are sketched in in rather general terms in the resolution.

Mr. Fisher: The measure before us is a routine one and there is no intention on my part of taking up a great deal of time or raising a variety of subjects. I would point out that the debate on this particular matter in previous years has on occasions been perfunctory and very brief, though at other times it has ranged widely, depending on the currency of interest in certain topics related to the Canadian National Railways and the C.P.R.

The parliamentary secretary indicated to us that the whole question of debt reorganization is still up in the air. I think ministers of transport in governments since 1962 have been, I will not say less than candid, but less than informative about the attitude and intentions of the administration in this regard. I know the Minister of Transport was in the railway committee when this issue was raised last summer, and he gave a general indication that the government was considering favourably the proposals which had been put forward. He may recall that I put on the record of that committee some very strong criticisms by the C.P.R. and some of the trucking associations of the proposal for refinancing put forward by Canadian National. In doing so I had no intention of supporting this criticism. It was done, rather, to elicit from the president of the C.N.R., Mr. Gordon, a public rebuttal, if you will, of the C.P.R. charges. The C.P.R. feels of course that in any financing of the C.N., and any refinancing in particular, its main competitor is being given a tremendous advantage.

It has been my contention that whatever his merits in some areas as president of the Canadian National Railways, Mr. Donald Gordon has failed in the financial sphere of railway management. I have made this point before, but I will bring it up again. When the royal commission on transportation made its recommendations in the early '50's, Mr. Gordon was convinced that with the refinancing of the C.N.R. the railway would very soon be in a surplus position and would never have to worry again about the size of its debt structure, or about the repayment of those debts and the meeting of its other obligations from year to year. The position of the C.N.R. did improve and there were a couple of years when the railway did show a surplus; in one year it was a big one; in another it was not so big. The other cry was that the whole railway had to be rehabilitated; there had to be central traffic control and new equipment of all kinds.

It was in those years of the middle '50's that the annual bill which came before us began to escalate. It is almost fantastic, when you begin to consider it in detail, the massive capital expenditure by Canadian National since 1954. Mr. Gordon was wrong in his opinion that the refinancing which followed the report of the royal commission on transportation in 1950 would put the C.N.R. in a viable economic position vis-à-vis its competitors. He was wrong again when he argued that the rehabilitation of the physical structure of the C.N.R. and the use of the most modern transportation methods would put the railway into a viable economic position and enable it to carry its debt.

Despite an increase in productivity, despite the decreasing cost of moving freight a ton mile which has resulted from all this tremendous expenditure, the position of the C.N.R. has really not improved. And so, after being wrong twice, Mr. Gordon comes up with his third major proposition since he became president of the C.N.R., namely that the debt structure should be completely reorganized. Figures have been mentioned running all the way from $690 million to $850 million. He has been most thorough in the proposition he has put forward. He elaborated it fully and clearly as long ago as 1961. He did so with particular thoroughness in 1962 and there were repetitions in 1963 and 1964. With all the discredit one may wish to place on the House of Commons, and the hesitation which a government may feel about trying to get a complicated measure such as this before parliament, this is a very bad show on the part of the administrators in the Department of Finance and the Department of Transport, and on the part of ministers over the last three or four years. It is a reflection upon them that it has taken so long for this debt reorganization to be handled and dealt with. In a sense, the kind of measure we have here would never have been necessary, or necessary in this particular form, if action had been taken on this more fundamental question.

I think it is our duty as members of the opposition to carp about this state of affairs, to criticize, to suggest that if Mr. Gordon has a case for debt reorganization, surely he has made it and made it again and again in the course of the last few years. I am very interested in this because the subject of debt reorganization fits into a much wider context. Recently there was a brouhaha in connection with run-throughs on the Canadian National. All across the country there was editorial criticism. Writers of editorials talked about "getting in the way of efficiency" on the part of the C.N.R. Well, if objection to a run-through affecting tiny little places like Nakina and Wainwright is getting in the way of efficiency, what about holding up of a question involving between $600 million and $850 million by the Departments of Finance and Transport?

How are those of us in politics who are aware that the C.N.R. is a crown agency to

react when we seem to be dealing on the level of $10,000 or $50,000 saved here or there in the name of efficiency while, at the same time, we have this kind of ball-up? And I think it is one, when the highest paid head of our largest government agency makes a serious and detailed proposition repeatedly, within the general context of tremendous change in the industry, change which affects the workers; within the context of other changes promulgated by the Railway Act which has been placed before us, which would alter the whole structure of freight rates in this country, something which would change the sacred cow and its ramifications in western Canada, which would lead to a massive abandonment program and which carries within it subsidies amounting to more than $1 billion in ten years. Nothing is done to deal with those important recommendations. Once again we come up with the traditional bill and we do not have the story before us relative to this question of the debt reorganization of the C.N.R.

I am not trying to put this out of focus or to distort it. But this is a very serious thing. I have heard all this nonsense—I like to call it garbage—about the MacPherson commission taking an over-all look at the railway picture. Damn it all, Mr. Chairman; it did not. There were a number of things it was specifically excluded from looking at, and it was not an over-all look at the transportation picture or an over-all look at all the railway problems.

I am not quarrelling with many of the recommendations, particularly the recommendation that a national transport council should be created. I think it attempted to prescribe, in the main, for the problems that the railways face; but it did not go into this whole question of the debt reorganization of Canadian National Railways; it did not go into the relationship of Canadian National Railways to the government or to the House of Commons. This bill, and the way these measures sort of march in in part and are delayed and held up, is an indication to me that we very, very badly need a good minister of transport. Maybe we have got one; I don't know. Maybe the present minister is the one we need. But surely we need a minister of transport who could get on top of all these matters, somehow get them into the House of Commons in some correlation and get them through in a complete legislative program—if you want, a session devoted to transportation problems. But it seems to me we peck here and pick there and get a little bit, and always it seems we are behind, in legislative terms, as to what the railways, the shippers and everybody else seem to want and need out in the country.

This is true not only for the railways but it is true for air. You know, Mr. Chairman, the fandango we have had over air transport policy in the last while, including colourful little gallops across the television screen with the present Minister of Transport, and charges here and charges there. One minute we feel T.C.A. and C.P.A. might amalgamate and the next minute we are getting balloons, I suppose, lifting with suggestions that no, it is a new kind of co-operation; and lately we have had the balloon that really in the air transport field the private carrier and private enterprise seem to be the answer. All I can say is that there is a considerable element of confusion, particularly in policy terms. This is not a major bill. We support it. In many ways we are not capable of arguing a great deal against it; but that is largely where it stands.

I have one suggestion to make, Mr. Chairman, that is not relevant to the bill but is directed to the Minister of Transport and the representatives of the Department of Finance. It is that in future, if we have to have more bills of this kind, they be sent to the public accounts committee where we would have the advice and guidance of the Auditor General. It is quite apparent that the Auditor General has views in this regard. I do not know how far he would like his arm to reach in assisting parliamentarians, but I have certainly had the impression from his comments about the C.B.C. and other crown agencies that he feels—and I certainly have felt, as a member of the committee at the times I have been a member of it—that the committee and the Auditor General together can do a good job in taking a look at these financial requirements of great agencies: I think this bill in particular is one that could go to the public accounts committee, be handled there very quickly and come back with more intelligent treatment, analysis, comment and recommendations than we can provide in this chamber, with the way the bill moves through it.

The last point I wanted to make in connection with the bill relates to the position of Air Canada as it seems to be involved in the C.N.R., with the C.N.R. as the financing agency. It is a very minor point, but it seems to me it is about time, in terms of the maturity of Air Canada as a company and because of its financial abilities, and that at least in the

foreseeable future it seems to have a revenue possibility that is excellent, the government considered allowing it to make its own financial arrangements completely by itself, rather than operating through Canadian National Railways. I know that at the present time this is just a service that is offered by Canadian National Railways and there are no strings to this; but it seems to me that in the interests of clearness, even if it is just to stop the annual question in our parliamentary committee that examines the C.N.R. and T.C.A.—which indicates the confusion of all members of parliament about this—we might achieve something by making that separation.

There is one point about Canadian National Railways and all other crown agencies of this kind that has always bothered me, and I know the Minister of Transport has spoken about it a number of times. I refer to the boundary line between administration and policy, and the whole question of what rights or responsibilities fall upon the House of Commons and its members with regard to the crown agencies. The difficulty we have is to ascertain where administration stops and policy begins; there is a grey area here. The minister reports for Canadian National Railways and reports to Canadian National Railways when issues are raised in the house. The railway reports to him when it has certain matters to raise aside from the financing. Yet we are never very sure what the position of the House of Commons itself is with regard to this question. I can underline this point by the fact that it does not seem to matter, when we review the annual report of the C.N.R., whether any report comes back to the house from the committee with any recommendations. It just seems to be a routine that we go through, which recognizes that there should be provided some sort of a talk forum where we can probe the president of Canadian National Railways; but it suggests to me that we actually have no real power to make recommendations with regard to policy; that all we can do, in a sense, is advance ideas and we really cannot put forward policy recommendations.

I would suggest that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Transport between them —particularly in connection with very large expenditures such as are covered in this bill and those they bring forward regularly—might consider this problem and see if they cannot provide us with a clear indication as to the rights of the House of Commons, or parliament, if you want, as an institution to examine, scrutinize and recommend in connection with these two very important agencies, C.N.R. and T.C.A. I hope the bill has a speedy passage today, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that at least one or two of my comments may have found some response or echo with the Minister of Transport. As I say, it is not his bill; but some of us are living in hopes that he may be that good Minister of Transport that we have dreamed about.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, every year a bill is introduced to authorize the Canadian National Railways to make certain capital expenditures allowing them to provide for some financial needs. The amount for the year 1964 is $155 million. As the year 1964 is almost ended, even though the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) asks us to accept this expenditure for 1964, I believe that the greater part of this amount has already been spent and that we are only called upon to approve it in principle.

On the other hand, the farmers throughout this country will not even receive the sum of $80 million in subsidies. None the less, we know that agriculture constitutes an urgent problem. I quote those figures in order to point out that the federal government should spend the money of Canadian taxpayers more judiciously.

We are not told why those $155 million are needed. Naturally, only the total amount is mentioned; but I am somewhat concerned about the fact that this amount of money is handed over to the Canadian National Railways which can spend it in any way it chooses, while we know that for some years the C.N.R. has been invading a field of operations for which it was not intended in Canada. Let us examine more specifically its intrusion in the field of trucking.

There is in Canada a very well organized industry, which carries on business efficiently, gives work to thousands and even tens of thousands of Canadian citizens who pay income tax, which allows Ottawa to collect substantial amounts in company profits; it is the trucking industry. The Canadian National Railways, and not the "truckers", were intended to weld the various sections of the country. The C.N.R. has in the last few years gone into the trucking business, while private industry was well able to give adequate service in this field.

It is thanks to government income taxes, the citizens' income taxes and also taxes levied on trucking concerns, that the C.N.R. has started to compete with the trucking industry. Taxes collected from the trucking industry are handed over to the C.N.R., which uses

that money to compete with the trucking industry which was operating to the satisfaction of all.

Out of the funds which we are now asked to vote, what amount will be used by the C.N.R. to purchase trucks and to set up truck routes throughout Canada, in other words, to compete with the Canadian trucking industry?

It would certainly be interesting to know that, because if we are asked to vote millions of dollars to enable the C.N.R. to compete with private enterprise, the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance might as well know that we cannot go along with that. However, if the Canadian National Railways intend to use those funds to improve other services they operate exclusively, then it will be more acceptable.

The C.N.R. have a deficit of approximately $60 million a year and in addition, they get an additional amount of about $86 million during the year in the form of subsidies and grants of all kinds. But since subsidies are being paid to the C.N.R. for the transportation of feed grain under the pretext of enabling farmers to pay less, why not pay the same subsidies to the trucking industry? As a matter of fact, for instance, a farmer of the Saguenay-Lake St. John district who wants to buy feed grain will have to get it in Montreal in order to take advantage of the grants paid to the C.N.R. to reduce his cost price, because there are no trains running between Montreal and Lake St. John, and the trucks serving this run do not get similar subsidies. Then, the farmer will pay more for his feed grain because subsidies are only granted to assist one and not all transport companies.

I should like to submit to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) who proposes resolutions to approve C.N.R. expenditures, that the C.N.R. has an important role to play, that of linking together the various parts of the country. This is very important. The C.N.R. could be a determining factor in the economic development of our country but it would not be desirable that every action be taken to the prejudice of private enterprise or other segments of our economy, as is the case today, for instance, against the trucking industry.

It is true that the Minister of Transport has not been at the head of that department for very long, but I think that he should delve more deeply into the matter when discussing the part the C.N.R. should play and its possible illogical competition with private enterprise in various fields.

This is what I heard the president of the C.N.R., Mr. Donald Gordon, say at a sessional railway committee meeting; "As president of the Canadian National Railways, whenever I am able to make a 5 per cent profit, I shall do so." That is an excellent aim, because this is a crown company for which he is trying to make as much profit as he can. He is working in the best interests of Canadian citizens as a whole. On the other hand, it must be said that this should not be done at the expense of other areas of our economy, because it does not make sense to improve one field to the detriment of another.

It is the responsibility of the Department of Transport to make sure that improvements in certain sectors are not made to the prejudice of others, but that as much co-operation is given to each of them.

That is not what is happening today. The Canadian National Railways compete strongly with the trucking industry as well as with the hotels and travel agencies, etc.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the minister should ask the directors of the Canadian National Railways to stick as much as possible to the aims for which they were established and to stop meddling ceaselessly into fields over which they do not necessarily have jurisdiction.

The proposed resolution mentions also:

—and to raise the limit on the Canadian National Railway Company's authority to refund matured, maturing and callable securities from the present level of $480,000,000 to $680,000,000.

I am of the opinion that this is an indication of the refinancing of the debt of the Canadian National Railways of which Mr. Donald Gordon, the president of the company, told us about for quite a while.

In this connection, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) or the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Pennell) if, prior to going ahead with this refinancing, the whole matter will be referring to the railway committee.

Mr. Chairman, I think the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance did not hear my question as he was talking with the member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette). I would draw the attention of the member for Lotbinière to the fact that this is no time to ask for patronage from the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance; he should let him listen to all the questions we are putting to him.

Canadian National Railways

Mr. Chairman, my question was this: Could the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance tell us if before undertaking the refinancing of the C.N.R. we will have an opportunity of discussing the refinancing procedure in the standing committee on railways, or any sessional committee, so that we may hear witnesses who are interested in this refinancing or affected by the effects it would entail?

We are being asked today to approve an increase in the C.N.R. appropriations when we know that the money, or at least a large part of it, has been spent and that C.N.R. deficits are met, in one way or another, by the government. Although this approval is only a technicality, an approval after the *fait accompli*, I would nevertheless ask the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance to tell the president of the C.N.R. that even if we are voting money in this way, without knowing why, we would still like to have some assurance that this money will not be spent on trucking facilities to compete with a private Canadian industry which is doing quite well.

Mr. Chairman, even if we allow the C.N.R. to increase by $200 million the maximum amount of securities due or to become due which it may redeem, we think the matter should nevertheless be referred to a committee before C.N.R. refinancing begins.

[*Text*]

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. McIlraith (for Mr. Gordon) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-137, to authorize the provision of moneys to meet certain capital expenditures of the Canadian National Railways system for the period from the 1st day of January, 1964 to the 30th day of June, 1965, and to authorize the guarantee by Her Majesty of certain securities to be issued by the Canadian National Railways Company.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): When shall the said bill read a second time; now?

Mr. Grégoire: At the next sitting.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, is it the wish of hon. members that we go ahead with this?

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. Grégoire: We have not seen the bill as yet.

Mr. Lambert: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not seen this bill.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the bill could be read a second time at the next sitting of the house or later this day, as the case may be.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, in this regard I should like to point out that there were certain questions raised at the resolution stage. I think the parliamentary secretary should answer these questions at the second reading stage. Since we do not have the bill it would be useless for us to go ahead at this stage.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I am not asking hon. members to go ahead now, I am merely asking that second reading be ordered for the next sitting of the house or later this day, as the case may be.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, we are opposed to that suggestion in view of the fact that we have not seen the bill. We have not had any opportunity to consider the bill, and there are certain questions to be answered by the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance. I think second reading should be given at the next sitting of the house. We have completed two stages already today.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. member does not understand the effect of the procedure I requested. He is saying the same thing I said. I asked that the bill be read a second time at the next sitting of the house or later this day, as the case may be. If it is agreeable to hon. members we might call it later today, but that probably will not be the case.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Is it agreed that the bill be read a second time at the next sitting of the house or later this day, as the case may be?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

SHIPPING

REPEAL OF NEWFOUNDLAND ACTS RESPECTING HARBOURS AND PILOTAGE

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport) moved the second reading of Bill No. S-40, to repeal certain acts of the province of Newfoundland respecting harbours and pilotage.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I might say that the only purpose of this bill is to carry out

one of the terms of union. It was felt that certain Newfoundland statutes should be carried on for a period of time. That was provided for in the terms of union. It was felt that in due course they would be repealed. I think it would be much easier if we go into committee to explain one or two small details by way of answers to questions asked by hon. members.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Batten in the chair.

On clause 1—*Repeal of the outport pilots and pilotage acts.*

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I think we should follow the procedures outlined in the amendments to the rules, that when a bill calls for merely a short title—I am sorry, I thought there was a short title.

Mr. Pickersgill: There is no short title; in fact it has no title at all.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport one question in this regard. I think I know the answer to my question but I should like to have it recorded. Has the province of Newfoundland agreed to all of these changes?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I have done my best to ascertain that, and it is my understanding that there is no objection at all. When this legislation has been passed, as hon. members will see by reading the last clause, it will be brought into force by proclamation after consultation not only with the provincial authority, but with any individuals who must necessarily be consulted in order to make the transition. This bill simply makes the ordinary laws of Canada apply to Newfoundland, as they now apply to other provinces.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask one question for clarification. I freely admit that I have not gone into this matter very deeply. It is a matter that affects the minister more closely than perhaps it would someone from the west coast. I recall being on a committee a number of years ago which considered circumstances surrounding the certification of masters and other deck officers of ships in the coasting trade. One aspect of our discussion at that time had to do with the advisability of the length of the transitional period with which certain individuals might have to comply as a result of the application of the general laws of Canada.

As I recall it, the committee finally came to agreement and parliament later took the appropriate action. It continued under the general laws of Canada provision for certain differences in respect to certain qualifications and other matters covering those engaged in the coastal trade in Newfoundland.

I notice this bill makes particular reference to the pilotage authorities. I am wondering whether it will abolish any such arrangements or whether there may be any question of the desirability of the continuance, under special provision of the laws of parliament, of arrangements with respect to people acting in that capacity in Newfoundland.

Mr. Pickersgill: Of course certificates for masters and mates would come under the Canada Shipping Act, and not under this legislation which applies only to pilots.

Mr. Lambert: This may be merely a legal quibble, but could the minister tell us when the outports, pilots and pilotage act, being chapter 215 of the statutes of Newfoundland, was passed? This is not an act which was passed by the Newfoundland legislature since 1949. It is one which predates confederation.

Mr. Pickersgill: They have revised all their statutes since confederation and they had to re-enact, as we do when we revise our statutes, all those that were still in operation; and if they had not included this one in their revised statutes there would not be any law on this. This is a layman's interpretation but I think I am right. My hon. friend from St. John's West is here. He is a learned lawyer and will correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. Lambert: The purpose of my question was to make sure that we are not, by inadvertence, repealing an act of that legislature which was passed since confederation.

Mr. Cashin: Under term 18 of the union of Newfoundland with Canada those acts prior to confederation remained in force. Certain acts came under federal jurisdiction, and it was suggested in the other place that it may have been inappropriate for the provincial government to have re-enacted these statutes in 1952 because the authority in this field lies with this parliament and not with the provincial government.

Mr. Olson: Does this parliament have authority to repeal an act passed by the legislature of Newfoundland?

Mr. Pickersgill: This relates to the constitution, and it is quite clear that any

provincial statute which falls within the ambit of section 91 of the B.N.A. Act could only be repealed by this parliament. We had an example last session when the Newfoundland Savings Bank Act had to be repealed. The bank was sold to one of the chartered banks and we were told that for some legal reasons the act had to be repealed. It could not be repealed by the provincial legislature, and since harbours and pilotage are matters which come exclusively within the jurisdiction of this parliament it is only this parliament which could alter such statutes.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

OTTAWA TERMINAL RAILWAY COMPANY

IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENT RESPECTING RAILWAY RELOCATION

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport) moved the second reading of Bill No. S-33, to incorporate the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company.

He said: Mr. Speaker, if the house will agree, I have asked my hon. friend, the member for Russell (Mr. Tardif) to speak on this bill because the terminal is to be located in his constituency. He has familiarized himself with the bill and I know he could give a better explanation than I.

Mr. Paul Tardif (Russell): Mr. Speaker, I wish I were as familiar with the bill to the extent the minister has given me credit. Not necessarily because of my efforts, but because it is logical that these improvements be placed in a proper setting, the new terminal will be located in my riding.

The purpose of the bill is to implement, with regard to the incorporation of a terminal railway company, the agreement for the relocation of railways in the Ottawa area dated October 17, 1963, between the national capital commission, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian National Railway Company. I think it would be wise to give a few brief historic notes of how this came about.

The first commission that was appointed for the purpose of studying the railway problem in the capital city was established about 60 years ago when Sir Wilfrid Laurier was prime minister of Canada. At that time it was thought necessary to make plans to relocate the railways and to eliminate the circulation of railroads in and out of the centre of Ottawa, if the capital were to grow as it should. For that purpose a report was prepared by a commission in 1899. It was called the Ottawa improvement commission and, though it did not make a final plan it did make some recommendations that were incorporated in the last plan submitted to the national capital commission and the federal parliament. The plan I refer to is one involving the relocation of railway lines and their terminal.

In 1915 what is know as the Holt report was made, and confirmed what had originally been reported. Unfortunately the first world war stopped the implementation of this report and the plan was postponed for a period of about 20 years. At that time the national capital commission, which was interested in the development of a federal area, revised the plan because of the problem caused by the added traffic of railways in and out of the city, and again recommended to the federal government that the recommendations included in the original report be implemented. The railway and terminal facilities serving the city of Ottawa created many problems and at that time it was found that it would be logical to cure these things by implementing the report that had been made.

I know that hon. members who are here regularly, and who probably have been here longer this session than they have been before, realize that there are many problems created by the Ottawa river, the Rideau river, the Rideau canal and the fact that the city of Hull which is separated from the city of Ottawa uses these facilities provided by the central station. Not only do the comings and goings of trains in greater numbers create problems, but also depressed areas are created surrounding the tracks. About 1938 it was decided we should go about implementing this plan with greater speed. However, the second world war intervened and again delayed the implementation of the plan.

[*Translation*]

I hope members of parliament will understand, as I do, that even at this late date it is better to start immediately.

For this reason an agreement has been reached by the national capital commission, the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railways so that the construction of the projected terminus may be started right away.

Specifications are ready. The ground is being prepared. Nothing, therefore, could

prevent the carrying out of this program so that the necessary agreements may be signed by January 1, 1965.

[*Text*]

I know hon. members will realize it is imperative that this be done as quickly as possible if we are going to cure some of the problems that now exist and which should have been cured many years ago. These plans have been delayed because of wars and other happenings. The relocation plan is now progressing. The Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways are going to be shareholders in this new terminal. It is planned that this terminal will be situated about a quarter of a mile from Hurdman's bridge and about two miles from the parliament buildings. It is planned also to construct a route with four or six lanes, I am not sure which, from the new terminal to the Chateau Laurier or the centre of the city. If we are going to have the terminal constructed according to the schedule that has been decided upon, it is important that this bill be passed by the house. I would ask hon. members to do so now.

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): The concern I have with the bill is really the objections that have been raised to it by the trucking interests. I do not know what substance there is in them, but I assume the minister or the hon. member for Russell have seen those objections and have a clear answer for us. I think the general assumption would be that this would be a non-contentious bill in that it is really a follow-up on the consultations for the creation of industry and transport and for the betterment of our national capital's appearance.

According to the truckers, if this new terminal company is given the powers which seem to be apparent in one of the clauses, the terminal company can initiate trucking and transfer services and provide total warehouse services. One can understand their concern. I think perhaps we can see this most clearly, not because the Canadian National is in the trucking business in various lines, not because the Canadian Pacific is in the trucking business in various lines, but because under this measure they are operating together in a terminal. The truckers feel that if this presages a co-operative move on the part of the two railways using the Ottawa terminal, with the very great rights given to them by this bill, then in effect the Ottawa operation, according to the truckers' interpretation, could become the centre of a completely new kind of trucking operation and terminal operation that has no precedent in Canada.

This is the only question I wanted to raise particularly with regard to the bill. It does seem to me there is a problem here that we might have to explore. We have heard from the minister that he intends to repeal, or he has introduced a bill that will repeal the Canadian National-Canadian Pacific Act, which is a form of co-operative bill that was supposed to set up the framework for co-operation. Now, it seems, since we understand that repeal is coming, we have a bill that brings the two of them together in concert again in this Ottawa terminal. I just wondered whether any consideration was given at any time to putting the terminal company, in terms of management, directly into the hands of one company or the other.

The minister may wonder why I bring this up. Perhaps he will recall the situation in connection with the hotel Vancouver. Mr. Gordon himself has told us in committee about that co-operative operation and said that it did not work because the terms had altered with the years. Again, I should like to have some indication from the minister as to what consideration was given in drawing up this bill to possible difficulties between the two companies, and whether there had been any consideration given to perhaps making the Ottawa terminal railway company an offshoot of Canadian National with some regulations carried in the bill to give Canadian Pacific a place. This is one of the things I would be interested in hearing from the minister that we were not given by the hon. member for Russell—and I am not trying to be critical of him. The other thing about which I would like to hear from the minister relates to the disposal of the assets that already exist, and what relationship they may have to his new organization and to the government.

I hope these do not seem like pettifogging questions, but I thought they would be worth raising now, and then we could go into the individual clauses of the bill very quickly.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder if there would be a disposition to give second reading to the bill so we could study it in committee this evening? I am grateful to the hon. gentleman for raising these questions, but I would really need someone in front of me to assist me in dealing with them.

Mr. Lambert: I think I should like to say a few words on this bill. It is one of the bills

about which I think I am right on my procedure.

Mr. Pickersgill: Then, I imagine it is six o'clock, sir.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTION 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 question to be raised at ten o'clock this day is as follows: The hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox; veterans affairs—announcement of increase in pensions and allowances.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

OTTAWA TERMINAL RAILWAY COMPANY

IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENT RESPECTING RAILWAY RELOCATION

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Pickersgill for the second reading of Bill No. S-33, to incorporate the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): There are a couple of points I should like to make in connection with the bill before us at this stage. The first has some connection with a point which was made by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher). I refer to the powers which are granted to the company to provide terminal facilities.

The railways have been slipping into certain practices in terminals in various cities in Canada which have had a serious effect on local cartage companies. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the railways have got into the road transportation side of distribution to a considerable extent. Not only have they got into interprovincial, long range trucking but they also carry on local trucking operations. I am aware of instances where the railways have engaged in what might be called loss leader practices by offering to distribute goods arriving at terminals at rates which are much lower than the economic rates in effect through the local cartage companies. The railways are in a position to do this, because in their entire operations these cartage losses boil up into a general soup of losses against which are provided certain subsidies. True enough, the C.P.R. does not operate at a loss but it is able to offset losses connected with some of its terminal activities through subsidies which exist for freight rate equalization and so on.

I am wondering whether this bill will not encourage the practice to which I have just referred. Clause 10 of the bill gives authority for the provision of terminal facilities and there are any number of powers granted in this connection. I should like the minister to tell us whether it is the intention of the railway companies to engage in this practice of undercutting through the use of terminal facilities. The local cartage companies would be most surprised if they were suddenly to find that the Ottawa Railway Terminal Company had turned into one of their chief competitors to such an extent that they were losing a large proportion of their business.

After all, we should seek to ensure that local businesses are strong and flourishing. There is no point in granting large companies the power to engage in certain activities just for the satisfaction of putting local enterprises out of business. I know there is a very arguable case for the railways endeavouring to run an efficient operation. We all say three cheers to that. But what is the over-all price we shall be asked to pay to create this efficient framework, this efficient operation? The purchase price may be somewhat too high.

This is the main observation I have to make. Perhaps as we go along, as we get to clause 10, we can get some further information.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): There are one or two points I wish to make. First we should like to know how much this relocation of the terminal in Ottawa will cost the federal government, and ultimately the taxpayers of Canada. This question has been asked before, and I presume the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) is prepared to answer it.

I do not really have any objection to the setting up of this Ottawa Terminal Railway Company for the purpose of relocating the railway terminal, in other words moving it from the downtown area to a location somewhere in the constituency of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Tardif). But if the House of Commons decides this is a desirable action to take, the government should be prepared

to offer at least some kind of co-operation to those other cities in Canada which want to do exactly the same thing. I know that the city of Calgary has been attempting to enter into negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway to move its terminal from the downtown area to the outskirts of the city, thereby making available for commercial and industrial exploitation a very large area which is now being used for switch yards, freight terminals and so on.

I think the three prairie provinces, which are now handicapped because of the provisions of the statute of 1881 exempting the railways from paying taxes on their main lines, are entitled to equal consideration when they wish to proceed with this kind of redevelopment within their city limits. After all, the provisions of this bill, if you read the memorandum of understanding made between the national capital commission, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian National Railway Company, require under clause 22 of the memorandum of understanding:

> The commission will pay all costs and expenses incurred by the National Railways, Pacific Railway and Terminal Railway
>
> (a) in development and preparation of plans, specifications, deeds, surveys, descriptions, applications and agreements;

The commission will also be required to pay all the costs in effecting the transfers of land referred to in this memorandum, including registration fees, land transfer taxes and municipal taxes that have been paid for any period after the land has been vacated or operations thereon abandoned by the railway, whichever is the earlier. The national commission is also required to pay all the costs in carrying out any other work that the railway companies may be required to do as a result of this memorandum or that the commission may lawfully require the railway companies to perform. We know that the national capital commission gets most, if not all, of its funds from the federal government, and it certainly seems to me that because the federal parliament is now disposed to paying huge sums of money—we do not know exactly how much it would cost, but I presume it would cost several millions of dollars to relocate the railway terminal in Ottawa to, if I may put it this way, dress up the city and make the downtown area more attractive, perhaps to have a more efficient and attractive railway terminal some place away from the downtown area in Ottawa—the federal government should also be disposed to taking the kind of action that would be necessary in order that some of the cities in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta may also do this.

We know that because of this statute of 1881 the railways have acquired certain lands that are classified as main lines within the downtown area of cities in these three provinces, which gives the C.P.R., and I presume also the C.N.R., a very strong bargaining position in effecting any transfers of land with the end result of enhancing downtown areas. I do not want to speak for very long on this matter but, as is well known to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), to the government and particularly, I might say, to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon), the premiers of the three western provinces have made representations to the Minister of Finance and to the government to have this statute of 1881 repealed so they can be on equal ground, if you want to call it that, and can bargain from a position equal to that of the railways. We know there has not been any action taken by the government to give effect to the representations that have been made. As a matter of fact the premiers of the three western provinces have made at least one, and I think more than one, trip to Ottawa to meet with the government and lay their case before them; and so far no action has been taken.

It seems to me that to be fair these three provinces ought to have some action taken by the federal government to remove this discriminatory statute that does in fact exempt the main line of the railways in only those three provinces; because after all, in all the other parts of Canada railways do have to pay taxes on their main lines. I believe that if we are prepared to spend several millions of dollars to remove this terminal from the downtown area in Ottawa to some place on the outskirts, we ought at least to ask the government to take the necessary action so that those three western provinces may also proceed in their negotiations with the railway company, and do exactly the same thing in some of the cities where there has been an expressed desire to enhance the downtown area by moving out the railway terminal and some of the side tracks that are there. When we get to the committee stage, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask some more questions along this line, but I raise these points now so that the minister may prepare himself to answer some of them.

Ottawa Terminal Railway Company

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. If the minister speaks now, he will close the debate.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I know there are reasons why the station in Ottawa should be moved out into the country, and perhaps not the best one is the fact that the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Tardif) represents the new location of that station. But I wonder if we have really weighed the reasons for moving this station and whether it is to the advantage of members of parliament, people who deal with the government of the nation, or even the people of Ottawa themselves. We all know that people going to Montreal today—and I am told that most members are well aware of this; maybe they will not say anything—very seldom fly to that city. It takes longer to go to the airport here and from the airport at the other end than it does to get on the train a block from the parliament buildings and arrive downtown in the heart of Montreal. People coming into this national capital can come in one of three ways. If they wish to fly, they land at Uplands airport, a number of miles out of town, and find themselves, after a long, very rough taxi ride, in the downtown area. Those that come by car of course have many ways in which to get into what is a confused city for tourists; but they eventually find their way downtown to where they wish to do business, particularly those interested in the government aspect of this city. But those who come by train do not have any trouble in getting to the downtown part of Ottawa and usually—and fortunately, compared with most other cities—are able to leave the station and be in the downtown section or this area in a short period of time.

I am well aware that Charlotte Whitton wants to use this little area down here for a theatre; she has said so on numerous occasions. But I really could not care less what she wants to do with it. I, as a traveller coming into Ottawa for many, many years, have always been very happy with the fact that the railroad went downtown; that it was in the major section of the city, and I have always considered this to be a big advantage to anyone coming into Ottawa to do government business. It is not difficult to explain to people how to get to the parliament buildings if they arrive by train, because when one walks out of the station he can see them. I am quite well aware that we are going to have a new edifice out on Industrial avenue, but to get to Industrial avenue means a long bus ride or, if one is coming to the city, a very confused trip by taxi or other means to get downtown to the business section.

I would be opposed to the railway moving the station out of this area. In my opinion they have some responsibility to the public that travels on the railroad, although there has certainly been less regard for the travelling public over the last few years than there has been to other revenue inducing parts of their enterprise. I am doubly surprised at this bill and I think I have support across the country in violently opposing a move to make the Canadian public pay for closing down the station in the downtown section of Ottawa, where it has been located since it was constructed, and relocating it out in the country. I cannot think of anything more silly than having one of our major transportation connection lines moved from a very advantageous position as far as the seat of the national parliament is concerned—it is only about a block away—to some place a great many miles out in the country. There is no point in talking about the roads which will connect it to the city because anyone who has driven on the roads in that area knows that a small car almost disappears during the course of the journey.

I am sure very little consideration has been given to the wishes of the Canadian public in this matter, particularly those of the public who travel by rail. If hon. members refer to the memorandum attached to the bill they will find the commission felt that in the interest of the national capital commission development plan it was advisable to relocate the station. I have discussed this matter with several members of the national capital commission when I have attended certain functions and have been able to raise the matter, and they just laugh and say there is nothing anyone can do about it. And I think that is true. I do not think there is a thing in the world that I can do about this and I do not think there is anything the Minister of Transport can do about it either. I think this move has been in contemplation for some time and probably it will come to pass. However, I do suggest that those who in their wisdom many years ago brought the railroads into the heart of the city were providing a service to the travelling public which we are not giving consideration to now.

I realize that the railway could not care less about its passengers. Anyone who has travelled on the C.N.R. finds that the accom-

modation is lousy. He will find that sometimes there is no one on the train who can tell why the train is running six or seven hours late, which happens periodically. It is matters like this which illustrate that the convenience of the travelling public is not given any consideration. However, let me just say that personally I am violently opposed to the relocation of the station from where it is now to somewhere out in the country. I would think that every hon. member of this house would have a hole in his head to vote for something which is not in his interest, is not in the interest of his constituents who may be using this facility, and no hon. member should be stupid enough to provide the money to make such a transfer.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, to adopt some well worn words, I did not intend to take part in this debate. But since the opportunity has arisen I do want to take a few minutes to express my views on this particular bill.

I have found myself wondering during the past two or three years whether this plan to relocate the union station away from the central part of Ottawa is a good and sound plan in its present context. I think there is no doubt that ten or 15 years ago, when railway trains were hauled by steam engines which were generally considered to be dirty for a downtown section of any city, because of the coal dust and other deposits they blew into the air, and with their noisy whistles disturbing people in the downtown section, there was a very good argument for relocating a railway station somewhere else than the centre of a city. However, there has been quite a change since then. Diesels are now used 100 per cent on all railways which use this station. These diesels are quiet and they are clean, so I think that the objection based on that particular approach, if there ever was one, has now disappeared. I wonder whether second thoughts might have been given to the situation which existed five or ten years ago when the plan was originally formulated.

The second matter I want to raise is this. It is a fact that the present location of the station is very convenient for the travelling public, not only for those who handle freight and express but for passengers who come into the city and find themselves immediately in the downtown section. I should not be surprised if not very many years hence we were wishing we had this station right down in the centre part of the city of Ottawa. There is everything to be said for keeping it where it is, although objection might be taken to the appearance of the station. Frankly I do not see where relocation of the railway tracks will be of any benefit. At present they run along a natural break in the landscape, just by the canal to a large extent. There does not seem to be any logical reason for this change, except the fact that a larger and probably more desirable complex of buildings could be constructed further out.

When this plan was first proposed some years ago, somewhere around the time I first came here, I saw the plan which had been prepared by the national capital commission. At that time it looked like a good thing to get this dirty railway station and all the railway trains out of the downtown section. But those who travel by air know that it is becoming more and more inconvenient to get to airports and similar facilities on the outskirts of cities.

I am not going to go as far as the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) and vote against this bill. I am not an Ottawan, except to the extent that one becomes more or less a citizen of Ottawa after being here for a few years. Nevertheless I do express some very serious doubts about the necessity for establishing a whole new complex in a location which will require us to make use of buses, taxis and other less convenient methods of transport in order to reach it. I am not talking so much about the welfare of members of parliament here, because I do not think that those of us who are here should concern ourselves about this slight amount of inconvenience. However, this city is the focal point of the travels of a good many people in diplomatic service, industry, and commerce of all kinds, and I think we should do something to make it less inconvenient for them when they are called upon to use the station. Therefore I express this very slight protest at this entire situation.

I assume that serious consideration has been given to this proposal. Also there may be other factors of which I am not aware. But I think that if the present building were put in good shape we would be no worse off because we have railway tracks running alongside the canal than we would be by having a road, which I do not think would be any more convenient.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say only a few words about this bill. This seems to be another step on the part of the railroad industry to, in one way or another, reduce services to the public at an

increased cost, without any real benefit to the transportation system. By accepting figures presented by railroad officials we are in the position of not knowing their goals, or even the direction in which they are moving.

Mr. Speaker, the various acts in respect of railway operations would lead us to believe that railway companies are established to provide services. That is apparently their main and ultimate aim. Officials of the C.N.R., in particular, have said on many occasions that they believe the only profit making part of their operations is the moving of bulk cargoes. When the situation reaches the point where that is the actual fact, I am sure these same officials will tell us that even that side of their operations is no longer profitable.

The ultimate result of the measure now under discussion will be the transporting of fewer and fewer passengers from and to the terminal facilities in Ottawa. I suggest that is the apparent present day trend throughout the country. It has appeared to the general public for a number of years that the aim of railway companies is to cut down on costs, and to effect increased savings, with the inevitable result of a lessening in the number of services provided. This move has led to proportionate reductions in revenue. At the same time the railway companies decrease their costs, services and general expenditures, they increase their capital outlays.

In relation to the present measure before us, the terminal is being moved from the centre of the city, causing a complete rerouting of present line facilities, and creating increased capital costs and decreased services, with the net result of a decrease in passenger revenue. I should like to know where this trend is likely to end. We as legislators must ask ourselves this kind of question. I do not have a bone to pick in respect of railway services provided here in Ottawa, but my contention is that this measure is just one more example of what railway companies have been doing during the past five, six and even ten years.

What do the officials of railway companies expect to accomplish by expending a great deal of money for rerouting present lines, and relocating terminals? Is the provision of a new decentralized elaborate rail transportation terminal going to increase passenger travel and passenger revenue? Will the measure now before us bring about a new agreement as to the use of the Ottawa terminal by the two railway systems now servicing Ottawa? Will the two railway systems be able to economize as a result of the adoption of this measure?

[Mr. Horner (Acadia).]

Mr. Speaker, the only logical answer to the questions I have posed is that this measure will accomplish none of these things. It may enhance the city of Ottawa in an aesthetic way. It will undoubtedly cause the removal of some unsightly track locations in the downtown area. Surely these unsightly locations could be improved without the necessity of a huge capital expenditure to move the passenger terminal from the centre of the city. Surely the same result could be obtained by a different and less costly method.

We have been told that the C.N.R. passenger traffic, particularly, and we assume this is at least partially true of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is decreasing, yet we are proposing under this measure to establish a railway terminal company which will be allowed to spend a huge sum on capital acquisition for the handling of passenger traffic to and from Ottawa. This is a small measure, but in view of these facts I think it should be considered seriously. It should be considered in light of the general trend on the part of transportation companies to cut down on service facilities in order to effect certain economies.

Mr. Speaker, many royal commissions have studied the question of railway operating costs. I do not intend to discuss this subject in depth at this stage, as it is very complicated and involves formulae in respect of costing maintenance and per mile passenger operations. The present measure is a perfect example of another means by which the railway companies generally feel they can cut down on costs. By moving their terminals to outlying areas I suggest they will lose revenue as the result of the loss of passenger travel because of the inconvenience and loss of service.

This result has been apparent time and time again in the case of highway construction on the fringe of towns and cities, and the decentralization of air terminals. One can visit almost any part of Canada and observe the construction of highways and airport terminals in areas some distance removed from the centre of cities. These decentralization operations are in time accompanied by a general move of other services from the centre of cities. In the case now under consideration I suggest it is only a matter of time before the new terminal is surrounded by housing and industrial developments. Time and time again we observe the construction of highways at the edge of small towns and cities, only to observe within a very few years that they are again bordered and surrounded by communities which have moved from original

downtown locations. I suggest in the present case within a short period of time the new Ottawa terminal will be encompassed by a heavy build-up of homes and industries.

The officials of the railways may believe that they are accomplishing something by this present measure, but I suggest they will accomplish very little as a result of the expenditure of this large amount of money, and I support my contention by the words of the officials of the company concerned. They tell us their passenger revenues are decreasing. Do they expect to increase passenger revenue by increasing the inconvenience to passengers and decreasing services?

Mr. Speaker, I have very little more to say about this measure, but I should like to point out as a warning that the present transitional trend on the part of railway companies, which is particularly apparent in the prairies, where rail line abandonments are being considered, will in one way or another cut down on services, thereby decreasing revenues generally to the point where it is no longer feasible to continue any attempt to provide these decreased services. I am wondering whether this situation is not once again evident in the case presently being considered.

Mr. J. E. Lloyd (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I shall only take a few minutes to present my views on this subject. The hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) made reference to exemptions from taxation in respect of certain railway properties at certain locations in Canada. He made reference to the fact that no uniform policy is followed. I think we are all aware of this. I cannot find the exact provision in the bill but I understand that this particular company will be paying municipal taxes to the municipalities in which these properties are located.

In the Atlantic provinces the railways only acknowledge a liability on a sort of voluntary grant basis equal to 50 per cent of the real property tax in the Atlantic region. They do so on the ground that the I.C.R. was a crown corporation and therefore enjoyed the protection of those provisions of the B.N.A. Act which exempt crown property from taxation. Here we have a railway company, a crown corporation, engaging in a venture with a private railway company, the Canadian Pacific, and jointly they will undertake certain developments. It is true that the national capital commission has certain responsibilities in the matter but the fact still remains that municipal taxation is a liability of this new company.

Ottawa Terminal Railway Company

Recently when the operations of Canadian National Railways were being reviewed by the railway committee I endeavoured to obtain from Mr. Donald Gordon, president and general manager of the C.N.R., an undertaking that they would supply us with a general statement of the different reasons across the nation for the differing kinds of municipal tax liabilities which they have undertaken to discharge and meet. The president of the company felt this was a matter that concerned the railway company and the municipalities involved and I believe he took the view that as a crown company he was in much the same position as a private company and should not be disclosing any helpful information to the railway committee with regard to this matter.

The result is that those of us who seek a correction of this inequality in municipal taxation, so far as the railways are concerned, are compelled to come to the house and seek assurances from the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) that correction of this inequity will be undertaken under the provisions of Bill No. C-120 if not at this time under this bill. I should like to know whether it is a fact that the properties to be held under the provisions of this bill by the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company will in fact be liable to municipal taxation. If so, does this mean that the fundamental law under which the C.N.R. denies liability for taxation in the Atlantic provinces is to be changed?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the minister speaks now he will close the debate. The hon. member for Portage-Neepawa.

Mr. S. J. Enns (Portage-Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks lest it be regarded that objections to location of the terminal are of a partisan nature. I for one endorse relocation because I feel that the present location, especially the appearance of the railway station, is deplorable for a capital city. The station is almost a barnlike structure and I should like to pose this question to members for their consideration. Do any passengers really live in the station? With the exception of those who want to go to the Chateau Laurier, almost everyone else has to travel somewhere by taxicab and so far as ingress and egress are concerned there is an almost impossible situation at rush periods when one train after another is arriving.

I feel that to rebuild the station in its present location would require the acquisition of a good deal of expensive property and it seems to me that it makes a good deal of sense to relocate the station in an area where there is other land available. I doubt that relocation

will make the new terminal much more than a 10 minute ride from downtown or parliament hill.

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, there is only one question that arises in my mind, namely what is going to happen to the pigeons? I wonder whether the pigeons down at the old station are Liberal pigeons.

Mr. McIlraith: They are liberal in some respects.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, as the house is well aware it was not anticipated that we would have this bill before us today, and I think all members realize it is a bill with a lot of interest and significance. As I recall, a number of years ago there was a good deal of discussion in the house in respect of the whole question of the suitable development of the national capital and in particular the heart of the capital area. I listened to quite a number of speeches at that time in which the idea was put forward that it would be desirable to eliminate from the area of the Rideau canal in the central part of the city what some people considered to be rather unsightly railway trackage. However, as far as I can recall this subject has not really had any great attention either in the present parliament or the one immediately preceding. I take it that in the meantime the national capital commission has proceeded with the development of certain plans and that one of the fruits of their planning is the proposal we have before us tonight.

Apparently these plans have now been brought to a formal conclusion as far as the capital commission and the railway companies are concerned, but I am wondering whether they have really kept pace with some of the developments that have been taking place in the interval. I assume that the original idea of eliminating the railways from the heart of the city and building a new terminal was developed at a time when we were still in the steam age so far as railway transportation was concerned. In addition, I would also assume that the large volume of freight and the necessary space required for freight car trackage were factors in the desire to take steps to beautify the central part of the city.

I was somewhat impressed by some of the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), and as he was speaking something else came to my mind, namely the conditions that exist in relation to the new terminal development in the city of Montreal, where one can arrive comfortably by train in the heart of the city and have ready access to the places he may wish to visit either on business or on pleasure. Inasmuch as I have the feeling that the present members of the house have not really given any detailed consideration to this matter, I wonder whether it would not be desirable to have a thorough parliamentary review of this whole question before the bill receives final passage by the house. I think we realize it has been considered in the other place and that if we take action upon it here that will in effect be the end of the matter. There are, I think, a good many considerations involved about which this house should be satisfied before that kind of action is taken.

I do not know what the minister may have in mind with regard to the further stages in the consideration of this bill. It does seem to me, however, there would be no harm in this bill being given a proper consideration by the members of this particular house. I know this subject matter was given careful consideration by many members of previous parliaments over a considerable period of time. It is with that thought in mind that I should like to place before the house, for its consideration, a motion which would ensure that sort of review by members of this house.

I should like to move:

> That this bill be not now read a second time, but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

Mr. Pickersgill: Before Your Honour formally puts that motion, I wonder if the hon. member would consider the possibilities of having the bill referred after second reading? I think the hon. gentleman knows that if his motion is carried, this kills the bill under our rules. I do not know if that is his objective. If it is, of course, the government would have to oppose this motion. We would have to ring the bells and have a division. I do not believe that is what the hon. gentleman really wants. I believe he just wants to have this bill reviewed. If there were any general disposition in the house to have it reviewed, as soon as second reading is given I would move to have it referred to the committee on railways, at which time officials could be called and examined.

If the hon. gentleman feels that he must persist in his motion then, because his motion is one of want of confidence in the government, we would have no choice but to oppose it. I suggest to him that he be satisfied to have

it referred after second reading. Several questions have been raised, and I would be glad to have the bill go to the committee where the officials from the national capital commission can be properly examined, and I really believe that would satisfy everything the hon. gentleman has in mind.

Mr. Barnett: I wonder if you would permit me—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; I understood that the hon. member had already spoken on the amendment and I presume the minister was speaking on the amendment.

Mr. Pickersgill: No, sir, I was really speaking to a point of order. I hope there will be indulgence to treat the matter that way so we will not get into a procedural difficulty.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I suggest that the hon. member for Comox-Alberni also speak on the point of order.

Mr. Barnett: I wonder if, in doing so, I could speak to the point of order by putting a question to the minister? The point of order relates to whether or not I formally put my amendment before the house and forwarded it to Your Honour. The question of order relates also to the consideration of what is involved in the passage of second reading of a bill. It is, in essence, approval in principle. Now, a question arises immediately in my mind as to whether the minister would be prepared to have this bill go before a committee of the house, where witnesses could be called and where such a review as members might wish of the subject matter could be properly made, and if it should develop that it was the considered view of the committee that some of the features of the plan were outdated or not applicable or should be altered in such a way as to comply with the suggestions that have been made concerning access for passengers to the heart of the city, would the government be willing to give the proper weight to that view of the committee? If that were so, I might be prepared—

Mr. Pickersgill: I can assure the hon. gentleman that any reasonable proposal from the committee will be considered most seriously. There is no question about that. I do urge him not to press the suggested amendment because it is a motion of want of confidence in the government which we would have to resist. I do not believe that is what the hon. gentleman wants to accomplish at all. I believe the hon. gentleman wants to send this bill to a place where he can get information from people much more competent than I am to give information. If they cannot satisfy him, he can oppose certain features of the bill, with the knowledge of what the considerations are with respect to it. I can assure him the government is not hidebound about this matter at all.

Mr. Barnett: May I just say one thing more on the question of the point of order? I agree with the minister that this subject matter, so far as I know, never has been nor do I think it should be, a matter of want of confidence in the government. Generally it has been a non-partisan matter in the sense that we are concerned with the future of the capital of Canada. Perhaps on these grounds, with the kind of understanding the minister has given to us as to the approach which he and his colleagues would be prepared to take to committee consideration, I might be prepared not to press my amendment in its present form, on the understanding the minister will take the initiative in referring it to the committee.

Mr. Lambert: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I must say we would not support any such amendment. In fact, if the government wishes to maintain the bill in the house, we are quite satisfied. We are prepared to deal with the issues here. In so far as whether or not it goes to a committee, I may say frankly we are quite prepared to deal with it in the house as it now stands.

Mr. Pickersgill: I want to thank both hon. members. While I am speaking, perhaps the whips could confer and if I am told when second reading is over there is a general desire to have this bill go to a committee, there will be no question about it: It will go. I will make a motion to have it go.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, is the minister now closing the debate?

Mr. Pickersgill: I don't know, sir; I thought I was speaking to the point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Well, I suggest that the procedure has been a bit irregular and I feel we should now attempt to make the procedure conform to the rules. If the minister speaks now, he will close the debate.

Mr. Lambert: On the point of order, has the amendment been withdrawn?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: My understanding is that the amendment has not been put formally. However, to clarify the situation I suggest that unanimous consent be given to

the hon. member to withdraw the amendment to the extent that it had been put to the house.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I should like to deal with the points that have been raised by various hon. members. The hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) and the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), raised points which I think could be discussed more properly when the bill is before the committee. Quite frankly, I should not like to attempt to answer them at this stage.

There is one point of a general character that I should like to make right now, particularly if the bill is to go to a committee. The powers that it is proposed to confer upon this terminal company, which is a company to be owned jointly by the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific, are powers that these two railways have separately and which they can exercise separately, I am advised, even if they were not given to the terminal company. They would not give the terminal company any power to engage in any general trucking or other services, but only deliveries from the terminal.

I think this is the point. It was suggested in the other place, I believe, that this terminal company should not be declared a work for the general advantage of Canada in respect of these particular services. My department took the view that it was sensible that these things should not be separated—that you should not put delivery services under provincial jurisdiction and the rest of the terminal under federal jurisdiction. And we were able to convince the hon. gentlemen of the other place of the soundness of this view.

Those are the main points with which I should like to deal, now. The others would be better considered in committee where we could be more precise about them. As to the points raised by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) and by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Lloyd), it is true that in most parts of the country the Canadian Pacific and the C.N.R., in respect to those lines of theirs which were once privately owned, are taxable, except that the Canadian Pacific has a statutory exemption from certain kinds of taxes in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, conferred by this parliament, and I believe in parts of Manitoba, conferred by the legislation of that province. It is also true that the premiers of those three provinces came to Ottawa some time ago and made representations to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) and myself seeking to have these privileges removed from the railways. We are giving the most earnest, I might almost say anguished, consideration to this particular matter at the present time and while this consideration is being given I do not think it would be very helpful for me to go beyond what I have said.

As for the question raised by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Lloyd), the government owned railways were the property of the crown and, as such, under the constitution were not taxable by any other taxation authority. The companies have made some ex gratia payments in place of taxes but I know there has been a good deal of dissatisfaction about this matter. I have no doubt whatever it will be reviewed when we come to deal with the big railway bill. Having said that, I do not think I should go beyond it because I am sure hon. members will agree that it is not really relevant to the measure before us, though I do not blame either of the two hon. members for taking advantage of this opportunity to raise the point.

Other speakers have given the benefit of their views on this bill, either pro or con. The hon. member for Portage-Neepawa (Mr. Enns) was pro. I am not sure which side the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) was on. The others were con. The station is, of course, to be moved to a new site in the area where my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Tardif) lives and which, he tells me, he can reach without any trouble in ten minutes, though it often takes 15 minutes to get from here to the station in a taxi. I know from experience that this more rapid movement is due to the Queensway, and even this will be much improved when the station is moved.

I think some of us have forgotten that the basic decision to move the railway was taken in a previous parliament and under a previous government. The decision was made and the house voted money for it over the years. Most of the tracks have been moved already and if we now decided that a wrong decision had been made we would have to reverse a process upon which parliament decided a long time ago. All this particular bill does is to establish a terminal company to carry out a decision made long ago by parliament. If we had not wanted that decision to be taken, we should have resisted it a long time back.

The first decisions in this connection were made before I was a member of the govern-

ment, and that goes back 11 years. At that time I did not think much of the idea. But the decision was made and a great deal of money has since been spent to carry it out. This bill represents, if not a final stage, then at least one of the later stages in that process. If we were to be tempted at this late stage to reverse that early decision we would want to look very carefully at what the cost would be, and I doubt whether many members, when they were in possession of all the facts, would wish now to follow a different course.

The whole question of relocation could more properly be discussed on the estimates of the national capital commission, but I do not see, if this bill is to go to a committee, why there should not be some examination of it there, too. In fairness to the railways—I am not their apologist but I do think one should have some regard for the facts in these matters—let me point out that the railways did not want to move at all. A lot of persuasion, a lot of arm twisting had to be applied to both railways before the move was agreed upon. The railways were conscious of the point raised by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) and by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) that it was probably easier to get passengers if they were located in the middle of the town. It was the town planners of the governments of the day, both the St. Laurent government and the Diefenbaker government, and this parliament which decided the railways ought to do this. And it was quite a hard job to get them to do it.

Mr. McIlraith: And it took a long time.

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes, it took a long time. Any idea that this bill is the result of some conspiracy on the part of the railways to get an advantage is just unhistorical, that is all. I think we should look at the facts as they are.

I do not think there is anything more I have to say about the main points raised. Any other points could be dealt with in committee of the whole or in the railway committee, if members would prefer to have this bill referred to that committee. Perhaps I could have some indication of what I should do.

Mr. Barnett: The minister referred to an estimate of the length of time the member for Russell (Mr. Tardif) says it takes him to go there by taxi—

Mr. Pickersgill: In his own car.

Mr. Barnett: I wonder whether the hon. gentleman can give us an assurance that the hon. member for Russell is prepared to pay our taxi fares between the House of Commons and the station.

Mr. Tardif: Just in case my hon. friend agrees to that, perhaps you would allow me, Mr. Speaker, to tell the minister that this is one thing I do not want to undertake.

Mr. Pickersgill: I have a notion there will be a very good bus service.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Mr. Pickersgill: Do I understand it is the desire of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni that we should send this bill to a committee? If it is, he having withdrawn his amendment, I will make the necessary motion right now.

Mr. Barnett: That is my desire.

Mr. Pickersgill: Then I move:

That Bill No. S-33 be sent to the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Pickersgill: Perhaps I could say a word. I believe there was some consultation at six o'clock or just before six o'clock and there was an understanding among the various parties that because of the nature of Bill S-7 and because if I may say so, no discussion of principle is involved—it is one of those bills amending a lot of sections of the act—if I made a very brief statement we would give it second reading. The hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch), who was consulted about it, agreed to this. It was also agreed that I would then move that it be sent to the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines, with a distinct understanding that when it came back here, if there was any desire for any general debate on clause 1, the government would not in any way seek to restrict any proper debate.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

AMENDMENTS TO GIVE EFFECT TO INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport) moved the second reading of Bill No. S-7, to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the minister that this bill will be referred to a committee, I will not make the remarks which I was otherwise going to make. But I do want to say that I do not think this is an unprincipled bill; there are a number of very important principles involved. All I want to

say is that in the bill are principles which were included in a bill introduced in a previous session, and those sections were withdrawn by the then minister because the marine engineers on both the western and eastern coasts had not had an opportunity of appearing before the committee and making their representations. Could we have the assurance from the minister that there will be a sufficient period of time in order that all those concerned on both coasts may have time to have their representations made here, and that they will be notified as to the date of the meeting of the committee?

Mr. Pickersgill: I would be very happy indeed, Mr. Speaker, to do that.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

HARBOURS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF HARBOUR COMMISSIONS

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport) moved the second reading of Bill No. S-10, to provide for the establishment of harbour commissions.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am going to do something that I do not think I have ever done before in the house, and I hope I will never do it again. I am going to follow my notes pretty closely in dealing with second reading of this bill, because I had rather expected that my colleague and parliamentary secretary would be doing it, and he had to be absent this evening. While I think I have a pretty fair idea of the contents of the bill itself, I would like to put a little historical material on the record which I perhaps would not get absolutely right if I did not follow the notes rather closely.

There are, as hon. members know, three kinds of harbours in this country. A number of our greatest harbours are under the national harbours board. There are a great number of harbours that are under the direct jurisdiction of the Department of Transport. In between these two categories there are a certain number of harbours which are governed by harbour commissions, which could only in the past and up to the present be set up by separate acts of parliament. There are 11 harbours administered by harbour commissioners, appointed under individual acts of the federal parliament. These are Port Alberni, Nanaimo, North Fraser, New Westminster, Winnipeg and St. Boniface, one of our greatest harbours—

Mr. Knowles: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: —Lakehead, Windsor, Hamilton, Toronto, Oshawa and Belleville. The original legislation setting up the harbour commissions at Toronto, Hamilton, New Westminster, North Fraser, Winnipeg and St. Boniface dates from the period 1911 to 1914; the remainder were set up at various dates between 1947 and 1960. This latter group of acts follows a more or less standard form, but it has been found that even the more recent acts need to be revised if certain policies which it has now been considered desirable to follow—and I think there has been nothing partisan about this—are to be applied.

The harbour commissions carry out functions which are initially the responsibility of the federal government and substantial financial contributions are made by the Department of Public Works to these harbour commissions through construction of facilities and dredging. In the course of improving surveillance and control of these commission harbours, it has been found by the Department of Transport that the old legislation needed to be modernized to take into account the increased pace of development of the last few years. In the case of the older acts, this is partly due to changed circumstances and changes in the pattern of shipping practices and freight handling. Certain changes in administration policy are necessary as a result of ad hoc arrangements made in the past, different treatment in different parts of the country, and some confusion and misunderstanding which has arisen once in a while in the management of these harbours. A consistent policy has now been evolved, particularly in relation to the sharing of costs of works in proportion to the ability of an individual harbour commission to contribute to its own development.

The more recent acts prohibit the use of revenue for capital works, although the commissioners may borrow for this purpose with the approval of the governor in council. This makes awkward the carrying out of the policy for the sharing of the costs of capital works. The authority of a commission with respect to harbour development requires more precise definition. The award of annual "surplus profits" to municipalities under the early acts, and to the federal government under more recent acts, has been found to militate against the initiative and enthusiasm of the local commissioners which is so necessary to an

effective harbour advancement and development. The ultimate goal of a harbour commission is complete financial independence with all administration, maintenance and construction being financed from harbour revenues.

For these reasons, it is proposed to enact a new standard act which would correct these flaws and which would permit the Department of Transport to exercise a reasonable degree of control over these commissions while maintaining as far as possible the advantage of local administration and local initiative for which these commissions are especially valuable. The bill provides for the creation of new harbour commissions by order in council which would also define the limits of the harbour and the authorities having power to appoint the members of a commission. Similarly existing harbour commissions listed in the schedule to this act could be brought under the standard act as circumstances warrant. This is the procedure now used to create or amend public harbours under the Canada Shipping Act.

It seems to me, sir, that this is the general explanation, but I should like to say a word about application. It is proposed initially to make this act applicable to new harbours but it is also considered that some of the existing harbour commissions will wish to come under the provisions of this standard act. I think, however, that entering into detail of that kind would be much more appropriate in the committee. I think I should make one general observation. I know hon. members are always somewhat reluctant to confer upon the governor in council the power to do things that in the past have been done by parliament; but I do really think this is one case where parliament can very well be relieved of a power which has often been shirked by governments in the past. Because these bills, being of a local nature, did not command priority and often got put off from year to year, these harbours were not developed as rapidly as they might have been had more speedy action been taken. The parliamentary control is completely maintained because the governor in council may not depart from the standard provisions; so that there is no power that can be given these harbour commissions which is not conferred by the act itself.

In addition, I may say that very exhaustive examination was given this bill in the committee in the other place. I appeared there and I think the representatives of all the harbour commissions interested also appeared and got a very good hearing. Several changes were made in the bill in the other place to meet the representations which were made, and to the best of my knowledge there is no feeling now on the part of any existing harbour commission that its position would be in any way affected adversely by the passage of the present bill.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, and because I would not like to get a state of constipation, if I may put it that way, in the railway committee, I would hope that we could deal with this bill in committee of the whole and dispose of it this evening.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, on the surface this bill does appear to be somewhat arbitrary in giving the government power to take over the operation of any of the 300 harbours which might be affected, with the exception of the three taken out during the course of the bill's consideration in the Senate—namely, Toronto, Hamilton and Winnipeg-St. Boniface. The bill also permits the taking over of those commissions which are set out in the schedule to the bill. However, in assuming control of these harbours, if the government sees fit to take control, they also bear a certain amount of cost as well. Therefore it is fair to assume that the government will not rush in unnecessarily to take control of various harbours where the expenditure of money is involved.

There was a very long discussion of this particular bill in the Senate. In fact, the same bill was before the other place in the previous session as bill S-38, but never left the other place in the last session, after the exhaustive discussion which resulted in the harbour of the city of Toronto being excluded. The former bill died at prorogation of the last session.

Under the new bill now before us the harbours at Hamilton and Winnipeg-St. Boniface are also excluded. As the minister said, exhaustive consideration was given the bill in committee in the other place. That is true not only of Bill S-10 but also of the previous bill S-38. All the municipalities which wished to appear and all the harbour commissions had full opportunity to go through the provisions of this bill. Therefore, in spite of this initial reservation that perhaps there is too much arbitrary control, I think most of the objections to the principle and the detail have been settled and we will not oppose the passage of this bill.

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, this bill, or at least one part of it, caused a bit of a sensation last year when

to the surprise of most of us, while it was before the Senate telegrams and letters suddenly began to rain upon us complaining about the bill. I remember that I spent two mornings or afternoons sitting in the Senate committee listening to complaints from Hamilton and Oshawa, and to representations from my own area regarding the views of the lakehead municipalities. I think that these objections have been met. Certainly at the time I could not really see what these people were worrying about, including the representatives of Hamilton and Toronto, but I assume they managed to convince the government that they were in a special kind of situation which should keep them free of the powers resting with the government, in this particular case with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill).

There are two comments I want to make about the bill and about the harbour commissions. One concerns conflict of interest and political partisanship in relation to the commissioners themselves. The other is the matter of the revenues which a commission raises.

The conflict of interest is something which is extremely difficult to determine, but it does seem to me that it is something which needs to be kept very much in mind by the governor in council when making appointments. I want to give the minister an example. The Canadian National Railways, as the minister knows, is an agency to which he has some relationship, as well perhaps as having some power and influence over it. We had a situation where one of the government appointees to the commission at Port Arthur was an employee of the Canadian National Railways; at least that was my understanding. I am not saying there was anything wrong here, but there was only one commissioner there who did not have some interest in connection with the harbour. One was the head of the shipyards. Another was the head of an elevator company which was involved. Another was an employee of the Canadian National Railways, a very able engineer. Because of their backgrounds and, you might say skills, these men were excellent people from one point of view to have on the commission, but the suspicion was raised in more than my mind that it was rather unfair that these men should be there.

For example, there was a controversy at the lakehead over who should bear the cost of icebreaking in the slips and around the harbour. One of the solutions seems to have been worked out as the result of a visit by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp), representing the grain interests, and I think the matter has now been resolved. But one of the matters which caused a great deal of questioning and bitterness on the local scene was the fact if the lakehead harbour commission had become more deeply involved in financing and in paying for this particular form of icebreaking it would immediately have thrown suspicion on the representative of the grain trade who was on the commission, because naturally it was the grain trade who stood to benefit most.

I have tried to think of an amendment to the bill which would so limit the appointments, but it would be almost impossible to rule out the appointment of this sort of person. Yet this is a matter which must be kept very much in mind, particularly in terms of balance. From the experience on the lakehead scene, which I am sure is duplicated in other harbours which tend to have the same interest, I would say you are caught between the fact that such men do tend to have the most knowledge to bring to bear, but they also have the most interest in what is involved. It seems to me that a special onus is left on the government when making these appointments.

One of the other problems which arises in connection with appointments is the political affiliation or interest of the people who are appointed. The federal government cannot be sure as to what may be the politics of municipal appointees, but it is very obvious from experience both under a Conservative government and under a Liberal government that this is looked upon as some kind of minor reward or recognition for a party man. As a politician I have no objection to that on principle, but I would put it to the minister that this, along with the conflict of interest, adds to the view that people tend to look upon harbour commissions as a political agency of the government or as an arm of the government identified with the ruling party. If you are not in that party or the government you can take some comfort from this, because it is not a very pleasant situation for the Department of Transport to be in—that a local agency, with which it has such intimate connections, is looked upon as being a partisan group. Again, you cannot spirit it away with any kind of amendment.

I should like to put to the minister one of the things, judging by the situation at the lakehead and at several other communities of which I am aware, which would help matters considerably for the minister—al-

though I suppose it is his deputy, with some kind of political connection, who ferrets out people for appointment. The minister should deliberately try to make sure that the people chosen are not those who have a glaring, open or marked reputation for being political partisans. I do not want to leave the impression that I think, because individuals support a party, or are particularly loyal to a party, this leaves them with a bar sinister, but the fact remains that a member of practically any other party can probably see these difficulties and dangers more clearly than anyone else.

This is the kind of an agency or commission we cannot get at as members of parliament, acting as either individuals in our constituencies or as members in the House of Commons. We have really no power of scrutiny. All we can do is sound off with criticisms. It is for that reason I think the whole practice with regard to appointments of harbours commissioners should be considered very seriously by the present minister and his deputy in an attempt to see whether they can establish, perhaps not any fixed rule, and certainly no regulations, but some sort of policy to take care of this conflict of interest in this partisan aspect. I do not know how possible such a thing is, but we know the present minister is not the least partisan of people, and I suppose his deputy, just as a result of the fact he has been at his job for so long, is both adept at and inured to compromise with a sort of a political reality, but I suggest to the minister that this might be at least an aspiration. I suggest that he examine this conflict of interest and this question of political appointment to see whether the difficulties that surround them can be circumvented by the appointment of people who have no conflict of interest and are not partisan.

The last topic I want to touch upon, Mr. Speaker, is the subject of revenues. Having read the lakehead harbours bill and this bill, I am not clear in my mind just how much freedom the local harbour commissions have to raise money. I do not know what is the pattern of their financing. Perhaps one thing we might gain by having this bill sent to a committee is some indication of the record of financing problems. I know there are financing problems and that the harbour commissions must obtain money. Since much of the money that has gone into harbours has come from the federal government, the federal government should have some control. I should like to know how much latitude exists for harbour commissions to make unilateral decisions, for example that they are going to raise the fees for the use of the harbours without previous consultations with the government. It seems to me that the actual situation which exists is that tacitly, despite the powers given by the bill, commissions tend to look for and accept the advice of the minister of transport.

Again because this is not spelled out clearly, it seems to me that there may be a certain hypocrisy in the bill, in that the great powers for raising money which exist in the general and particular powers are really not as strong or powerful as we may think when we pass the bill.

The question I should like to leave with the minister is, since this is an over-all bill bringing a number of harbour commissions in this country within a single framework, whether it would be possible out of this single pattern to establish some kind of annual publishing of the reports of these commissions in some detail so that we will have a picture of their operations. I happen to know that these commissions publish their own statements, but it seems to me there should be a common format indicating statistics of revenue, traffic and expenditures, with a budget for the coming year. This might be very useful and should in no way inconvenience the commissions in doing the jobs which the powers given to them by the bill would indicate they are doing. That is really the only substantial request I make to the minister. Would he consider whether it might not be possible to have some kind of publishing of a common nature carried out. This may involve an extra cost upon the Department of Transport through the queen's printer, but it seems to me it would be a most useful thing.

One of the difficulties in trying to analyse harbour needs in this country is that the report of the national harbours board gives specific data only for so many harbours, and then only general data in respect of all the rest. I think the minister will recognize that the dominion bureau of statistics does not really pick up the slack and give a ready picture of the kinds of traffic, a summary of the facilities and revenue, and a general plan of the capital expenditure for various harbours. This would be something hon. members would find useful. Certainly I would find this very useful, as it would enable me to follow from year to year what is taking place.

It seems to me there is always some question in our minds when we have three or four patterns of administration of similar facilities such as harbours. We have the na-

tional harbours board, and we are now going to have this schedule of harbours under this act. There are other ports which have harbour commissions but which will remain outside.

One of the questions repeatedly occurring has to do with a scale of expenditures, and the kind of facilities which should be provided. The minister may remember the controversy over who was going to pay for the provisions to extend the grain handling facilities at both the lakehead and Vancouver. One was under this kind of a commission and the other was under the national harbours board. The relationship of the government's role with respect to expenditures in this particular area has never really been settled clearly. I do not know where there is a more primary responsibility upon the government in relation to a harbour under the national harbours board than in respect of a harbour under this particular act, but certainly they are treated differently in relation to administration and financing, and their relations with the department are different.

I suppose we should really be asking whether it might not be practical to look forward to some future time when the national harbours board is the general administrator of all harbours. As long as there are three different kinds of harbours which handle a substantial amount of traffic there may always be the possibility of some kind of rationalization of the whole relationship of the federal government to them. I think the previous minister of transport deserves some congratulations for the fact that all the objections to this bill, which were many, disappeared a few months ago while he was still in charge of the department. I can only assume that since it took place under his regime he played some part in allaying the suspicions, and since we have not been congratulating him too much lately it might not be amiss to do so now.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks I should like to add to those made by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) in connection with the bill. My first reaction was somewhat similar to that expressed earlier by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), namely that we should look rather carefully at the suggestion that we put into the hands of the governor in council powers which heretofore have been exercised only through an act of parliament. However, I was satisfied at least partially by the explanation of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), that one of the results of the passage of this measure might be to facilitate the establishment of harbour commissions where otherwise they might not be established.

I should like to say to the minister that one thing for which I am always on the lookout is the development of a government policy to provide for a more satisfactory method of administering smaller ports than in my view has heretofore been devised. If the passage of this bill will help to facilitate that kind of development I want to say here and now that I am all for it, although I do not actually see anything in the bill to indicate definitely that its provisions contain the kind of solution which I should like to see brought about in respect of the administration of many of the smaller harbours.

I have only one harbour in my constituency which is administered by a harbour commission, the harbour of Port Alberni. If I may say so, this is one of the more important harbours on the west coast of Canada. In fact, according to some claims I have seen recently it is British Columbia's second harbour from the point of view of tonnage shipped, although I believe that the harbour commission in the constituency of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Cameron) is inclined to challenge that claim.

Nevertheless, what I really want to say is that I have discussed the possible effect of the bill with the Port Alberni harbour commission and my understanding is that they are satisfied its terms will not adversely affect the operation of that harbour. There are one or two matters in connection with the provisions of the bill that I may wish to question when we get to the committee stage.

One of the advantages I have always felt arose out of the operation of harbour commissions established by an act of parliament, as has been the case up till now, was that out of their revenue surplus they did have certain funds, usually not too large in the cases that have come to my attention, which could be spent entirely at their own discretion. There have been certain advantages in this situation. I know that some works in the harbour of Port Alberni have been constructed in this way which might not have been constructed if they had required a vote out of public funds at the federal level. Nevertheless these works have added to the usefulness of the harbour.

I think I understood the minister correctly that in the future any harbour commission which is operating within the framework of

this legislation will have no such surplus funds, because any such funds will automatically go into the consolidated revenue fund after certain operating expenses and so on have been taken care of. This particular aspect of the bill raises some questions in my mind which I may wish to pursue further in the committee stage.

If I may sum up, Mr. Speaker, I hope we are moving in a direction which will facilitate the more adequate administration of smaller harbours. In my experience they have largely been left out of the picture from the point of view of creating an efficient mechanism for local administration. The result has been that there have been many headaches for the administrative officers of the Department of Transport, inasmuch as these habours are in most cases isolated from any direct, day to day supervision by these officials.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

On clause 4—*Contents of proclamation establishing commission.*

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I should like to inquire about the thinking of the government in proposing that the number of members of a commission shall in all cases be not less than three and not more than five. There is nothing unusual in this proposal in itself but I raise the question because of the point I mentioned earlier when we were at the second reading stage with respect to the administration of smaller harbours. So far as the administration of smaller harbours is concerned, has any consideration been given to the possibility of setting up a modified form of harbour commission involving a single commissioner? There might not always be three suitable people available. Has the minister any comment?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I can make a very brief comment on that point. I think that a harbour that can be administered by one person should not have a harbour commission at all but should be in the third class of harbours I have mentioned. Unless a harbour is of sufficient importance and magnitude to warrant at least three persons being appointed, it does not seem to me there would be any advantage to be gained at all in removing it from the class of harbours which includes the great majority in Canada and which are administered directly by the Department of Transport.

Mr. Barnett: I will not quarrel with the minister on that point but I raise it because I think there is need for the development of a better mechanism for the administration of smaller harbours than I have seen up to the present time. I hope further consideration will be given to this matter.

Mr. Olson: I only wish to ask the minister if there is any intention on the part of the government to make these harbour commissions responsible for more harbours than the 11 he mentioned at the outset of the resolution stage?

Mr. Pickersgill: As a matter of fact, it was thought when we were waiting for action on this legislation, we might put the harbour at St. John's, Newfoundland under a harbour commission under this legislation. Then we had requests from the provincial government, the city of St. John's, the board of trade, the longshoremen and all interested parties in the harbour that it should be brought under the national harbours board. The government decided that since that seemed to be the general wish of the community, that should be done. I do not know of any other that is in immediate contemplation, but there are one or two that have made some approaches to us.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 8 inclusive, agreed to.

On clause 9—*Jurisdiction within harbour.*

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, in connection with clauses 9, 10 and 11, but particularly 10, is it the intention that the government shall acquire the harbour facilities, that is the land, buildings and so forth, and transfer them to the commission or is it the intention that in most cases, the commission will merely administer the assets that are physically there?

Mr. Pickersgill: There is no question of anything being taken over. In the case of existing commissions, the commission does own works in the harbour. In the case of any new commissions that would be established, I would assume any federal works in the area would be turned over to the commission.

Mr. Aiken: Is it the intention to take over property from a municipal corporation which had previously been operating a harbour? If not, would the government have power of expropriation of municipal assets?

Mr. Pickersgill: I understand it has been the usual practice where there was property owned by a municipality in a harbour, when a harbour commission is set up the municipality puts its properties under the commission as does the federal government.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 10 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 13—*Bylaws.*

Mr. Fisher: I want to raise a question with the minister in connection with the powers, particularly under paragraph (h). The minister may recall that there have been some proceedings against ships for dumping waste oil and other refuse. I understand these proceedings have been taken under the Criminal Code, although the harbour authorities may have provided the information for the charge. I want to find out whether this power under paragraph (h), and under the authority to establish police, could be used more effectively than seems to be the situation at the present time in relation to the few examples we have seen where the scale of fines against these shipping masters and shipping companies that have been dumping oil have amounted more or less to a pat on the wrist.

I wonder if the minister could tell us if there has been enough experience with this kind of harbour commission, with the problem of policing, discipline and good conduct of harbours, to indicate that they should assume more of the powers this section would seem to give them? I know I am getting rather indefinite, but what I am really asking is, does the practice up to now indicate there should be a limitation upon the policing and, if you like, the punishment powers of the commission in the sense of the present reality as against what seems to be the sweeping powers that are given under this particular clause?

Mr. Pickersgill: I think it is the general rule that commissions which are set up under a statute can exercise only the powers the statute itself confers. A commission could not make criminal law—at least I defer to the lawyers here, but I would think this most unlikely. They could only create the kind of offences that relate to the specific powers given to them. This is one reason their bylaws would have to be examined by the governor in council, so the Department of Justice would have a chance to look at them and make sure they were not purporting to make bylaws which could not have any legal validity because they had not had conferred upon them the power necessary to make the bylaw.

[Mr. Aiken.]

Mr. Fisher: I appreciate that comment. We have had two matters locally in which the commission has been involved and, in the opinion of some people, regrettably not sufficiently involved; one was the question of oil and the other relates to the right of the harbour commission police to deal with duck shooting and the carrying of firearms in the harbour area. One of the consequences in terms of public opinion on the local scene that I encountered with each of these instances was that the harbour commission and its police were damned if they did and damned if they did not. They were damned by some people for interfering with the shooting of ducks, and they were damned by other people because they had not taken sufficiently strong action in connection with the release of waste oil.

The point I really wanted to make to the minister hinged on how much encouragement, despite the fact of perhaps because of the fact, the government retains the scrutiny of bylaws, will be given to harbour commissions to sort of police and, in that sense, punish, the people who commit these actions? I suppose in the context of what we are doing here, this is a fruitless question. I am quite prepared to allow the clause to pass, but I should like to remind the minister and his officials there is a problem here that I am sure will be cropping up again and again.

Mr. Pickersgill: It does crop up a great deal. There are some very difficult questions because, as the hon. gentleman knows, sometimes the dividing line between what is regarded as property and civil rights and what is regarded as shipping is not an easy one to draw. I have just taken two examples at random. I understand it is the desire, as much as possible, to encourage these harbour commissions to maintain good order in their harbours, to see that everything that is properly within their powers is done and to avoid things like pollution, the dumping of garbage or anything of that sort.

I wonder, sir, if you could avoid seeing the clock if that were the wish of hon. members, for a few minutes so that perhaps we might conclude this matter.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 14—*Commission may borrow and issue debentures therefor.*

Mr. Barnett: I should like to ask one or two questions in connection with clause 14.

They may be related to clauses 14 and 15 which have to do with the powers of the commission in connection with the expenditure of money for capital and operating purposes. One of the questions which occurs to me is whether the passage of this bill will alter the pattern that has existed in the past in relation to the policy of smaller harbour commissions to make arrangements for capital expenditures by appropriations from the Department of Public Works for the construction of certain works such as wharves, breakwaters and so on. Second, what would be the effect of the operation of these two clauses on the ability of the commissions to construct minor capital improvements within their harbours without having to go cap in hand to parliament for an appropriation, or having to borrow money under terms which would involve payment of interest?

Mr. Pickersgill: I think I can deal with those points very briefly. I should like to deal first of all with the points the hon. member raised on second reading; I am sure it might create a certain amount of misgiving if we were just to read the last three lines of clause 15. Perhaps I could deal with the relevant clauses together, as the hon. member did. It is not the intention of the governor in council to insist that any surplus which might be left over each year should be paid to the receiver general. Paragraph (b) of clause 15 (2) refers to the appropriation to the funded reserves of the commission of such amounts as may be approved; it is intended that these harbours should build up funds from their revenues and have them available for their own use. However, it is thought that if the funds become so large, and if they are based on capital works originally paid for by the taxpayers, the surplus, if it is to go to anyone, should go back to the exchequer which provided the capital in the first place. There is no thought whatever of trying to make large profits out of these harbours. As far as capital works are concerned, where revenue is sufficient the commissions are not restricted from carrying out capital works of their own; they do not need to come to us for permission. But many of these harbours are not self-supporting and are not likely to be. In these cases the Department of Public Works will share, with the harbour commission in providing the kind of works which would be provided in harbours of that kind if there were not a harbour commission.

Mr. Barnett: Let me be clear on this question of funded reserves. I took that expression to mean reserves to pay off the bonded indebtedness of the commission. But a commission could build up a reserve out of which it could undertake direct capital works made possible by accumulated surpluses.

Mr. Pickersgill: It is my understanding that that is also true. In fact it is for both purposes.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 18 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 19—*Expropriation.*

Mr. Aiken: There is just one question I wish to raise with regard to this clause. I may have a technical mind, but there seems to me to be a problem here in connection with expropriation. The assumption is that anyone is prepared to sell for a price. The clause says:

> A commission may...take or acquire lands... without the consent of the owner where it is unable to agree with the owner as to the price to be paid therefor—

The question which arises in my mind is this: Suppose the owner does not wish to sell at all, and there is no argument at all about the price. Would the clause be operative in these circumstances? It would seem that the words "as to the price to be paid" would be surplus. Someone might say merely "I will not sell", and there would be no power of expropriation.

Mr. Pickersgill: I understand that the provision of the Railway Act which is applied by reference here is that the expropriation would only be legal if the property expropriated was essential for the railway. A railway could not expropriate for any other purpose. Therefore, by analogy it would have to be clearly needed for the harbour before this power could be exercised; and of course in case of dispute the courts would decide wheher it really was needed. Moreover, if any such expropriation can of course only be done with the consent of the governor in council. I think the hon. gentleman knows that there is always likely to be pretty strong opposition in this house, which would be very likely to bring up the grievance of anyone who really felt aggrieved in this matter, and that the governor in council would not act lightly.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, I do not think my point was understood. My point is that the power of expropriation that the commission has is limited by the words "as to the price to be paid therefor". As I say, what is the situation where someone says in effect, "I do not want to sell"? There is no power

of expropriation in such a case. That is my point. If there is an argument about the price, the commission may expropriate. If there is no argument about the price, and if the man just says. "I am not going to sell," there is no power of expropriation. This is the point that is not made clear in the bill.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask that this clause stand for a moment, in the hope of getting some legal advice from on high, while we go on with the other clauses. I have not any lawyers in front of me; I am not a lawyer, and I would not like to go very far in this field without advice. Perhaps we could stand clause 19.

The Chairman: Clause 19 stands.

Clauses 20 to 29 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 30—*Procedure for bringing existing commission under act.*

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, in respect of clause 30 I have been asked to have it made clear on the record whether or not the harbour commissions as listed in the schedule to the bill will remain free to continue under their present charters as established by the various acts of parliament unless there is agreement as to the provisions of both paragraphs (a) and (b) of subclause 2. In this connection I would think it appropriate that the minister, particularly because as I understand it in most, if not all cases a majority of the members of the harbour commissions are appointed by the government, should say whether or not it is the intention of the government to exert any influence upon the existing harbour commissions, either directly or indirectly, as to what action they should take to bring themselves under the terms of this bill; and, in reference to that section that has to do with municipalities, whether the government intends to make any representations, directly or otherwise, to the municipal authorities in connection with bringing existing harbour commissions within the framework of this bill.

Mr. Pickersgill: I can say, first of all, that I gave an assurance to the committee of the other place—if it is permissible to say that—that there would be no pressure whatsoever brought on any of these harbour commissions. They have acts of parliament. Unless they see some advantage in coming under this legislation there is nothing we can do for them. I do not think there is anything we should try to do to coerce them in any way. We feel that it will be apparent that there are certain advantages to them in coming under this legislation, but that is for them to decide and not us. As for trying to influence municipalities either to establish harbour commissions or not establish them, I think that is something about which I have to be a little cautious in answering.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, may I say that I did not ask the minister about influencing municipalities in order to establish new harbour commissions. I was referring to asking the municipalities to co-operate in establishing—

Mr. Pickersgill: Well, let me just say that that would be in an infringement of provincial rights which no Liberal government would contemplate.

Mr. Lambert: In the case of one of the listed harbour commissions appearing in the schedule, I hope it will not be a condition of the provision of certain capital installations through, say, the Department of Public Works that it would be necessary to pass the appropriate bylaws and come under the great controls.

Mr. Pickersgill: I really do not think there would be any particular advantage to the federal government in doing that, even if we had any thought of doing it. The only thing is that there might be in some of these other statutes—I have not gone over them carefully in comparison with this bill—certain things we could not do for them under their existing legislation which we could do for them under the present legislation. There might be some advantages there. However, I do not think we would hesitate to point that out to them. Otherwise it is not our desire to try and impose any uniformity at all. We think this legislation is rather better than any of the existing acts and rather better from the point of view of the commissions, but that is for them to decide.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 31 agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall we revert to clause 19?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

On clause 19—*Expropriation.*

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, I have had some discussion on clause 19 and I still have some reservations about the power of expropriation. However, the President of the Privy Council is satisfied that there will be no difficulty in expropriating whether the problem concerns price or whether it concerns the question of

selling. Under those circumstances I will withdraw my objection, because it really concerned the limitation, as I saw it, of the power to expropriate. The government is satisfied that the clause is sufficient so I will not object further.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, would you allow me to break the rules to thank hon. gentlemen opposite for their consideration of me today. I do appreciate the chance to get through all these smaller bills as far as we have gone, and I am genuinely grateful.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, we have clearly demonstrated today that this is a very co-operative house. Some people misinterpret what goes on in the House of Commons, but we have shown what can be done.

May we hear about the business for Thursday and Friday?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. On Thursday we will begin the redistribution bill, in accordance with the arrangements made this afternoon. At the conclusion of our consideration of that bill we will, for the remainder of Thursday and Friday, take up estimates. The estimates we propose to submit are first, the estimates of the Secretary of State, followed by the estimates of the Minister of Forestry, the estimates of the Minister of Public Works and the estimates of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to the provisions of standing order 2, this house stands adjourned until Thursday next at two thirty o'clock p.m.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 12, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT

TABLING OF REPORTS OF ACTUARIAL VALUATIONS

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, today I am tabling the reports of the quinquennial actuarial valuations required under sections 33 and 48 of the Public Service Superannuation Act.

The most important of these reports deals with the state of the superannuation account as of December 31, 1962 and shows that new deficiencies of $110,536,000 arose during the five year period ending on that day. The largest contributory factor was the deficiency arising from salary adjustments authorized in 1960 and again in 1962 for various classes of contributors. Subsequently the salary increases authorized in July, 1963 with effect from October 1, 1962 added another $22 million to this deficiency.

In accordance with the policy outlined in this house on March 6 of this year authority will be sought from parliament later in this fiscal year to write off to net debt the initial deficiency of $110,536,000 plus interest, and to charge the deficiencies arising from pay increases authorized during the fiscal years 1963-64 and 1964-65 against expenditures over a five year period commencing with this fiscal year. Thus one fifth of the deficit of $22 million plus interest and one fifth of the deficiencies arising from subsequent similar salary increases will be charged to expenditure during the fiscal year 1964-65.

The other two reports which I have tabled related to the death benefit accounts established under part II of the act. These reports show that a satisfactory contingency reserve is being built up.

BROADCASTING ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING REPRESENTATIONS AGAINST OBSCENE BROADCASTS

Mr. C. W. Carter (Burin-Burgeo) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-138, to amend the Broadcasting Act (broadcast tending to corrupt morals).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is described in considerable detail in the explanatory notes; but briefly put, this bill assembles the authority and powers already possessed by the board of broadcast governors together with existing regulations already laid down by the B.B.G. in such a way as to provide a means whereby the ordinary citizen or group of citizens is enabled to take action in respect to obscene broadcasts in much the same way as is now possible with respect to obscene literature.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING INCREASES IN PENSIONS AND ALLOWANCES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Prime Minister whether, having regard to the representations made yesterday by the dominion command of the Royal Canadian Legion and the criticism they advanced as to the smallness of the 10 per cent increase in disability pensions, it is the intention of the government to give reconsideration to this matter to the end that a fair and reasonable increase in disability pensions will be provided.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the government feels that in the circumstances the action taken in regard to veterans pensions was fair and reasonable and does not intend to review that action, particularly as it is not able to draw the same conclusions from the facts that are available as the Legion delegation has drawn.

Mr. Speaker, the Legion people also recommended that the government take the same action in respect of Canadian veterans as it does for the civil service, by placing pensions and war veterans allowances under cyclical review every two years. I told the Legion delegation yesterday that I thought that was a reasonable request and that that kind of cyclical review will be taken every two years. That was misunderstood in some quarters as

an indication that we would review the action just taken. That is not our intention.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Prime Minister for his answer. Would he say whether or not the government is now giving consideration to making provision for assistance to those who served such long imprisonment at Hong Kong?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may reply to that question. As I have indicated to the house, at the moment there is an inquiry under way. It is our thought that we should wait for that report before reaching any conclusion as to what should be done for the Hong Kong veterans. We hope that the report will not be too long in coming.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, can the minister give any indication as to when that report will be forthcoming? I know it is difficult to fix an exact date.

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Speaker, I will make an inquiry in this regard and report my findings to the Leader of the Opposition.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I wonder whether he would inform the house if he anticipates presenting legislation to the house before Christmas in regard to the elimination of the 365 day clause in the War Veterans Allowance Act, so these Canadian veterans can participate in the increase he has announced.

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that at the present time I am not in a position to give that undertaking. I would like to be able to do so, but I cannot guarantee it.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister. I wonder whether he can inform the house if legislation will be introduced after Christmas 1964, so these veterans can participate in this announced increase?

Mr. Teillet: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can usefully add anything to what I have already said.

PUBLICATIONS

INTENTION OF GOVERNMENT RESPECTING PENDING LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question arising out of a letter I received from Mr. Harold Cook, of *Liberty* magazine, indicating that attempts to republish *Liberty* magazine are floundering because of the continuing swing of advertising revenue to *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he would consider issuing some kind of an interim statement which would clarify the government's position on this whole question of advertising in periodicals and on the recommendations of the royal commission on publications, in view of the long delay that has followed the appearance on the order paper of the original intention of the government.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to take into consideration this whole matter of the possibility of making a statement pending action by the government on the matter now on the order paper.

GRAIN

WHEAT BOARD ORDER RESPECTING DAMP AND TOUGH GRADES

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 Trade and Commerce concerning the Canadian wheat board. In view of the fact that the Canadian wheat board have now cancelled an order which allowed their agencies to take in damp and tough grain and remove it to the drying facilities at the lakehead and the west coast, and in view of the fact that there is still a large quantity of this damp and tough grain in certain areas of the prairies, I wonder whether he would take up this matter with the wheat board to see whether they can extend this practice at least until most of the tough and damp grain is taken to the drying facilities.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to discuss this matter with the wheat board.

PRINCE RUPERT, B.C.—INCREASE IN ELEVATOR CAPACITY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him whether there is, contrary apparently to the state of affairs in the

defence department, any delay in announcing policy with respect to grain elevators?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is talking about the same grain elevator, the matter is still under consideration.

FINANCE

INQUIRY AS TO LOANS TO BRITAIN BY OTHER COUNTRIES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister of Finance?

Since the Bank of Canada granted a loan to England in order to save the pound sterling, could he tell us whether other countries have done likewise? If so, what are those countries?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as I said some time ago, a statement to this effect would come more appropriately from the British authorities than from myself. At some appropriate time however, I will be glad to give my hon. friend the details he asks for.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

PROTECTION OF HUNTING RIGHTS GRANTED BY TREATY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, and in view of his absence perhaps his parliamentary secretary will bring it to the minister's attention. Owing to the increasing number of treaty Indians being required to stand trial for alleged hunting infractions, would the minister assure the house that the hunting rights granted our Indian people by treaty will be protected?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): I shall take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE OF CERTAIN MILITIA UNITS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Associate Minister of National Defence?

In view of the fact that the Régiment de Joliette is one of the most famous and well-known regiments in Canada, does the government intend to reconsider its decision, maintain this regiment and prevent its disappearance?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member undoubtedly knows that in this matter the department benefited from the thorough study and recommendations of the Suttie commission which, in fact, was composed of militia officers. Before any final decision was taken the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer), the higher officials of the department and myself reviewed three or four times every militia unit in the country in order to ascertain that a right decision had been reached.

Under the circumstances I regret to say that, to my mind, it would serve no useful purpose to reconsider that decision.

[*Text*]

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, arising out of the answer given by the associate minister I would direct a question to the Prime Minister, and under the circumstances I hope I will get a favourable answer. Has he received a protest from the Northern Ireland associated clubs regarding the disbandment of the Irish Regiment of Canada and the Irish Fusiliers, thereby leaving no vestige of an Irish regiment in the militia across Canada? Knowing the Prime Minister's background, this is one time I expect I will receive favourable consideration for the request that the Irish have at least one regiment in their own name.

An hon. Member: What are you doing to the little people?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, just before luncheon I did receive the communication to which my hon. friend refers. It was from the association he mentioned and had an enormous maple leaf on the letterhead, and I have to add it was a green one.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It also had a crown on it.

Mr. Pearson: Yes, a crown on a green maple leaf. I am sorry that the circumstances are not such as to enable me to take favourable action with regard to representations of this kind.

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): A supplementary question to the Associate Minister of National Defence. Does the answer he gave a few minutes ago also apply to the famous Hastings-Prince Edward regiment?

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anything I can add to what I have already said. A good deal of consideration has been given to each of the units. The Minister of National Defence, members of the department and I have looked at each of these cases at least three or four times and I do not think there is anything I can add.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Associate Minister of National Defence or the Minister of National Defence explain why the department failed to accept the recommendations of the Suttie commission, which reported favourably with regard to the maintenance on the active list of some of these regiments?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the reason that some of the recommendations were not upheld was very carefully explained in the committee on defence, and I do not think it would be appropriate for me to repeat at length now the arguments and factors which entered into the judgments and which were explained at that time.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Just give them in summary for a change.

PROVISION OF NUCLEAR MISSILES FOR R.C.A.F. IN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of National Defence and ask him whether the reported delay of several months in the installation of nuclear warheads at Comox and certain other air force stations in Canada means that the government has under consideration plans to abandon bringing these nuclear weapons into Canada.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): There is no delay, Mr. Speaker; the projects are proceeding on schedule, and we expect the special ammunition to be delivered on schedule.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question. When the minister says "on schedule", when will that be; because almost two years have elapsed since he promised to arm the Voodoos with nuclear missiles?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, there was some delay before the associate minister and myself had responsibility for the department. Since then we have managed to move along at a reasonable speed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Crab fashion.

Mr. Hellyer: We expect the special ammunition to be available in the new year.

Mr. Churchill: Toronto and Montreal still unprotected.

NATIONAL PARKS

AMENDMENT OF REGULATIONS RESPECTING ZONING AND BUILDING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. Has there been a change in the orders in council governing zoning and building requirements in our national parks? If so, would the minister kindly disclose why these changes have been made?

Mr. Speaker: Surely this is a question requiring a long answer, and it should be put on the order paper.

Mr. Woolliams: May I put this question to the minister. Has there been any change made in this regard, and if so why?

Mr. Speaker: The question is considerably shorter, but it is still the same.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. Is the minister prepared to table the changes in regulations in regard to Banff national park?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Well, Mr. Speaker, we have made a decision with respect to the policy dealing with buildings there. It has not been incorporated in an order in council but it has been disclosed to the advisory committee, and they are aware of the regulations that are being used at the present time.

Mr. Woolliams: As a further supplementary question, have there been regulations passed and is the minister prepared to table them?

I am advised by the council that the minister advised them regulations had been passed, and I ask whether he is prepared to table them?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Comox-Alberni.

Mr. Woolliams: Surely the minister is prepared to answer such a reasonable question on such an important matter covering all the national parks in Canada. I ask him if he will table those regulations. Is it not correct that he has made regulations, as pointed up by the fact that Hawrelak is building another hotel?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member knows the rules.

Mr. Woolliams: I would like to debate this at ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources supplementary to the one asked by the hon. member for Bow River. Would the minister inform the house whether any recent changes have been made by order in council in national park regulations, specifically affecting the Bow river site in the Banff national park? Also, could he comment on the results of his recent meeting with the Banff advisory council on this important issue?

Mr. Speaker: Surely this is a question for the order paper, particularly since three questions have been asked on it this afternoon.

Mr. Woolliams: By that time the hotel will be built.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there is a matter of importance here. The minister is usually good when it comes to answering questions and I ask him, will he not table the regulations? Surely the various national parks and members from those areas have a right to see them. I suggest to him it is not parliamentarily very proper to refuse to table regulations, and I would ask him to do so.

Mr. Laing: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to tabling the regulations.

Mr. Woolliams: Fine.

Mr. Laing: They have already been made known to all those in the parks. The people there are conversant with them, and the basis upon which we made a decision with respect to Bow River is well known to all the people within the park.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated that he is willing to table these regulations. Would he also table a copy or copies of the Oberlander report for the Jasper park development, which was unveiled recently at Jasper national park?

Mr. Laing: I will be very glad to do that, Mr. Speaker.

PENSIONS

CANADA PLAN—INQUIRY AS TO SECOND READING OF BILL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Has a decision been taken with regard to the second reading of the bill respecting the Canada pension plan? Will it be proceeded with next week?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The government business for next week will be announced, I hope, at the end of tomorrow's sitting.

AGRICULTURE

SEPARATE DEPARTMENT FOR EASTERN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

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

Since he stated that the creation of a Department of Agriculture for eastern Canada also appeared on the government priority list, could he tell us whether this legislation will be brought before the house before the end of the present session?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, a bill has been drafted in connection with this matter, as my hon. friend knows. I hope we will be able to get to it as quickly as possible. I doubt if we can get to it before Christmas, but that will depend on the progress we make.

REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT RESPECTING DAIRY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Inquiries of the Ministry

About two weeks ago the Minister of Agriculture advised us that he was getting ready to disclose to the Canadian people, or the farmers, his new policy with regard to the dairy industry.

Can the minister tell us if we can expect information about that new policy in the near future?

[*Text*]

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): I would be glad to make the announcement just as soon as we have one.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Isn't it born yet?

ELIGIBILITY OF SMALL BLOCKS UNDER P.F.A.A. REGULATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Have there been any recent changes made in the regulations under the P.F.A. Act in regard to the eligibility of blocks of less than township size?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): No, Mr. Speaker, there have not been.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION OF DEPARTMENTAL ESTIMATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Perhaps the Prime Minister, on more mature reflection, has been able to further consider the question I asked him on Tuesday with regard to the setting aside of two days in the immediate future for further discussion of the external affairs estimates in order that we may discuss problems facing Canada. I wonder if he is now in a position to tell us whether it is the government's intention to accede to this request.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): If we are on estimates next week, and that is a possibility to say the least, then I should think the Department of External Affairs could be brought forward next week and that would provide an opportunity for discussion.

CONGO—SAFETY OF CANADIAN CITIZENS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

[Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John).]

Is he in a position to provide the house with supplementary information about the Canadian victims of the distressing situation in Congo?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Thompson went to Nairobi the day before yesterday; he had discussions there and he is to go back.

[*Text*]

QUEBEC—POSSIBLE CONSULAR EXCHANGE WITH FRANCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister. Are the Prime Minister and his government in accord and agreement with the latest reported separatist policy being put into effect by Premier Lesage of the province of Quebec, whereby he is now consulting with the great President de Gaulle with a view to setting up a consular exchange between that province and the republic of France?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, any reports to the effect that a consulate is being set up by the government of Quebec are quite inaccurate.

WATER RESOURCES

ONTARIO—CONSERVATION WORKS ON CREDIT RIVER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): I wanted to ask the minister of national resources whether his department has reached any conclusion yet on the Credit valley conservation scheme. If so, what is the nature of the decision? If there has not been any decision, when will we have one?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): I have reported to the house already that regrettably the benefit in respect of this scheme is largely recreational, as a matter of fact to the extent of 71 per cent. We have been studying the possibility of separating part of the works that relate to flood damage. I hope to be able to make an announcement next week.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

POSTAGE RATES ON CARDS IN UNSEALED ENVELOPES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. Pascoe (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for

the Postmaster General. To answer inquiries I have received from constituents will the minister indicate whether postage on Christmas cards in unsealed envelopes has been increased to 3 cents?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the hon. member has asked this question. I would remind him and other members of the house of an announcement that was made by the Postmaster General in September, 1963 that as of April 1, 1964 the postal rate on cards would be raised from 2 cents to 3 cents. This does not apply to Christmas cards only but to Easter cards, Mother's day cards and Father's day cards, etc. It has been in effect since April 1; there has been no change in this state since then, nor is any change contemplated.

Mr. Pascoe: To avoid misunderstanding and postage due claims, will the minister take action to see that the increased rate is publicized before the Christmas mailing season begins, because at present there is a great deal of misunderstanding?

Mr. Nicholson: I can assure the hon. member that steps have already been taken toward that end. A special publicity campaign has already been launched.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

MEETING OF LABOUR MINISTER AND NOVA SCOTIA PREMIER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Is it his intention to have the Minister of Labour confer with the premier of Nova Scotia during his visit to Halifax this week end, in the hope that whatever difficulties have arisen with regard to federal-provincial relations may be eliminated and a more harmonious relationship result?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the minister is in Nova Scotia at the moment, and I hope he will be able to set the premier straight on this matter.

Mr. Coates: As a supplementary question I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Minister of Labour to meet with the premier. I think the people of Nova Scotia would like to see such a meeting take place.

Mr. Pearson: I am sure they would, and I am sure the minister will do everything he can to get the matter straightened up, if that requires a meeting with the premier. I shall get in touch with the minister right away.

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF REPORT ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Finance.

Further to the report he tabled last Friday, on the break-up of federal government expenditures and revenue concerning the various provinces, and with a view to assisting the Canadians who are interested in analysing this very complicated report, can the minister tell us what figure, per capita, represents the 45 per cent portion of the national budget? Is it $150, or $175 per Canadian?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): I have not the figure, Mr. Speaker. It would require some elementary division, which I am sure my hon. friend could do just as well as I.

STUDY OF ECONOMIC INTERDEPENDENCE OF PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Several weeks ago he told us that the report of the commission on the interdependence of the provinces would be ready in a couple of weeks. I wonder if it is ready, and when it will be available to the house.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, it is not ready. As soon as there is something to report, I will be very glad to do so.

IMMIGRATION

STATEMENT BY U.S. NAZI LEADER ON VISIT TO CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration I wonder whether I could direct a question to the parliamentary secretary, and ask whether his attention has been drawn to the statement of George Lincoln Rockwell to the effect that he entered Canada quite openly, disclosed his passport and other identifying documents to the immigration officials, and in no way tried

to gain entry by subterfuge. If this information has been drawn to his attention, will that be incorporated in the subject matter of the investigation being made into how this person got here?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I will bring the hon. member's question to the attention of the minister.

TORONTO—STATUS OF PERSONS CONCERNED WITH NEWSPAPER STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration of which I gave him notice this morning. Several weeks ago he told us that certain persons concerned in the I.T.U. strike in Toronto would be asked to leave the country. I should like to know whether they have left the country and, if not, why not?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this question as notice and draw it to the attention of the minister on his return.

PUBLIC SERVICE

SUPERANNUATED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—REQUEST FOR INCREASED PENSIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Is he now in a position to indicate to the house the terms of the reply he sent on Tuesday to those who were concerned about increases in pensions of retired civil servants, and were those terms favourable?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, replies have gone to the representatives of the federal superannuates national association, to the civil service federation of Canada and to the civil service association of Canada. These replies have now been received by them, so I think it is appropriate for me to announce in the house that the government has come to the conclusion—and this was embodied in the replies—after reviewing the principles involved and the facts cited, that any steps it should propose to parliament to alleviate difficulties faced by retired persons should be general in character and not confined to former employees of the government of Canada.

[Mr. Howard.]

The government believe, in the light of general action already taken and proposed to benefit all retired people in Canada—I am referring here, of course, among other things, to the old age security pension—that it would be unfair to the great majority of retired Canadians who have not worked for the government to make special provisions to benefit only former employees of the government of Canada. To do so would constitute, in a sense, a form of discrimination against the majority of other retired Canadians who cannot expect such treatment from the government as such, or generally from their former employers.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, because of the unsatisfactory nature of this reply I give notice of my intention to raise this question at ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING PRESS GALLERY ACCOMMODATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Prime Minister a question that arises from a current magazine story and later information I have received regarding a plea to the Prime Minister from delegates of the parliamentary press gallery for assistance in their determination to stay in their present quarters. I would like to ask the Prime Minister what response, if any, he has made to these importunities.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not think any importunities were made. A delegation representing the press gallery did call on me, I think it was the day before yesterday. They told me about their difficulties, of which I already had some knowledge, and asked if I would discuss the situation with the Speaker who has, I think he will agree, the primary responsibility in this matter.

Mr. Fisher: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that subsidies for non-governmental work seem to be involved in this question, I wonder whether the Prime Minister would consider having this matter reviewed by the public accounts committee.

Mr. Pearson: I think at the moment I will confine my intervention to a talk with the Speaker on the matter.

AIRPORTS

MONCTON, N.B.—PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT OF TERMINAL BUILDING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. On October 22 I asked a question of the acting minister with regard to the airport facilities at Moncton. I wonder whether the Minister of Transport is now in a position to answer that question.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I did notice the question at the time, and I think when I first came back into the house I had a few notes on which to base a reply. The hon. member of course knows that a very considerable addition is being made to the terminal at Moncton, and so far as I know it is in every way adequate. But if there have been any recent representations I would like to inform myself fully before giving a definitive answer. I could perhaps do that on my estimates.

Mr. Coates: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The problem is with regard to the space available to passengers. Apparently a large addition is being made but it is not one that will be of benefit to passengers because a restaurant is going to be constructed as well. Representations have been made to the minister to have the space available to passengers enlarged. I wonder whether he has given consideration to this matter.

Mr. Pickersgill: I will certainly look at those representations, Mr. Speaker.

REDISTRIBUTION

PROVISION FOR BOUNDARIES COMMISSIONS AND READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION

The house resumed, from Tuesday, November 10, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-72, to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions to report upon the readjustment of the representation of the provinces in the House of Commons and to provide for the readjustment of such representation in accordance therewith—Mr. Pickersgill (for Mr. Pearson)—Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

On clause 6—*Appointment of chairman.*

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday the minister discussed clause 6, this clause having been set aside while the other clauses of the bill were discussed. On that occasion the minister put two propositions to the committee regarding a change to clause 6. Without going into detail my suggestion at that time, which was accepted by the minister—and I thank him for that—was that the debate be adjourned and the bill discussed again today so that in the interim we could discuss these two proposed changes to clause 6.

We have now had a discussion Mr. Chairman, and have come to a conclusion. It was the feeling of the group in this party who met that as far as we were concerned, although we preferred the terms and conditions of the bill as originally drawn and presented by the minister, in order to compromise and come to some sort of settlement so we could get this legislation through the house we should give serious thought and consideration to accepting one of the changes suggested by the minister.

One of the proposals was that two members of the commission be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons. We believe this proposal has some merit, although as I say we would prefer to accept the original bill as drawn by the government and presented to parliament. Nevertheless sometimes consideration must be given to other people's viewpoints, and we have given such consideration to that suggestion.

In arriving at that conclusion I should like to summarize what has been our position in the past with reference to this redistribution bill. We received some criticism to the effect that there was delay on our part with reference to the passage of this particular piece of legislation. We felt that as a matter of principle the commission should be made up of personnel appointed by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition who would sit with the commissioner. It was then that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre moved his amendment, which was known—I think I can say this without slighting the hon. member—as the Knowles amendment. It was at that stage that we reached a deadlock on the bill.

Therefore, what was our position? First of all, our party's position was that we should have one commission for all Canada; that if there were to be ten commissions the bill should have been left as it was so the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition each in turn would appoint one member of the commissions. At that time the minister had this to say, and it might be well to review it because he did leave the gate open. As reported at page 741 of *Hansard* for March 10, 1964 he said:

After various other possibilities were considered the government finally agreed to put in the bill the suggestion that the chief justice of the province should nominate the chairman from a member of his court; that the leader of the government, the Prime Minister, should nominate one of the members of the commission; and that the Leader of the Opposition, who is an officer of parliament, should nominate the other. I say unreservedly that I have every confidence that no matter who occupies those offices, any person who becomes leader of the opposition in the parliament of our country or prime minister in the parliament of our country would take this responsibility seriously and make the kind of nominations that all of us would feel were appropriate under the circumstances. I do not hesitate to say that with respect to this provision or with respect to any other method which commends itself to the house or to a majority of the house and which seems likely to produce as fair and effective a result, the government will be quite prepared in committee to consider on its merits any amendments to this procedure.

To be fair to the minister, he did leave the door open at that time, and it was left open both for the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and any other member of this committee. At that time the amendment was moved.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we objected to the amendment on similar grounds to those outlined by the minister on Tuesday, namely that one person would be appointing three people. We also objected to it on the ground that those people were to be appointed from a certain group of people in a certain category. We contended that in some respects that could lead to discrimination. In fact it might mean that people with practical experience and knowledge of politics and who would then be referred to as politicians might be discriminated against.

Therefore we as a group feel that the solution to this problem is to accept one of the propositions which have been put forward by the minister, so we can get the bill approved by this house and the commissioners can get on with the job. The proposition is that the Speaker appoint two of the members of the commission. Let us take a look at this for a moment. The Speaker, as the minister said on Tuesday, is elected by the members of the House of Commons. He sits in a judicial capacity in the House of Commons. Certainly my experience has been—and there are many here who are my seniors—that the Speaker has always exercised his position judiciously, as I am sure would any Speaker given that responsibility by the house. Certainly I know we would have every confidence that the present Speaker would exercise his powers judiciously in this regard.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Therefore, after some consideration and serious thought, we would entertain a change to clause 6 of the bill so the two other members of the commission would be appointed by the Speaker. No doubt the Speaker would consult with the leader of the government and the Leader of the Opposition and the leaders of the other parties in making his choice. But I repeat that we feel his choice will a judicious one having regard to the fact that we want to set up a commission which is as close to purity as we can get it so the question of redistribution is taken out of the field of politics.

This position we have taken is, of course, predicated on the fact that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will withdraw his amendment. In order to get this bill through now and let the commissioners get on with the job of redistribution, which is a very big job, I trust the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will recognize that we have compromised our previous stand. We repeat that we would rather have had the bill in its original form. We dislike the bill as it would be amended by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and we are suggesting some compromise. It is not exactly what we would like, but it is the best we can do today in order to reach a compromise.

When I say a compromise, it is really a settlement. I looked up the meaning of the word "compromise", and the best definition I could find in the Oxford dictionary was that it means to meet half way or to reach a settlement. I think this is the best settlement of the dilemma in which we have been.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre seems to have been making other statements outside this house since this was discussed on Tuesday, and one can never be too sure of the position he might take. However, I sincerely trust that because of the compromise we are making he will also compromise his position. I should like to congratulate the minister for the compromise he has adopted. Since we have reached consideration of the clause of this bill having to do with these appointments, I hope the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will realize that the only solution to be found to the problem lies in a withdrawal of his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like very much to hear from the minister and from the member for Winnipeg North Centre as to what they think about the position we are adopting.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Bow River has pointed out that the members of this house have had 48 hours to consider the proposals which were placed before the house on Tuesday afternoon. The hon. member has said that the members of his group have considered those proposals. The same is true of us in this party. We have looked at both proposals offered by the Minister of Transport in the light of what we believe to be the desire of parliament regarding redistribution.

I shall spell out the reasons for our position, but I might as well not keep the member for Bow River or anyone else in suspense. We do not feel disposed to withdraw our amendment for the purpose of agreeing to either of the amendments proposed by the Minister of Transport. Perhaps it is not necessary to discuss, in more than a sentence or two, the second proposal made by the minister, because apparently the Progressive Conservatives are not interested in it either. May I say that the second proposal strikes us as being worse than the first one.

Mr. Chairman, the second proposal was that each individual provincial commission consist of four people with votes and three people with eyes and voices but without votes. These other three were to be appointed, one each by the leaders of the three other parties in the House of Commons. We feel that an arrangement of that kind would really turn this so-called impartial redistribution into a political dogfight, and if that proposal were put forward we would oppose it very strongly. However, it is not even being considered by the Progressive Conservatives, so we do not have to deal with it further.

Mr. Woolliams: We thought it would be unfair to you.

Mr. Knowles: We do not think it would be unfair to us, we think it would be unfair to the people of Canada, and we think it would be adverse to the principle we have already agreed to in this house.

We now come to the other proposal the Minister of Transport has made, which the hon. member for Bow River says his party is prepared to accept, namely that in the legislation the Speaker of the House of Commons be asked to name the other two members of each of the ten provincial commissions. The first comment I want to make is to the effect that I find the bit of logic which we have been handed rather difficult to understand.

The Minister of Transport used an expression the other day which the hon. member for Bow River has just repeated. Maybe they have consulted during the last 48 hours. At any rate, this is what the Minister of Transport said on Tuesday, as recorded at page 9954 of *Hansard*. I note the way *Hansard* is building up. It probably has reached 10,000 pages by now for the first time in Canadian history. At any rate this is what the minister said:

> It is true that there were limitations on the kind of persons who could be appointed, but notwithstanding that fact, that is perhaps rather a concentration of power in the hands of one man—

That was in reference to the chief justice, under the terms of my amendment, appointing three persons. That statement was made by the Minister of Transport and has now been made by the hon. member for Bow River. They have said it would be rather a concentration of power in the hands of one man to ask one man to make three appointments, but now the proposal is that we ask one man to make 20 appointments. The suggestion is that we ask the Speaker to appoint two members to each of the ten provincial commissions. Please tell me how the power to appoint three members is a concentration of power in the hands of one man and that you get away from that by giving to one man the power to appoint 20 persons.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the hon. member would permit a question. Would he not consider in fairness that each of these commissions has jurisdiction over matters in its own province? There are ten separate commissions to be set up, one for each province, which will have jurisdiction in reference to that province. In other words the commission set up for the province of Ontario will not be governing in the jurisdiction of the province of Alberta. Is that not fair?

Mr. Knowles: That is a typical attempt on the part of the hon. member for Bow River to answer a point, and is a complete non sequitur if ever there was one. Of course there are ten separate provincial commissions. What we are talking about is the basis of the argument made against our proposal, which was that the power of appointment, with which we are dealing in our consideration of clause 6, as suggested by our amendment, was being concentrated because one man was being given the power to appoint three people. Now the proposal is that one man be given the power to appoint 20 people. I suggest that that is logic in reverse.

Mr. Woolliams: It sounds pretty illogical to me.

Mr. Knowles: It certainly is, and I am glad I have convinced my hon. friend.

Mr. Woolliams: I was referring to your argument.

Mr. Knowles: An argument in this chamber during a debate of this kind is much like the argument about motherhood. No one criticizes motherhood. We have the name of Mr. Speaker put before us, and all our respect for the Chair and our confidence in the impartiality of the Speaker is brought into play. When I think of the number of times the hon. member for Bow River has not even accepted the judgment of Mr. Speaker, as he did today when his question was ruled out of order, it becomes rather strange that the hon. member feels the Speaker is such an impartial person he could make these appointments across the country.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I did not challenge the Speaker's ruling during the question period today just before orders of the day were called. The minister did not answer the question and according to the rules laid down by the hon. member, who has been so proud of the changes, I rose and said that I should like to have it debated at ten o'clock. That is not a challenge of a judicial decision of His Honour the Speaker, and certainly represents no disrespect for him. I think the hon. member should withdraw his remark, and if he has a sound argument let us get on with it.

Mr. Knowles: That is non sequitur No. 2, Mr. Chairman. Let us get back to the issue.

The argument is put forward that somehow or other by asking Mr. Speaker to make these appointments we would take this whole matter out of politics. Does any Speaker of the House of Commons know the personalities and situations of each of the ten provinces of this country? Is there any person who is likely to occupy the chair of this house who is in a position on his own to make these appointments? The answer is obviously in the negative. If this job is entrusted to the Speaker he is going to have to obtain advice and consult someone. I think the cat was let out of the bag by the hon. member for Bow River when he agreed to that suggestion and said his party understood that if this amendment were accepted the Speaker would consult the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and then, out of the kindness of his heart, he said the Speaker would probably consult the leaders of the other parties.

Mr. Woolliams: I put them all in the same category.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend and I are in agreement in that regard, but what he does not seem to realize is that by doing so we are keeping redistribution as a partisan and political affair. The whole purpose of the legislation before us—and the Minister of Transport said this was the only aspect of it on which the government would stand or fall—is that we are going to put redistribution beyond parliament, we are going to put it in the hands of an impartial commission, we are going to have these boundaries drawn objectively by people outside the parliamentary arena. But under the terms of the proposed amendment we are going to have two of the appointees to each of these commissions given their positions by Mr. Speaker on the basis of an understanding, stated in the House of Commons, that he will have consulted the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and the leaders of the other parties. In other words we are making it quite clear that what we are going to get is appointments that are political in one sense or the other. Either they are political in that they are proposed by political persons, or they are political in the sense that they do not displease the political leaders of the various parties in the House of Commons.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder whether the hon. gentleman would permit me to ask him a question. Does he know how these appointments are made in the United Kingdom?

Mr. Knowles: I had hoped that in this house we were going to move a step ahead.

Mr. Pickersgill: Does he know?

Mr. Knowles: Yes. In the United Kingdom they are made by order in council.

Mr. Pickersgill: No, they are not.

Mr. Knowles: If my hon. friend knows something about this that I do not know I would be glad if he would so advise me, but my general understanding of the practice in the United Kingdom is that they have not gone as far in the direction of impartiality as it was proposed to go in the bill brought in by the government here, and we welcomed the attempt of the government, supported by all parties in the house, really to go in for a

non-political, impartial redistribution of the seats in the House of Commons.

I suggest that when you have people appointed in this way you are not going to achieve the high ideal that we started out with when the bill was introduced. I also submit that this puts a terrific load on Mr. Speaker himself. He has his hands full administering the staff and the affairs of the House of Commons. He has a full time job just occupying the chair and retaining that impartiality that goes with the occupancy of the chair in the House of Commons. To impose upon him now this very highly political chore of naming these people to these various commissions across the country is, I submit, unfair to him and out of line with the basic principles of this legislation.

The hon. member for Bow River quite properly has drawn attention to the willingness of his party to compromise, and I do not detract from that by one iota. For a long time his party seemed unwilling to agree to anything except clause 6 in its original form. He now says they are prepared to agree to clause 6 in the terms proposed by the Minister of Transport in one of the amendments. That is a change of position. If the Liberals had changed like that the Tories would call it a retreat but I will not do that.

Mr. Pickersgill: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I know the hon. gentleman always wants to be fair. The Liberals have never taken a position on this bill except on one point, as the hon. gentleman fairly said before. We consider that every member should be guided by his own conscience in this matter, which is the equal responsibility of every member of this parliament. I hope the hon. gentleman will take my words sincerely and not ascribe positions that I have taken to anybody but myself.

Mr. Knowles: I have no quarrel with what the Minister of Transport has just said. In fact I want to endorse what he has said, to the effect that the only point in this whole matter that the government has regarded as sacred, if you will, or that the government has regarded as a point on which it would stand or fall, is on the basic proposition of redistribution being taken out of parliament and given to an independent body. My contention is that we are denying that basic principle if we set up that body on terms under which its independence is not as clear as it really could be.

I started to say that I recognize the element of compromise that has been indicated on the part of the official opposition, and I do not want members to think our position is an immovable one and that we insist on the terms of my amendment to clause 6 and nothing else. We too are prepared to negotiate, to find some middle ground if it is at all possible to do so. I was wondering whether over the 48 hour interval there might be some attempt at negotiation of the point, but there was none, at least so far as my experience is concerned in the last two days.

But I want to say to the government and the official opposition as well that if the objection to my amendment—and after all it is my amendment we are still officially discussing—is that it places this power of appointment in the hands of the chief justice of the province, which some people do not like, we would have no objection to changing the situs of that power of appointment. We would have no objection to substituting the Speaker for the chief justice in so far as making these appointments is concerned, but we do feel that the kind of advice, the guide lines, the directions that are contained in my amendment should be given to the Speaker as well.

We would suggest that either one of two things be tried as a means of arriving at a consensus among all five parties in the house. After all, the government is really in no better position to win the support of one party and lose the support of two or three others than it would have been if it had stayed where it was. I suggest that as a basis for arriving at a consensus among all five parties either one of two things might be done.

Mr. Leboe: Making a mountain out of a molehill.

Mr. Knowles: We had such fine support from the hon. member for Cariboo when this matter was up before, but apparently he has got tired of it. I suggest either one of two things, either that my amendment be amended by substituting the Speaker for the chief justice but leaving in the amendment the categories from which the Speaker would make the choices, or that the government should indicate that it will add words to its amendment so far as the power of appointment by the Speaker is concerned. The government's amendment could read that these appointments be made by Mr. Speaker provided, however, that the appointments or at least one of them be made from a certain class or category of persons.

As an offer to compromise, as an offer to find some basis on which we might all agree, I suggest that provision should be made in the proposal, whichever way it comes about, whether by way of amendment to my amendment or amendment to the government's amendment, for our proposal that one of these appointees, whether he is named by the chief justice or by the Speaker, should be the chief electoral officer of the province, the surveyor general, the recorder of vital statistics or a person of that kind.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that we are prepared to withdraw our amendment if an alternative is put forward that is acceptable to all of us and in keeping with the basic principle of the bill, but if no such acceptable alternative is brought forward we would not, of course, be willing to withdraw our amendment. We feel it is in keeping with the basic principle of the bill itself, and that if the house does not want our amendment it will have to vote it down rather than expecting us to withdraw it.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, taking into consideration the two alternative proposals by the Minister of Transport with regard to the previously moved amendment to clause 6, it becomes obvious that in trying to find perfection in the selection of the commissions we become involved immediately in different interpretations of perfection.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in looking over the two alternative proposals it seems to me that the one that returns to the appointment of some members of the commission by the leader of the government in the house and the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons is not essentially different from clause 6 in the original bill. I should say that we were not particularly happy with the idea of trying to set up what might be called a non-partisan redistribution commission and then turning around and allowing the leaders of the two major political parties in the country to appoint 50 per cent of the membership of these commissions. I think therefore, so far as we are concerned, we can almost disregard that particular proposal.

We come, then, to the second proposal that has been suggested. We think there is some merit in having the Speaker of this chamber appoint at least some of the members of these redistribution commissions. Certainly it is true, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said, that the Speaker will be appointing 20 commissioners across the country. He will also, it is expected, seek advice from someone, but we do not disagree with that at all. What is more, we think he may even seek advice from some of the political parties in the country. There seems to have been an attempt to downgrade the advice that can be received from political organizations in the country in so far as redistribution is concerned. I suppose it is fair to say that each political party will certainly have to take into consideration its own interests in redistribution. At the same time, this would be offset by other parties making their representations as well.

I do not subscribe to this theory, if you want to call it such, that the advice that can come to these commissions from political parties would be all bad. I think even the practice we have had in the past, that has been deplored in some cases, has not been that bad. Certainly political organizations are keenly interested, and I might say some of the executive officers of the political organizations within a constituency probably have a better knowledge of some of the problems of organizing or setting up constituencies in the light of such considerations as natural boundaries, community of interest and so on, than any other groups in the country.

Overriding the consideration of finding a perfect formula for nominating the members of this commission, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that redistribution is long overdue. I believe perhaps the second alternative proposal is as close to perfection as we can reach at this time. I want to say this, too, whether we accept the original draft of clause 6 in Bill No. C-72 or the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre or either of the two alternatives that have been presented to us within the last 48 hours. Overriding all that is the fact that we need to have redistribution. If we do not reach some kind of agreement soon we are going to have another election based on the 1951 census. In my opinion this would be a far greater disservice to the electorate in Canada than anything that could come about from any one of the four proposals that are before us. I feel that the limit imposed by clause 13, for example, whether it is 20 per cent, 25 per cent or even 33⅓ per cent, will be such that there will not be a great deal of discretion left to the commissioners in so far as the size of a constituency is concerned. Certainly there will be some discretion in the minor adjustment of borders, but at least the limit imposed by clause 13 does remove a great deal of the dis-

cretionary power redistribution commissions have had in the past.

Speaking directly to the change from the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to the new proposals, I would say that I do not accept the contention that the president or a similar officer or member of the faculty of a university would be any less partisan politically than the Speaker of this house. As a matter of fact I believe the Speaker would be considerably less partisan, if I may put it that way, than most of the members of these faculties. I feel that the question before us, therefore, at least the paramount question before us, is to accept one or the other of these four proposals and get on with setting up the redistribution commission so that it can be done, rather than squabbling over what might be called the minor details in seeking perfection.

An important idea, by the way, advanced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was that the chief electoral officer of a province or perhaps the surveyor general of a province should be a member of the commission. There are a number of reasons for that, I think. First of all, for example, the chief electoral officer of a province of necessity would be very familiar with the topography, community of interests and so on because he has been involved in these things within the provincial jurisdiction. He would be a very useful member on the commission simply because of his knowledge of the province, regardless of what his politics might be. We would hope, of course, that he did not have any partisan political tendency that would guide his thinking.

The other reason that the chief electoral officer of the province would be a useful member of the commission is that he could probably give some guidance to the commission in so far as making the boundaries of a number of provincial constituencies coterminus with the boundaries of federal constituencies. This is a matter that has some merit because I know that, particularly in the first election following redistribution, there is a great deal of confusion along the boundaries of both federal and provincial constituencies. People get used to going to certain polling places. They get used to dealing with the old set-up, if you want to call it that, and it is a little difficult to educate them or to inform the electorate of the constituencies about the many changes that may have been made.

I am not going to speak any longer, Mr. Chairman. I think we would prefer to accept the alternative proposal which gives the Speaker of this house the power to name two of the members on the ten commissions. If anything could be done to give some guidance to the Speaker, along the lines that one of the men to be appointed should possibly be the chief electoral officer or the surveyor general of a province, that might be useful. But we are not prepared to hold up the adoption of clause 6, because we think redistribution, based on a more recent census than that of 1951, is a more important consideration than these minor details.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I thank hon. gentlemen for indicating so clearly what their positions are. The hon. member for Bow River has indicated that those of his friends for whom he speaks—and I gather that is quite a considerable portion of his party—are willing to accept the first of the two alternative suggestions I made the other day. Of course I indicated clearly the other day that I thought this was a far better suggestion than the other.

Although I was rather impressed by some of the things said by the hon. member for Medicine Hat, I frankly think all four methods that are now before us in one form or another would result in perfectly satisfactory commissions. There has been a lot of unnecessary hairsplitting about these things, but I have never indicated any fundamental objection to any of them.

I sympathized with the views of members of parties other than the Conservative and Liberal parties when they felt there was some bias against them in choosing the leaders of the two major parties as appointors.

Mr. Knowles: On a point of order, surely the minister knows he is misstating the case. We never expressed concern that this was bias against us. We expressed the view that it was inconsistent with the idea of doing it on a non-political basis. If we thought there was a bias against us we would be accepting the fourth proposal, but we are not.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am not in a mood to make much distinction in the matter. Whoever they might be, I do not believe the leader of the opposition and the prime minister would exercise this power in any other than the judicial way in which parliament intended it to be exercised. I would not have taken responsibility for putting that in the bill in the first place if I thought they would be activated by partisan considerations.

I did think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre had found a way of designating

the kind of people it would be desirable to have on these commissions, in the light of the Manitoba experience which is the only one we have had in Canada. I said I thought I was slightly in favour of that, but I never went beyond that; and I think the hon. gentlemen will agree that I said only that if I had to choose between the two I think his amendment had some slight advantage over the original bill. But I pointed out, and I repeat, that it enables three members of a four member commission to be appointed by one man.

I do not always agree with the hon. member for Bow River, but I believe he had much the better of the argument with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre about the concentration of power. The Speaker will be making two of these nominations.

Mr. Knowles: Two times ten is 20.

Mr. Pickersgill: But not on the same commission, as the hon. member for Bow River pointed out. There will be only two persons on each commission appointed by one appointor, and two others appointed in a different manner. That is certainly less concentration of power than to have three appointed by one person on each separate commission.

As for the tremendous difficulties and burden this will impose upon the Speaker, I think he can well bear them, considering the other burdens we place on him every day. I am totally unimpressed with that argument. Like the hon. member for Medicine Hat I believe the most important thing is to carry out our constitutional responsibility to make sure there is a redistribution which, as we all know, is long overdue. That is the overriding consideration.

This other rather complicated scheme I put forward also has a precedent in New Zealand, and I think it would not result in an unsatisfactory, unfair or partisan redistribution. I do not think any of them would, but of all four the one I like best is the one giving these appointments to the Speaker. I believe he will seek to appoint, wherever they are available—and this is all the hon. member's amendment would do—officers like the chief electoral officer of a province and the surveyor general of a province, someone who is technically competent; but we cannot force him to do so, and we cannot force these people to act. That is the original difficulty we had in this matter.

Therefore I am not much in favour of trying to put this condition into the amendment itself; but when the hon. member's amendment is disposed of and if the house does not accept it—I guess it will not—then if he wants to move a subamendment he can test the committee on this point. That is his right, and I think that would be the proper way to do it. Personally I feel that if we are going to give this task to His Honour the Speaker, we should give it to him, period. We should not seek to give it to him and then say, "We are just a little dubious about this and we think we ought to tell you how to do it."

Mr. Knowles: Has the minister forgotten the arguments he used in favour of my amendment when, if we were to give the job to the chief justices, he argued that we should give them guide lines?

Mr. Pickersgill: Exactly; but I would remind the hon. gentleman that the chief justice of a province is not an officer of the parliament of Canada. He is not under our jurisdiction, and if there are any flagrant abuses of this power by His Honour the Speaker we have a remedy in our rules. It has been used only once or twice in our history, and I hope it will never be used for a long time again.

I am totally unimpressed with the suggestion that this would impose a terrible burden on the Speaker, or that there would be any difficulty, or that in any advice the Speaker should choose to take there would be any more suggestion of partisanship than in any other method of appointment which might possibly be devised. That is why I asked the hon. gentleman if he knew how appointments are made in the United Kingdom.

It might be useful to refresh hon. members' memories on that point. There are four commissions in the United Kingdom, one each for England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, and the chairman of all four commissions is the Speaker of the House of Commons. I think it is true that his chairmanship is perhaps rather perfunctory but he has a voice and I suppose, being the chairman, he has the largest voice of all if he chooses to exercise it. The deputy chairman is a judge of the high court appointed by the lord chancellor.

There are two other members in the English commission, one appointed by the home secretary and the other by the minister of housing and local government. They are not even appointed by order in council; they are appointed by ministers. I do not think anyone in this house would want to trust ministers to make such appointments and at no time

have I suggested that this be done, but that is what is done in England and there has never been any real suggestion I know of that the English commission was not as non-partisan as anything one could reasonably get. In Scotland the two ministerial appointments—there is a judge who is the deputy chairman—are made by the Secretary of Scotland. The situation is analogous for the other two commissions, and I think it would be wasting the time of the committee to go beyond that.

What we would be doing here, if we did not accept the hon. gentleman's amendment and instead accepted the one which I am now quite satisfied I would be justified in moving if the hon. gentleman's amendment is defeated, would be saying that the chairman of each commission shall be appointed by the chief justice of the province and, if there is any default, by the Chief Justice of Canada; that two other appointments apart from the representation commissioner would be made by the Speaker. We will be saying that we have enough confidence in whoever may be the Speaker of the House of Commons to feel that he will appoint the kind of people that it is the whole purpose of the legislation to have appointed; that is to say, persons who will be independent and objective in their judgment.

I have always thought, as I confessed on Tuesday, that this would be the best method, if it was acceptable to the house. The only fear I ever had about proposing it was that we might have a serious division in the house about it, which I would regret. But I do not think there was anything said by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre that would lead one to hesitate to make this motion and to take the sense of the house about it. The kind of objections he made were not the kind of objections which reflected in any way at all upon the Speaker or upon the office of Speaker, and I am sure he did not intend to make any such reflection.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, may I confirm that. My objections are objections in principle; not against the person or the office.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. gentleman's principles in this particular case are principles, if you like, but they are not principles to which I subscribe. I do think there is no person more likely to be completely independent in these matters than the Speaker of this house, whoever he may be; and I remind hon. members that there is the glare of publicity upon the actions of the Speaker of this house that there is not even upon the chief justice of a province. I am very glad indeed that hon. gentlemen immediately opposite are willing, in the spirit in which the hon. member for Bow River put it forward today, to say that, while for them this is second best they are willing to accept it. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre obviously feels that his amendment is better than anything else and I think therefore it should be put to the house and we should vote on it. I may say, of course, that when only two possibilities appeared to be before us—that is, the original bill and the hon. gentleman's amendment—I was disposed to vote for it; but having found something that I think is better and on which I believe there is sufficient consensus in the house, I of course would not vote for his alternative.

Mr. Leboe: Mr. Chairman, I will only take about two minutes of the time of the committee in connection with this amendment. I just wish to say that I think we are moving along and are making progress, which is something the people of Canada are looking forward to. I think we have been making a mountain out of a molehill as far as the power vested in these commissioners is concerned. The rules are set down in connection with the working of the commissions, the formula is very rigid and quite confining, and I do not think there should have been nearly as much discussion as we have had in connection with this matter. That has been my opinion right from the beginning. I believe these commissions could have been set up a long time ago.

I am particularly interested in the fact that there was a long delay in again bringing this matter before the house after its initial introduction. I think this was wrong. I believe that when the bill was before the house it should have been kept before the house. We should have been in the position to deal with it and get on with the job so these commissions could be set up and working. There will be other times when any amendments that are needed can be brought forward in the light of experience. This is not, I hope, our last session, although it is going to last a little longer than some of us thought would be the case to begin with.

There is one thing I should like to mention in connection with these long delays. If we are going to continue to be four or five years behind in having adjustments made to electoral boundaries, I think something should be put into the British North America Act and some changes should be made that would

take into account other vital statistics being used in order to upgrade our position as far as the population is concerned. In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would just say that since we now have a degree of unanimity in the house, we are glad to be able to support any amendment that may be introduced which most members of the house will support.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I think the intention of the hon. member for Medicine Hat, echoed by the Minister of Transport and the hon. member for Cariboo, that an election based upon the 1951 census would be most unfair and injurious to the electorate carries with it, as they stated, the implication that we should therefore give passage to whatever measure might be presented to us, if it is presented in a reasonable way and if the arguments in favour of it appear on the surface to be reasonable. I think this is a somewhat misleading and somewhat false position to take.

It is correct that we are long overdue in carrying out the responsibilities that devolve upon parliament with regard to the question of redistribution following the decennial census, but I believe we should not let that consideration override the possibility that any bill which is before us is likely to be wrecked, adulterated or watered down from the original principle. I think this is likely to take place here.

Generally, Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is agreement that we want (1) to have a redistribution system as soon as possible in order that redistribution can take place, and (2) we want that system to be non-political. These two principles are correct, but they should not blind us to some of the other features which might be bad in attempting to put them into effect. I believe this might be the case here, with these compromise proposals that are being presented and argued. It is my understanding that there was a large degree of the spirit of co-operation among all the parties in this chamber up until Tuesday of this week, when the Minister of Transport placed the two alternate proposals on *Hansard,* but that since that time—I have consulted with the people in the New Democratic party who participate in these all-party meetings—there has not been any sort of discussion or consultation as has usually been the case in matters such as this. At least there has been no sort of consultation or discussion to which my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre was invited or in which he participated. I am not objecting to that in any way, and I am sure he is not objecting either, but it does seem passing strange that all of a sudden there is agreement from those who previously raised the most stringent objections to the manner of proceeding as proposed in the bill introduced by the government.

I assume that what has taken place—I am not objecting to this, of course—is that there has been some behind the scenes consultation between the government and the official opposition in an attempt to reach a meeting of minds on what previously had been an impasse. As I say, I do not object to that, but if it did occur I think the fact should be placed on record so that the house and the general public will know that such arrangement did exist and that the Minister of Transport is not completely taken by surprise at the position of the official opposition. In fact I think he let the cat out of the bag when he virtually anticipated what the vote of this committee might be on the amendment before us if and when it did take place, which indicates that there was this prior consultation in an attempt to reach a meeting of minds. In fact, I would put the suggestion forward that such a meeting did take place, and in the absence of any denial of my suggestion I think we can accept as a fact that there was a behind the scenes meeting on the proposals now put before us.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, since the hon. gentleman is making certain insinuations I think I should make it clear that there has been no greater degree of consultation with anyone in the official opposition than there has been with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Howard: Well, Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about degrees of consultation, whatever that vague term might mean. We are talking about consultation and discussion as such. I am not going to argue the point; if that is the way the government wants to operate then that is its own business. But in the light of the alternate suggestions which the Minister of Transport has put forward and the alacrity with which one of them has been accepted by the official opposition, it does lead one to look a little deeper into what is being proposed here, what is likely to be the effect of such a proposal, and what are to be the mechanics by which Mr. Speaker appoints these two members of the redistribution commissions.

I should like to read, if I may, a few comments made by the Minister of Transport, as

recorded at page 9954 of *Hansard* for November 10 last. He said:

—it might be better to trust His Honour the Speaker to do the sensible thing, and not to put any strings upon him except the obvious string that these appointments must be made from persons resident in the province.

This point was touched on by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I hope the inference is not drawn from this that because one may object to this procedure outlined in the proposal he is thereby not trusting Mr. Speaker; the minister's words are:

—it might be much better to trust His Honour the Speaker—

So if we do object to this it should in no way be interpreted as implying any degree of mistrust of the integrity or honour of the individual who may at any given time hold the position of Mr. Speaker.

There are some very revealing things in the statement of the Minister of Transport of November 10 which I think disclose in essence why he proposed the alternatives and why he was favourable to one of them. It equally discloses why the official opposition jumped at the opportunity to endorse one of the proposals.

Mr. Pickersgill: It was a pretty slow jump.

Mr. Howard: The reasoning behind this, of course, is that if the proposal by the Minister of Transport is finally accepted it will in essence, even though it does not say so in the bill, be identical to that which was contained in the bill itself; namely that there would be political partisanship and activity in the selection of the commissioners, which is the one thing we are trying to avoid. That is the one principle in the bill on which everyone was agreed—that the redistribution of seats in Canada should take place in a completely non-partisan atmosphere. I submit that the proposals put forward by the Minister of Transport run contrary to this principle, and in effect attempt to drag Mr. Speaker into the political arena as well, which is even worse.

The Minister of Transport in his remarks the other day went on to quote the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings as follows:

We have a Prime Minister who is an officer of the house and a Leader of the Opposition who is also an officer of the house, and they are the only ones in this category. I agree that whoever occupied the office of prime minister or leader of the opposition would exercise the authority given to them under this provision in a manner which would be entirely creditable both to themselves and to parliament—

I am reading the entire quotation, Mr. Chairman, because I do not want the minister or the committee to think that I am selecting something out of context.

The minister then goes on to quote the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre as follows:

I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre should correct his stand on this. What is required in this country is respect for parliament—

No one will disagree with that.

—and that carries with it respect for the leaders of these two great parties.

Then the minister went on to quote the hon. member Edmonton West and another member of the Conservative party, each of whom in his reasoning and argument was supporting the provision in the bill that the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition should participate in the selection of two of the commissioners.

I think it is obvious from those quotations, and it is obvious from the speed with which the official opposition endorsed one of the proposals of the Minister of Transport—in fact, the hon. member for Bow River let it slip earlier this afternoon, if that is properly what he did, when he said that undoubtedly Mr. Speaker would consult with the leaders of the government party and the opposition party in the selection of these two commissioners—

Mr. Pickersgill: And also the other leaders.

Mr. Howard: I do not know from the movement of the minister's head whether he is agreeing.

Mr. Pickersgill: I was pointing out to the hon. gentleman that that was not all that the hon. member for Bow River said. As I heard him—I see he is here now so he can speak for himself—he said he assumed that the Speaker would consult the leaders of all groups in the house; and I think there would be nothing improper at all in his doing so, as long as he exercised his own judgment and did these things properly. That is what happens of course in the United Kingdom. There are consultations, which means that there is that assurance. The hon. gentleman has been trying to read into words which I used the other day meanings which were never intended and which are not there. All I ever meant by consultation was that there would not only be the assurance that the appointments would be appointments of independent and objective persons but that they would be the kind of appointments which would com-

mend themselves to everyone as being such. Some degree of consultation to make sure of that seems to me to be only ordinary common sense.

Mr. Howard: I have listened to the speeches of the Minister of Transport in this house on a number of occasions and know him well enough to know that it is possible to read almost anything into what he says; and invariably that is the case. So, regardless of the bland statement that he now makes, I say to that statement: rubbish. What was initially intended when the government introduced the bill was that there would be—

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman now is breaking the rules of the house. He is one of the most experienced and skilful parliamentarians in the house, and we all acknowledge that fact, but nobody knows better than he that he has no right to attribute motives to other hon. members. I have stated what I meant, and what I meant is what the words say. I had no thought at any time that there would be any kind of bargaining so that there would be one appointment of a Tory and one appointment of a Grit, or anything of that sort. All I ever thought consultation would be used for was to make sure that the kind of individual appointed would be completely without a partisan character. If I thought anything other than that would happen I would be opposed to this proposal.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, the highly flattering remarks of the minister have comcompletely disarmed me. However, it is an undeniable fact, and should be obvious to anyone, that in its original form subclause 2 of clause 6 proposes that the two members of the commissions, other than the chairman and representation commissioner, would be appointed, one by the leader of the government in the House of Commons and one by the leader of the opposition in the House of Commons. When the minister now says that he never at any time intended anything other than that these appointments would be nonpolitical and non-partisan, I again say rubbish. The minister did say that which I have indicated, and that is what is said in the bill now before us. What could be more clear than that one of the two members of the commission, other than the chairman, shall be appointed by the leader of the government and one by the leader of the opposition? That is what the bill says, and if the minister is trying to suggest that that does not imply, or perhaps even more than imply, a desire for political appointment to this commission, then I do not know what it does imply.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, once again I rise on a question of privilege. I have all the copies of *Hansard* in front of me and I could easily look up what I did say during second reading of this bill. It was quoted earlier today by one hon. member opposite. What I said was, and I repeated it again today, that if these functions were carried out by the prime minister and the leader of the opposition, whoever they might be, I believe they would carry them out in the spirit in which this parliament asked them to do so, and they would not make political or partisan appointments. That is my belief. If the hon. member thinks that just because a man happens to be the leader of a party, it is impossible for him to act in an independent and objective manner, having been given a trust, he has a lower opinion of human nature than I have.

Mr. Grégoire: You are very naïve when you think that.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for the Minister of Transport to become insulting in his remarks, but if that is what he believes, good luck to him. He can go right ahead believing that.

The fact of the matter is that it says in the bill that two members shall be appointed by the two leaders. We are not here, Mr. Chairman, being called upon to legislate as the result of the faith and belief of the Minister of Transport. God forbid our ever doing that. We are legislating in the Queen's english, and nothing is more clear than that by the provisions of this bill one member shall be appointed by the leader of the government in the House of Commons and one shall be appointed by the leader of the opposition in the House of Commons.

Mr. Chairman, we know from past practice that leaders of governments in the House of Commons engage in politics and partisanships whenever there is an occasion to do so. I do not place the present Prime Minister above that position. One need only look at the recent appointment to the Senate to obtain some indication of that haven for retired-work-horses.

Mr. Woolliams: What about Mr. Coldwell's appointment?

Mr. Howard: I did not know that Mr. Coldwell was appointed to the Senate.

Mr. Pickersgill: He was appointed to the privy council, which is an even more honourable appointment.

Mr. Knowles: That will get you in trouble with the Senate.

Mr. Howard: Perhaps if the hon. member for Bow River and his party had considered following their program of reform of the Senate after they were elected in 1957, we might have a different situation today, but even his great leader was unable to get away from the desire to partake in political activity in making political appointments. I am not so naïve that I could believe the Minister of Transport when he says that no prime minister is going to make political appointments if the occasion to do so arose. I believe that he might be enticed into doing that sort of thing.

The fact of the matter is that the original presentation of this bill, which was in the name of the Prime Minister, admittedly, and not in the name of the Minister of Transport, provided for appointments to be made by the prime minister and the leader of the opposition. Perhaps if the bill had been under the sponsorship of the Minister of Transport we would now have a completely different proposal without this obvious attempt at partisanship.

Regardless of how often the Minister of Transport says that he did not mean there should be partisanship, or that he does not believe in that sort of thing, the proposal made by the Minister of Transport, in respect of the mechanism by which one of these commissioners would be appointed, would lead us in the direction again of political partisanship in the selection of the members of these commissions, through influence brought to bear on whomever happened to occupy the position of Mr. Speaker. I do not say that in a derogatory way, but so long as the office of Mr. Speaker is a political office, and not a permanent non-partisan one, which I am sure we would all like to see, this possibility would remain.

My second point in argument against the proposal of the Minister of Transport is that it is regrettable that Mr. Speaker should be dragged into the political activities of this nation even more than he has been dragged in at the moment. Every government in recent times has expressed the feeling, shared I think by all members of this house, or at least of this party, that Mr. Speaker should be a non-partisan individual. I think we are all in favour of the sort of semi-colonial attitude, that whatever is done in the United Kingdom should be done here, namely that we should have a Speaker who in fact occupies an honoured position for a long period of time, and that his office should be removed from political activity not only on a day to day basis but as well during political campaigning. The fact of the matter is that this is not the case. I do not know how far away the time is, and perhaps the sooner the better, but Mr. Macnaughton, our present Speaker, will be running as a candidate in his own constituency. Presumably there will be, as there has been in the past, candidates of other political parties running against him. As has happened to previous Speakers, he will find himself embroiled in political controversy, perhaps emanating from the bill we are considering at this time. Perhaps his riding will be redistributed; such has happened in the past. In fact I have heard the Leader of the Opposition say that the terrible Liberals have wiped his seat out from under him time after time.

Mr. Woolliams: You are talking about his riding.

Mr. Howard: When I used the word "seat" I knew what I was referring to, but whether or not the hon. member for Bow River did is another question. The Speaker will be involved and embroiled in political activity and controversy in a partisan way, and I assume he will still be a Liberal candidate in the next election. What we say we want to have happen is to have the Speaker set apart from political partisanship. We do not even like the fact that at election time he has to run under a party label, with candidates of the other parties running against the Speaker, because we want to preserve his position on a non-political and non-partisan basis in order to guarantee, if it needs to be guaranteed, that the rules of the house will be enforced in an impartial and non-political way.

But instead of moving in the direction of placing Mr. Speaker in an even more non-partisan position because of the office he holds it is now proposed that we should move in the direction of bringing him into politics by dragging him into consultation with political leaders in order to select the members of the redistribution commission which we want to be non-political. I think this is regrettable.

It is for these reasons that I say we should not rush madly into endorsing one or other of the proposals which are before us at least

by way of suggestion, if not in a formal way. We should not do so merely because we happen to have a strong desire to pass a redistribution bill in order that redistribution may be made on the basis of the 1961 census before the next election takes place. Incidentally, while we are on the subject of elections, we could very well have an election on our hands within the next few months. Everyone tells me this is quite possible and that it is probable that such an election would be conducted on the basis of the 1951 rather than the 1961 census. I am sure the minister will know more about that than I do because of his closer consultation with individuals in the office of the chief electoral officer, as well as his knowledge of other matters. Be that as it may, for the reasons I have outlined I submit we do not want to be seduced into endorsing either of the proposals now before us merely because there is a desire to hurry and pass the bill. Hurrying to get the bill through is commendable in itself, but in trying to do so we must not destroy the main principle, the establishment of redistribution commissions on a non-political and non-partisan basis.

In my opinion the proposal of the Minister of Transport that Mr. Speaker should make these appointments makes the bill even worse than it was in its original form. In its original form political partisanship was at least out in the open where everyone could see it and we could expect certain things to take place. Now it will be hidden behind the scenes. In addition, we are attempting to drag Mr. Speaker into the political arena and partisan activities to a far greater extent than he is at the moment, and in the process we are likely to degrade even further the office of Speaker, when what we want to do is to elevate it.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre made some alternative suggestions to the proposal of the Minister of Transport. I submit they should be looked at very carefully. I do not think we should rush helter-skelter into picking one or other of the amendments which have been suggested. In another 20 or 25 minutes we will reach private members' hour starting at five o'clock, which is followed by the supper recess. I suggest it should be possible during this interval for the leaders of the parties or their spokesmen to get together and consult on this matter and see whether or not they cannot work out some generally acceptable compromise amendment. In the light of the variety of things that have been said I submit that is a far better way to approach the matter than to follow the suggestion of the Minister of Transport that we should have a vote right away on the amendment which has been before the committee for some months, when he will then proceed to move another amendment which just came to our attention a couple of days ago and about which, as the Minister of Transport has said, there has been no consultation with anybody.

I think we should put the consultative process to work, provide an opportunity for the various parties to consult and maybe by eight o'clock they will be able to arrive at a workable, worth-while amendment. If there is unanimity with regard to such an amendment, the possibility of political partisanship will be even further removed. I think this is the principal objective we all want to achieve, the carrying out of redistribution on a strictly non-political basis because we have had too much of political interference in the past.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Chairman, we are now on the sixth day of debate on this particular clause. It seems to me we have heard all the arguments, or certainly sufficient argument to make up our minds on these points. I have intended for some time to support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and that is still my intention. It seemed to me that in the past the official opposition did not want this amendmen to come to a vote, but today we see the New Democratic party, which proposed the amendment, determined that it will not come to a vote. I would hope we could get on with the matter.

Mr. Howard: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member for York-Scarborough does not want to be unfair and misinterpret what has been said. I for one never said that we did not want the amendment to come to a vote. All I said was that we should not rush, because the matter can be discussed during the supper hour.

Mr. Moreau: Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that those people who are suggesting that we should get on with the nation's business might very well agree to do so.

Mr. Scott: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, as a constituent of the hon. member for York-Scarborough I want to voice my objection to his imputing motives of that kind to our group. He is in danger of losing my vote in the next election as a result of the motives he is imputing to us. We are trying to air our

views on the question. We are not trying to prevent a vote at all.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Moreau) cannot claim that we did not devote to this matter before us all the time required, because during those six days of debate we did not yet say one word relevant to it. However, when stupidity such as this amendment occurs, then we should not be told that we talked long enough, because we wish to say a few things on this subject.

It is proposed that the Speaker appoint the members of the electoral boundaries commission. Was he asked if he would accept those duties? That is something different. On the other hand, if closure is to be imposed—

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I suggested that we vote on the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and when the time comes to discuss other motions, the necessary time should be granted.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, concerning the point of order, I must say that it is not the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre who submitted that text.

Why are we presented with this text before voting on another amendment? Instead of voting on the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, we were asked to vote on a rather stupid suggestion by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill). I have it in my hands. Where does it come from? We are asked to vote on this matter without discussing it. This is a round about way of proceeding. Endeavouring to have the Conservative party defeat the Liberal party is a stupid thing, because both think alike and work together to the prejudice of the Canadian people.

How can the Speaker of the house know the residents of Prince Edward Island or British Columbia whom he will appoint as commissioners? What will happen then? It is simple; the Speaker will seek advice, and from whom? From the old Liberal party. It is easy to see that there is collusion between the two old parties at the present time. Their agreement is quite obvious. They said to themselves: each of us will suggest one man to the Speaker. So, there is an agreement between the old parties. In what do they differ? Both, when in power say the same thing, and again, when in opposition, say the same thing.

But in this particular business, I am supposed to believe that there is no agreement between the two old parties. Let me tell you this: accept that, and you will see everything else adopted, because there is an agreement, a tacit agreement. And we should accept that without a word? The hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Moreau) did not consider the matter very long before asking us to end our discussion.

Mr. Moreau: I simply asked for a vote on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I am in favour of the amendment moved by that hon. member and I should like to express my opinion by my vote.

Mr. Grégoire: If you are asking for a vote on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, did you conclude an agreement with the Conservatives on that matter? That is another way of suggesting: let us vote on the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and afterwards, we will manage to have it passed by the Conservatives. Of course, it was necessary for the Conservatives and us, also, to have a copy. Now, we all have a copy. That is an understanding. You want to vote on this amendment, very well, but give us at least an opportunity to discuss it.

Let us suppose that Mr. Speaker does accept that job, and appoints redistribution commissioners and then, if we are not satisfied with the work done, who should we blame? Mr. Speaker? Then, would the hon. member for Lapointe be entitled to rise while the Speaker is in the chair to tell him: "Mr. Speaker, I am blaming you for having appointed the commissioners who played petty politics in our ridings." Would I have the right to do so? At that time the standing orders will be amended.

If the Speaker appoints political partisans, people who were not recommended by the leaders of the old line parties and who do not do their job properly, or carry it out in a partisan way, will I have the right to blame the Speaker and tell him: "You are all wet." If a member of parliament said such a thing in the house, he would soon be evicted.

Why impose upon the Speaker such a part? Let us assume that the present Speaker had appointed some commissioners who had not done their work properly, and that when the time came to appoint a new Speaker the Prime Minister would say: "I move that Mr. So-and-so be appointed as Speaker," at that time I am quite sure he would not receive

unanimous consent from the members. On the other hand, if the Speaker begins a session without unanimous consent, what kind of session shall we have? Have you ever thought of that?

Would the Speaker be the only party responsible for such appointments? Will he be responsible to the house? Would we have the right to direct any question to him after he has appointed any commissioners? These are the questions to which we have not received, as yet, any answer. Moreover, does the Speaker accept such a duty?

I have the utmost confidence in our present Speaker. I feel he is fair, unbiased and sincere. If I were told that the present incumbent would always be Speaker, I would be sure that he would be impartial and that his appointments would not be made on a political basis. But will it always be the same Speaker? Indeed, would he agree to take on that job? I would be most surprised if he did. Before approving this, let us ask the Speaker if he would accept that task.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask you a question. If you were Speaker of the house, would you accept such a responsibility? Mr. Chairman, you who are Deputy Speaker, would you take that risk since the proposal mentions:

Any person holding the office of Speaker.

Would you accept making those appointments at the risk of my criticizing you later in the house? In my opinion, you should answer the question since you might be called upon to fill that position under the amendment which reads as follows:

The Speaker of the House of Commons or any person holding the office of Speaker.

You are such a person, Mr. Chairman. I am asking you the question. Are you ready to answer?

The Chairman: The hon. member knows full well that the chairman of the committee is not allowed to take part in the debate.

Mr. Grégoire: I am not asking you to participate in the debate. Since you are liable to be affected by the amendment, I am merely asking you to assist the committee because, before making an appointment, one should find out whether the appointee will accept.

Have you ever seen a senator named by the Prime Minister refusing his appointment? Certainly not. Why? Because the person was asked for his assent before being appointed to the Senate. So, if you are qualified to fulfil the duties somebody will ask you, before your appointment, if you accept the position. Nobody is asking you to take part in the debate and, moreover, I am convinced that if you want a delay hon. members will grant it to you so that you can answer a question.

I would ask the same thing of the Minister of Transport who sponsors this bill. Did he ask the Speaker whether he was willing to accept this duty?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pickersgill: If the hon. member would like me to answer now, I will. I am quite sure that His Honour the Speaker, as would any Speaker, would accept any obligation which the house in its wisdom saw fit to impose upon him, so long as it did not impair his judgment. Of course if it did, he would have only one recourse. We have given many decisions to the Speaker by decision of the house in the past. I have not any doubt whatever that if it is the will of the house the Speaker will, as he undertook when he became Speaker, carry it out.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: And if the Speaker refuses, will you appeal his decision? Will you request a vote in this house to force the Speaker to agree?

Is the Minister of Transport telling me that he pledges his word that the Speaker will agree? That is another question which I would like to have answered. Does the Minister of Transport pledge his word now, officially and in the name of the Speaker of the house, that the Speaker will accept?

Can the minister answer that?

Mr. Chairman, I can see that the minister is not willing to answer. I will put my question a third time. Is the Minister of Transport ready to pledge his word, officially and in the name of the Speaker, that the Speaker will accept the duties which we want to entrust to him?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pickersgill: The simple answer to that is that we are not referring to the present incumbent. We are making legislation that will be in force until it is changed. As the Speaker himself points out on many occasions, he is the servant of the house. He is a faithful servant of the house and I am sure he will do anything that the house in its wisdom entrusts him to do.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I would like to put two more questions to the Minister of Transport. If the Speaker does not agree or

is not willing to accept the new responsibilities which we would like to place on him, does it mean that the Speaker has ceased to be a wise servant of the House of Commons, and that the government would have to replace the Speaker if, for personal reasons or in anticipation of what will take place, he does not want to accept this new office? Will the government then appoint a new Speaker?

Would the minister answer that question?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pickersgill: No, I do not think I would like to reply to that question. There is a good principle about replying to hypothetical questions, and I think we should stick to actualities.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, this is not a hypothetical question. On the contrary, it is a distinct possibility, because I believe that the Speaker—as I know him—seeing that there is strong opposition from several members, and from at least two political parties, will realize that there are objections in certain parts of the house, and I am convinced that he will refuse to accept an office involving him directly in electoral and political partisanship.

After listening to the speeches delivered by members of the New Democratic party, and understanding the attitude of the members of the Créditistes on this matter, then, the Speaker refuse, ask the chairman of the involve him directly in politics and elections.

He also takes the risk of being blamed by members in connection with the appointments he will have to make, though he will not be personally responsible for the work done by the persons appointed.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that, before submitting his amendment the Minister of Transport should ask the Speaker of the house whether he accepts the office and, should the Speaker refuse, ask the Chairman of the committees (Mr. Lamoureux) whether he is willing to accept it.

Another point which I mentioned a while ago and would like to enlarge upon is this one. Let us suppose the acting Speaker, now chairman of the committee, should become responsible for appointing two members of the commission. I wonder if, in that event, he would feel very much at ease in appointing two members from Newfoundland to the commission. I also wonder if he would feel very much at ease in appointing two individuals from British Columbia or Alberta, individuals who would also become members of the electoral boundaries commissions.

I do believe the chairman will admit in his heart of hearts that such a duty should not be assigned to the Speaker of the house or to the Deputy Speaker.

What would he say if the Speaker knew nobody in the other provinces? Let us suppose he did not know anybody capable of performing this duty in another province. What will happen then? From whom will the Speaker seek advice? The Prime Minister? If the Prime Minister makes both recommendations, they will be political recommendations.

On the other hand, if he tells the Prime Minister: In all fairness, I shall also consult with the Leader of the Opposition, what will happen? They will still be political appointments.

If, by any chance, the Speaker were not as fair, honest and efficient as our present Speaker or the Deputy Speaker, who are beyond reproach and well deserve the confidence of the house, what would happen?

If, in five or six years from now, the Conservative party should go back to power and appoint a Speaker who would wish to use this legislation to indulge in political partisanship, what would happen then?

Mr. Chairman, you will agree that it would become dangerous if the Speaker should be replaced and that instead of consulting with qualified people, his successor should take advice from political organizers.

Still on the same subject, Mr. Chairman, appointments are being made at the present time. Appointments of electoral officers in the constituencies, of returning officers, those are political appointments. Can it be said that in the 265 constituencies in Canada electoral officers and returning officers have all been appointed on the basis of their competence or could it be that some of them have been appointed because they were former members of parliament or staunch Liberals or Conservatives?

Are we to believe that an electoral officer appointed by a political party is going to name qualified persons as returning officers when we know that some of them cannot even read or write? Why are those returning officers appointed there? Because through political patronage, they seek to get as many votes as possible; we know that from time to time they try to call in a man from a large family so as to get all the votes in that family in favour of the Liberal candidate, since a Liberal has appointed him there.

The same thing is likely to happen respecting those political appointments if the Speaker is not always as honest and competent as the one who occupies the chair at the present time.

And if the Speaker had to make political appointments, might not the Prime Minister have this point in mind when appointing a Speaker, and think: "I must have a Speaker who will make appointments that can be sanctioned or approved". When thinking about appointing a Speaker for the house, the Prime Minister, and designated within a po- and so, we shall just have to give him our list of names, and he will appoint those people on the electoral boundaries commission".

Mr. Speaker's being appointed by the Prime Minister, and designated within a political party is no reason for the Minister of Transport's forgetting it. If he did not think of it, I can hardly believe it, because I trusted him to be more intelligent.

Mr. Chairman, to help the committee carry on the study of the defects of the Minister of Transport's proposal, I hope that the latter, after having realized the technical and other flaws of his proposal, will try to improve it and suggest some method which will, at least, get redistribution out of politics.

Mr. Chairman, I should call it five o'clock.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: Order. It being five o'clock it is my duty to leave the chair so that the house may proceed to the consideration of private members' business.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper namely, notices of motions (papers), private bills and public bills.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I glean from discussions I have had with some hon. members that they would be agreeable to waiving private members' hour today and proceeding with public business.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, if we were to proceed with the debate on redistribution between now and six o'clock I think it would be difficult for the party leaders to consult about the various proposals we have been discussing. To allow for that kind of consultation I think we should proceed with the business set down for this time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would have a suggestion to make.

The Minister of Transport would perhaps agree to put aside clause 6 until after the six o'clock adjournment when we could consider less contentious clauses.

At that time the Minister of Transport would have had all the time between five and six o'clock, and also between six and eight o'clock, not necessarily for consultation with the leaders of other parties, but also to ask the Speaker if he would accept to fill such duties and, thereafter consult with the leaders of the different parties in order to find another solution. We could perhaps reach an agreement on these points and continue with the measure concerning redistribution.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Apparently there is not unanimous agreement.

Mr. Pickersgill: In view of the eloquent appeal we heard last night about getting on with the public business I wonder if hon. gentlemen in the New Democratic party would not consider going on with public business during the next hour.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, the items set down for discussion at five o'clock are equally important, and they are public business.

Mr. McIlraith: No, they are private members' business. They are not public business.

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 notices of motions (papers).

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES BY PROVINCES

The house resumed from Thursday, October 29, consideration of the motion of Mr. Grégoire:

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of the report prepared by officials of the Department of Finance concerning federal expenditures in each of the provinces of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, before taking the vote—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member has already taken part in the debate and cannot speak a second time.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the standing order does at least allow me

to reply to the main arguments that may have been put forward, or to give further details—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No. Order. The hon. member cannot speak a second time on the points that were raised during the debate.

[*Text*]

Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the issue involved in the production of papers in these circumstances is a very fundamental one concerning the relationship of the civil service to this house. The question involved is a very difficult and technical one in terms of explanation and understanding. Last Saturday the press printed copies of an order for return filed by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) in reply to questions originally raised by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer). We are dealing essentially with the same subject matter. The whole question of the return of taxes by provinces and federal expenditures by provinces is one that certain members of this house have distorted, and distorted I would submit for their own partisan, political advantage. They have not served the cause of national unity by this procedure. Last week in this house there was a debate brought on, I believe, by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) in which the Minister of Finance took part, who pointed out that the reply which was filed, a careful reply summarizing the results of research in the department, consisted of ten pages of explanation of a very fine, technical nature. This did not prevent hon. members attempting to obtain an oversimplification of the returns, asking questions concerning the technical procedures and whether or not such and such an inference could be drawn.

The problem here, Mr. Speaker, is the question of the production of what are really the working papers of civil servants. I had the privilege and honour to serve as a research officer in the research and statistics division, in this case for national health and welfare, for some nine years. In the course of that time I participated in a number of projects which had as their purpose the preparation of answers for the minister in the house or deriving information which was used for programming within the department. It was frequently the case that when a first, initial draft of a study was prepared it had to be examined by senior officers within the division, examined very carefully, edited and checked. It would be a gross disservice to any department of government, to any research officer, to compel the premature, public disclosure of documents which are incomplete in themselves and which do not represent the standard of scholarship and of final preparation of material which is the mark of integrity of the civil service.

What the hon. member seeks to secure by this resolution is the publication of a series of premature, early drafts of reports which are incomplete, likely to be misinterpreted and which would do no service to Canadian unity. I do not believe it would serve the house or Canada to have this kind of material placed before the house in the form in which the hon. member who moved the motion presumably intends. I know there have been references to this matter in the press. There was a reference some weeks ago in *Le Devoir*, a front page story of a study in the Department of Finance, which presumed to make certain findings. We have now seen the final results as a result of screening, editing and polishing; and I use "polishing" in the sense of correcting inaccuracies or the exploring of areas of the subject matter which call for more careful attention. The results of that study have been filed and placed before this house. What can be the purpose of the mover of this motion in proceeding with it, in the face of the answers that were given by the Department of Finance to questions of an exactly similar nature posed by the hon. member for Three Rivers?

I think all members of this house should ponder the fundamental principle involved here. Are they going to, if they vote for such a motion—which I hope they will not—establish the principle that there should be no confidentiality of early drafts, of early reports of research officers in different branches of government? It would destroy scholarship within the research divisions of those men and women who serve this country and serve it well, who serve it with distinction and who are recognized in their professional capacity, if they did not have the right to work at their material, produce preliminary drafts, rework the preliminary drafts and stay with this material until they came to the conclusions and the results which they felt in their conscience and integrity they were prepared to support.

A parallel in regard to any form of research can readily be brought to mind. Someone doing laboratory research, who does experiments and makes certain initial findings which suggest certain hypotheses, does not publish these results right away. He tests them; he sets them up against repeated observation

and experiment before the results are placed, as contributions to knowledge, in the public record. The acceptance of a motion of this nature would destroy the integrity of research operations in the federal civil service and would have very serious repercussions in terms of morale, in terms of the operations of government departments and in terms of the government itself of this country. I know that the mover of the motion thinks he can gain certain advantage by consistently pursuing a question which has been the subject of a great deal of ill informed speculation. There is the question in terms of federal expenditures. The hon. member who questioned the Minister of Finance the other day raised the matter of interest on the national debt. The question was asked, how was this distributed by provinces, and the assumption was that this would be done on a per capita basis. The mover of the motion then asked, "What would happen in the case of payments, in regard to the federal debt, of persons who reside outside Canada? What allowances are made?" Again this illustrates the very difficult and involved technical preparations that must be part of any such study, not only on the expenditures side but on the revenue side.

The Minister of Finance indicated, in response to questions asked in the early stages of debate on this motion, that revenues which are raised in any particular part of the country cannot be ascribed at first glance simply to the place from which they are reported. Sales taxes paid by a manufacturing concern are in fact paid in many different parts of the country; customs duties levied at one port cannot be properly ascribed to any one province without a careful examination of the nature of the goods on which duty has been paid.

The problem of distribution involves a very difficult study of the whole question of the incidence of taxation. There are no simple or easy answers to this, Mr. Speaker. The answers which have been given by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) are the best which can be provided. Presumably they are not good enough for the mover of the motion; he wants answers which will suit his own purposes. I am reminded of the old story about the facts: that if they do not suit the theory then so much the worse for the facts. We have given the facts to the hon. member in the most careful, polished and complete form in which they can be presented with academic integrity, and I use that phrase to this house in its very best sense. There can be no useful purpose served by the mover of the motion's seeking to go beyond the presentation which has been made and seeking to explore through compelling disclosure of early drafts, working papers and incomplete statements a matter as explosive, as difficult and as emotional as this one.

These are days, Mr. Speaker, when perhaps greater strains are laid on our confederate structure than have been laid for many decades. There is an onus on all of us to be responsible in our public statements and to be responsible in this house. We should not lightly without good reason question such a matter as a formal statement by the Minister of Finance disclosing the origins of taxes and the destination of expenditures by provinces, such as that prepared in the way this return has been prepared. We raise much greater questions of national unity if we seek to go beyond the best professional competence and judgment of the officials of the department who have been responsible for the preparation of the order for return and the material contained in it.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have no choice but to say that this is not the kind of motion which should be accepted by this house. It is wrong because it seeks to compel premature disclosure of information which is not complete in itself. It is wrong because it would challenge the very integrity of those in the public service who are entrusted with research and investigation operations in various government departments. It is wrong because it seeks to give a distorted and very dangerous interpretation, within the present context of our confederation, of what one area gives and receives compared to what another area gives and receives. It is wrong because it seeks in the course of a public debate to deal with matters of an intricate and technical nature involving the compilation and interpretation of statistical data which can only be collected by those, in justice to the persons concerned, who are trained to interpret and understand that data, data which should not be misused for any narrow political or partisan advantage.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and for many other reasons which can be advanced, I think it would be proper for the mover of the motion to say to the house at this time that this is not the procedure for seeking such information. The procedure for seeking such information is by putting questions on the order paper. The questions which have been placed on the order paper dealing with

this matter have been answered. If there is a question concerning the nature and validity of the assumptions and the interpretation of the material, then the most satisfactory procedure is again to phrase additional questions dealing with the returns which have been filed. These questions can be stated precisely. They can be framed by the hon. member, if necessary by consulting with persons who are trained, to make sure that the proper points are raised, and the answers can be prepared and filed accordingly. This procedure is the orderly, responsible and I suggest the sensible way of dealing with this matter.

The alternative procedure would, in my submission, seek to compel the premature and I would suggest disturbing publication of incomplete, early, preliminary notes, preliminary findings and preliminary tables which are in many cases prepared by a junior officer who is assigned to the project, and subsequently reviewed by his senior in that particular section or division. Any procedure which distorts the research process by placing the civil servants involved in a position where their academic integrity and reputation would inevitably be jeopardized is one which I am sure on reflection will not commend itself to many members of this house.

I would strongly suggest to the very utmost of whatever persuasive powers I possess that the mover of the motion should withdraw it; that he should have recourse to the alternative of phrasing questions which can be put on the order paper and which can deal with any particular aspect of the problem which he feels has not properly or adequately been answered in the order for return which was tabled by the Minister of Finance in reply to the question posed by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer). Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the mover of the motion to withdraw it. I think the reasons for withdrawing it are compelling. Failing withdrawal I believe there is no alternative but for the members of this house to say that the principle involved here in moving this motion is repugnant to us, that we cannot accept it and that in all conscience we must vote against it should it come to a vote, which I sincerely hope the mover of the motion will refrain from asking.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Villeneuve has already participated in the debate and cannot speak a second time.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that it was six o'clock but I did not think that my time was up.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Unfortunately, the hon. member did not ask to speak at the beginning of the time allotted to private members' business as listed on the order paper, and as his speech must be considered as having ended at six o'clock, I do not think that under the standing order he can be heard now.

Is the house ready for the question? If the hon. member for Lapointe takes the floor now he will thus close the debate.

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I thought that at the beginning of this sitting I was speaking so as to close the debate, but I noticed that the Liberals, as usual, insisted in obstructing and delaying this discussion indefinitely. A certain member spoke for 20 minutes and said nothing, while I was prepared to close the debate around five o'clock in order that we could proceed as soon as possible with the other business of the house. This proves that the business of the house is not always delayed by the opposition, but often by the members of the party in office.

I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that the arguments which were brought forward did not convince me in the least, except that some persons fear to produce figures.

The hon. member who has just spoken reminds me of the ostrich which hides its head in the sand and shows its rear when danger threatens. We must not be afraid to give figures, because only when we know exactly what is going on can we propose solutions, and when we make suggestions, then we can reach an agreement.

If facts are never revealed, if they are kept hidden, so that there are only complaints, warranted or not, so that the present system can continue without being amended, there will always be uneasiness and criticism.

We want the figures to be published.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that since I presented my motion the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) has given us an answer to a question put on the order paper.

What surprised me is that according to the reply all the provinces got more from Ottawa than they paid into the federal treasury. If that is the case, how does one account for the difference? If each province gets more than it pays out, where does the money come from?

Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia get twice as much as they pay in; in the case of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, it is just about twice as much also British Columbia and Alberta get one and a half times what they give and Quebec and Ontario nearly 12 per cent more.

Where does the federal government get the money to give to the provinces more than it receives from them?

Would it be that it has started using the Bank of Canada? Is he multiplying money, to give more than he receives?

The Minister of Finance did not answer this question, but the answer is quite simple: if he ran into debt for that purpose, there was a deficit.

Mr. Turner: Correct.

Mr. Grégoire: I hear the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George say that it is correct.

If in order to give us an extra amount the Minister of Finance incurs a deficit, why then include the deficit in the figures he gave us? That is not very smart.

In other words, in the $915 million which is deemed to have been given to the province of Quebec at the rate of so much per capita, they cannot say why it is such an amount. No details have been given. It is known there is one billion dollars in regard to the debt interest, but it is neither the citizens of the province of Quebec nor those of Ontario who receive the interest on the debt. The interest is paid in a proportion of between 70 and 75 per cent to foreigners: Americans, English, Belgians, Swiss, French, Italians. That money does not find its way into our province.

We are told that the $915 million going back to the province of Quebec includes a part of defence expenditures totalling $1.5 billion. But we can hardly say that when we bought Voodoos, Bomarcs and nuclear arms in the United States, weapons that will never be used again, such expenditures were made in the interest of one province only, no.

And when the amount includes a deficit, because the money must come from somewhere, and we learned a moment ago that it did come from a deficit, that deficit is not passed on to the citizens of a province. However, interest must be paid on the deficit.

Therefore, the amount should not be based on what we receive but on what we pay.

The figures submitted by the Minister of Finance are misleading.

Why could we not be told how half or nearly half the total amount is redistributed?

[Mr. Grégoire.]

For instance, in the case of the Farm Credit Corporation the province of Quebec gets practically nothing. In the case of expenditures of the federal government in the field of transportation, for railway crossings or installation of traffic lights, for instance, Quebec gets 25 per cent. The same thing can be said about expenditures of the Department of Fisheries where Quebec only gets a very small percentage of the amount involved.

The estimates of the Department of Finance amount to $83 million, $46 million of which are going to the wheat board, that is to the three prairie provinces, while $10 million were spent on reforestation across the country but not a single penny in the province of Quebec.

But the Minister of Finance received reports and was faced with complications. Then the results were disastrous for his department because he noticed that there was a lack of balance in the country as a whole. At that time he made it a point to hide the true figures and statistics. He included them in a total of $915 million, saying: it is so much per capita, but there was no question of figuring out the debt in each province. It was said: it is so much per capita. That is less incriminating.

Mr. Speaker, we got only part of the report the Minister of Finance was supposed to give us. We did not get the whole thing. We feel that even if he let us have part of it, the Minister of Finance should now give us a breakdown of the $915 million remaining, which make up more than half the total.

The people of Canada must know the facts as well as the House of Commons. Nor will we be content with a partial reply; we want a full reply.

That is why we will ask a vote to be taken on that matter, and then we will see who, in this House of Commons, wants things out in broad daylight, and who, through their votes, will indicate that they prefer to hide the truth, to keep it under a bushel.

Mr. Caouette: Hide the financier.

Mr. Grégoire: Hide the financier, as the hon. member for Villeneuve says.

We will see, through the vote, who wants to play ostrich, to stick his head in the sand and his posterior in the air in times of danger, and who are those who do not fear to see the facts brought out in broad daylight.

This will help to arrive at a better computation of what has been badly calculated in the past.

This is the reason why we are asking for the production of that report in full.

Mr. Habel: It looks to me as if the separatists convinced you last night.

[*Text*]

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Grégoire) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Bélanger	Howard
Boutin	Latulippe
Caouette	Lessard (Lake St. John)
Dionne	Peters
Girouard	Scott—11.
Grégoire	

NAYS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack	Kelly
Badanai	Klein
Baldwin	Knowles
Barnett	Konantz, Mrs.
Batten	Lachance
Benson	Laing
Berger	LaMarsh, Miss
Bigg	Lambert
Boulanger	Lamontagne
Byrne	Leboe
Cardin	Legault
Caron	Lloyd
Carter	Loney
Cashin	Macdonald
Choquette	Mackasey
Churchill	MacLean (Queens)
Clancy	MacNaught
Coates	Macquarrie
Cooper	McBain
Cyr	McIlraith
Danforth	McIntosh
Deachman	Madill
Diefenbaker	Martin (Essex East)
Doucett	Matheson
Drury	Millar
Ethier	More
Eudes	Moreau
Forest	Munro
Forgie	Nasserden
Foy	Nielsen
Francis	Nugent
Gelber	O'Keefe
Gendron	Olson
Godin	Ormiston
Gordon	Otto
Granger	Ouellet
Gray	Pascoe
Greene	Pennell
Gundlock	Pickersgill
Habel	Pigeon
Haidasz	Pilon
Hays	Rapp
Hellyer	Ricard
Honey	Rinfret
Horner (Acadia)	Rock
Horner (The Battlefords)	Rouleau
Howe (Wellington-Huron)	Ryan
Irvine	Starr
Jewett, Miss	Stenson
Teillet	Tardif
Thomas	Watson (Assiniboia)
Tucker	Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Turner	Webb
Vincent	Winkler
Wahn	Woolliams—110.

PRIVATE BILLS

LAURENTIDE BANK OF CANADA

The house resumed from Thursday, October 15, consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford for the second reading of Bill No. S-13, to incorporate Laurentide bank of Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order No. 2, resuming debate on the motion of Mr. Basford for the second reading of Bill No. S-13, to incorporate Laurentide bank of Canada.

Mr. MacNaught: Stand at the request of the government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the house to stand this measure?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous agreement. Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Pickersgill: Getting on with the country's business.

Mr. Peters: —as the minister said, we are getting on with the country's business by establishing a number of banks. This matter is of considerable interest to me because I have been interested in the negotiations that have taken place in recent years between the banking institutions that we have, the number of banks that have been established and their relationship particularly to the small loans field. It has been of interest to me, Mr. Speaker, to learn that all the banks we now have, and they are not numerous in Canada, have been more interested in amalgamation than they have been in establishing a number of small regional banks.

I believe that this whole problem of banking should have been referred, as it is necessary by law to do every ten years, to the appropriate committee for discussion. There should have been a decision with regard to the policy to be followed under the Bank Act for the next ten years, before these bills were brought before parliament. You will recall that some of our major banks, banks which have been in operation many years, have amalgamated. The Imperial Bank of Canada, recently amalgamated with the Bank of Com-

merce to form the Imperial Bank of Commerce. This has been repeated by several of the other major banks. In fact there has been a tendency for banks to amalgamate and we are now faced with a new concept in the banking facilities of the nation, particularly in relation to the proposed Laurentide bank.

This is an institution which warrants a great deal of attention from members, particularly with regard to the reasons why it is proposed. It will be a rather unique bank, with a wholesale-retail operation. The bank will wholesale for its retail outlet, the Laurentide Trust and Finance Company. How will this work and how will it fit into the pattern we have established for banks in the national sphere?

This is a bank that will not need to deal in loans as do other banks, and it is interesting to note that the parent company recently bought a finance company which is in a dubious position and whose affairs are now before the courts.

We have not been able to examine fully this matter of vertical integration in the banking industry. There must be reasons why the old stalwart banks have found it necessary to amalgamate, and they have reached great size by doing so.

We have had very stable banking institutions in Canada. At times members of parliament have been distressed because of the policy taken by individual banks in relation to retail credit, but on the whole our banking institutions have been responsible, and have been subject to control, suggestion and direction by the government of the nation. Governments will continue to give such direction and for this reason it makes one wonder why we are now embarking on a new course which we have not previously allowed.

Several banks have been able to take advantage of the ceiling on small loans to charge interest rates greater than the 6 per cent which by law is allowed. They have been able to do this through such things as insurance, and devaluating the value placed on the collateral pledged with them. In many cases they have been able to boost interest rates to 12 per cent, 14 per cent and even higher; but these rates do not come within the ambit of those charged by finance companies, including the Laurentide Trust and Finance Company, because many of these charge interest rates as high as 30 and 40 per cent.

I do not believe it is in the national interest to charter a bank which will act only as a wholesale agency for its finance company. I would point out that bills to incorporate banks are completely different from other private bills which come before parliament, such as those dealing with divorce or the building of pipe lines. I believe a committee of both houses should be made aware of policy changes with respect to the Bank Act. As we know, by law it is necessary to review it every ten years, and it is shortly due for revision. I think any decision on the chartering of new banks should await policy decision with respect to this revision.

It is also interesting that this is a Senate bill. Many editorials have appeared in newspapers questioning the impartiality of members of the other house to decide on certain banking bills, when hon. members of that house themselves in many cases are members of the boards of directors of competing banks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hour for the consideration of private members' business has expired.

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 ten o'clock this day are as follows: The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams); national parks—amendment of regulations respecting zoning and building; second, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles); public service—superannuated federal employees' request for increased pensions; third, the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard); grain—Prince Rupert, B.C.—increase in elevator capacity.

The house will now revert to the business interrupted at five o'clock.

REDISTRIBUTION

PROVISION FOR BOUNDARIES COMMISSIONS AND READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. C-72, to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions to report upon the readjustment of the representation of the provinces in the House of Commons and to provide for the readjustment of such representation in accordance therewith—Mr. Pickersgill (for Mr. Pearson)—Mr. Lamoureux in the Chair.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

The Chairman: Order. House again in committee of the whole on Bill No. C-72.

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Chairman: The question is on the amendment.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to delay this matter because I might be accused of filibustering, and I see that my friends are already in agreement. But I would like to say a few words in reference to the remarks made this afternoon by the hon. member for Skeena, and particularly that puritan element of his remarks. I think it has been proven this afternoon that where you have four or five parties it makes the work of parliament quite difficult. There is no doubt about it, there was an impasse as far as redistribution is concerned. I think I can perhaps take the blame for my party in this regard; I fought the amendment, what I call the Knowles amendment, and I fought it with all my heart because I thought it was wrong. Finally the government said, "Look; we will compromise". We then asked for an adjournment; we got that adjournment, and we had a meeting. We did compromise. We were ready and willing to accept the first proposal made by the Minister of Transport.

Then we find that immediately the shoe is on the other foot and it pinches, these puritans, these people who go on television and say, "We don't filibuster. We are the purest Canadians; vote for us in the next election. We would never think of filibustering; we are pure; we are the purest people there are. We would never think of delaying any legislation or opposing any compromise" —this is what the Leader of the New Democratic party has been saying—hold up this legislation. These people went all across this nation and said, "We are the party. Don't trust those old line parties that have governed Canada since confederation". But they are the people who must take the blame for this bill not being voted on at five o'clock, and they must face that fact.

An hon. Member: Filibuster.

Mr. Woolliams: I knew they would cry, Mr. Chairman, because they hate to hear the truth. When you have four or five parties in parliament it makes our work very difficult. It has been proven today. I have said this at other times, and it has been proven correct. We talk about amending the rules. The fact is that you can amend the rules, and it does not matter whether we are talking about redistribution or anything else; parliament will never function properly, no matter what kind of rules we have, when you have four or five parties with different ideas. As soon as the shoe pinched and was on the other foot, we saw who filibustered this afternoon.

I want to see a vote on the subject; I want to see it tonight. I would like to get on with the nation's business, and I want everybody to know—and I hope the press write about it—that these puritans who went on television and said, "We don't filibuster. We don't talk for nothing", include the Howards and—

The Chairman: Order, please. I am sure the hon. member will recognize that for the last few minutes he has strayed quite a distance away from the subject matter now before us, which is an amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I was hoping that after a few introductory words the hon. member would come to the subject matter. I think he has perhaps gone beyond the point of no return now, and I would ask him to limit his further remarks to the question before the committee.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment, on a point of order, before we proceed any further. I would ask that Your Honour be lenient. The hon. member for Bow River is trying desperately to dig his party out of the grave, and we should cooperate with him.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I am going to listen to your ruling, except that I would like to say one sentence, if I may, with reference to this matter. They talk about filibustering. What about the question of divorce in this House of Commons? What about the Ralliement Créditiste—and there is not one of them here tonight—and the bank bill?

The Chairman: Order, please. That was two sentences.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I think you are one of the most tolerant chairmen we have had in a long time. I want to see a vote on the subject.

An hon. Member: Then sit down.

Mr. Woolliams: I will sit down later, and when I do sit down I hope this filibuster is

over, because when it is I will have served parliament. We took a strong position. We asked for an adjournment. We got one. We discussed this matter. We compromised. Compromise, as I said this afternoon, means settlement, or giving way a little each way. We have arrived at a settlement, and I hope we have a vote and get the matter ended now.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, just to help the filibuster along and help the hon. member for Bow River out, I would like to say a few words. We are discussing an amendment and have been discussing an amendment that is not before the house. We discussed this afternoon and are discussing this evening —although certainly this was not evident from the remarks just made—an amendment that really is not before us at the present time. The amendment before us is one moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Some hon. Members: North.

Mr. Peters: Winnipeg North Centre. It was moved by the hon. member some time ago; in fact in April of this year. Today the discussion—and the hon. member for Bow River just now certainly confirmed this—is on an amendment that was worked out in a back room between the two major parties in this house.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. I can tell him right now that there was no amendment worked out in a back room. With regard to the inference the hon. member is drawing, let us just review for a few minutes—this is in reference to the question of privilege—

Mr. Peters: Just stay on the point.

Mr. Woolliams: I will stay on the point. Don't ever worry about me. You never knew a point when you saw one. Let me finish, Mr. Chairman. We asked the minister if they would adjourn the matter, and if they would we would meet together. We met and we made a decision. We came back into the house, in the face of that meeting, and made our decision. We announced our decision. Therefore I would hope that the New Democratic party would stop drawing inferences from facts of which they have no knowledge.

Mr. Peters: Let me make it very plain, Mr. Chairman, that the "we" he is referring to is not the members of this house but probably two political parties in this house. Everyone has the amendment before them—

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Mr. Woolliams: On another point of order, Mr. Chairman; when I say "we" I mean the Conservative party, and I would hope the member would stop imputing motives to me and the rest of the Conservatives.

Mr. Peters: I do not think I can impute any that probably could not be worn. The amendment before us I believe comes from the government and is going to be moved by the government. Therefore I assume that the meeting in the back room was comprised of these two political parties, and not the members of this house.

Mr. Woolliams: Were you absent the other day when the minister announced it in the house?

Mr. Peters: I have a copy of it.

Mr. Woolliams: Were you absent?

Mr. Peters: I am also of the opinion that this was not worked out in the house or in the normal manner; that it is by passing an amendment that has not been voted on yet, which is one that I think warrants consideration by members in open discussion in the house. I also hope that even the member for Bow River will give some consideration to the proposal. The proposal that has been made concerns a system that I understand is in operation in the province of Manitoba, in the provincial sphere, and has been quite acceptable in that province and has removed politics from the redistribution of seats there. It is very important, in my opinion, that politics be taken out of the redistribution of seats in Canada. It is important to every Canadian that we come as closely as possible to—

Mr. Woolliams: This is a filibuster.

Mr. Peters: —re-implementing one vote, one member representation, whereby each person has equal representation no matter from which part of the country he comes. I believe this is British justice.

In years gone by there has been a great deal of gerrymandering with regard to electoral boundaries. I believe this gerrymandering has occurred because of the kind of arrangements which have been made in back rooms by the two political parties which are suggesting another arrangement today. The only hope I have is that the Speaker of this house, who must be impartial if he is to receive the respect due him as first commoner of the nation, is not asked to do such a political job as making this decision. The question was asked this afternoon whether the Speaker would not

have difficulty in choosing people in various parts of the country. I should have thought that under the old system one political party would have difficulty in choosing people, and in my opinion two political parties will have difficulty in agreeing on the persons who can and should be chosen to decide the electoral boundaries in this country.

The amendment before us tonight suggests that lists should be made from which the chief justices of the provinces would be able to choose the people who will assist the redistribution officer in selecting representatives from the provinces. Perhaps the amendment should state whom the lists should include. There may be an argument put forward that the chief electoral officer in each province should be represented. There may be some argument that some provinces may not have academically capable persons in provincial universities who would agree to representation on this basis. I think a lot of these considerations are superfluous anyway because the chief electoral officer has possibly already decided who are the best people for the job. I would suggest that there is no rush to get this bill passed at all if these people are already chosen and the boundaries pretty well defined, because there need only be a brief examination of each particular boundary, with its endorsement by the commissions. I believe these people are available and willing to act and that they have already been approached.

I also believe there is not much doubt about the fact that the man who has been chosen to head up the redistribution of the electoral seats in Canada is sincere in his desire to do it on a non-political basis and to make the representation as equal and as fair as possible in every part of Canada. I believe we do not need any back room agreements. We do not want to load upon the Speaker lists of persons who may be appointed by either one of the major political parties of this country. I believe that this parliament should make that decision by providing these lists so that we can get on with the job of redistribution in a truly non-political and non-partisan manner.

I suggest that rather than making these back door agreements and arrangements which perpetuate the system which has been adopted in the past to the detriment of everybody, and rather than making an arrangement which will force the Speaker to make appointments which may not be non-political and for which he may be criticized later, the committee would be well advised to consider the amendment before it now. Hon. members have had a chance to look at it for some months now and I hope they will give it favourable consideration, because in my opinion it will completely eliminate the gerrymandering system we have had in the past and will totally remove any political overtones which may have been previously intended.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, when Bill No. C-72 was introduced several months ago, we discussed ways and means of carrying out redistribution.

For instance, it was suggested that provinces familiar with geography and provincial organizations should be consulted regarding readjustment of boundaries. Clause 6 (2) concerning appointment of other members reads as follows:

> Of the two members of the commission other than the chairman and the representation commissioner, one shall be appointed by the leader of the government in the House of Commons and one shall be appointed by the leader of the opposition in the House of Commons, but in the event of failure to make any such appointment within the time provided therefore by this act, the appointment shall be made by the chairman.

Today the government is introducing the draft of a bill to replace clause 6(2) and it reads as follows:

> Appointment of other members: The two members of the commission, acting for a province, other than the chairman and the representation commissioner, shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons and selected among persons residing in that province and whom he judges competent...

That is the French word. Some may believe that it means "iodine", but apparently it is "idoine" (competent), to the effect that the Speaker of the House of Commons may choose the two members concerned in every province of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I believe sincerely that our provinces are more qualified to suggest the boundaries of new electoral ridings than any federal organization or any organization appointed by the federal government. After reading paragraph (1) of clause 6, which reads as follows:

> (1) The chairman of the commission for a province shall be appointed by the chief justice of the province from among the judges of the court over which he presides...

—or after consulting with the chief justice.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) just indicated that political interference in the appointment of members of redistribution commissions should be put beyond any political point of view.

I am in complete agreement. All judges of the superior court, anywhere in Canada, Mr. Chairman, without any exception, were appointed politically by the party in office. We all know that from experience. Those are not just wild suggestions or ill-considered words, but they are truly based on what we have seen, on what does exist, not only in one province, but in every province. And that is why I think we should call upon organizations which have nothing to do with politics, with the Liberal or the Conservative parties, and ask them to select the persons who will be appointed to the commission that will look after redistribution.

So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the Speaker of the house appointing two persons from among the residents of a province, but in regard to the province of Quebec, I wonder whether the Speaker himself is well aware of what is going on in that province, whether he is aware of all that is happening in our province.

I see that the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne) is in his seat. He knows perfectly well that in Quebec, in our province, there are completely non-political organizations that could be commissioned to deal with the redistribution of those ridings.

When I spoke about redistribution a few months ago, Mr. Chairman, I said that I myself had gone to see the maps drawn by the chief electoral officer and I noted then that the population was taken into account for certain ridings, while for others, geographical matters were being considered.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact remains that if an electoral redistribution is to be effected throughout Canada, and more especially in the province of Quebec, I feel we must select fair-minded people without any political affiliation whatsoever, who will see to it that the province of Quebec is divided, organized or reorganized, following the federal redistribution, according to the wishes of that province. I do not think it is up to Ottawa to select the people who will decide upon readjustment of federal riding boundaries in the province of Quebec. Quebec is part of our confederation and is in Canada, of course, but each province should be free and have the opportunity to decide upon the representation it should have in the federal parliament.

Mr. Chairman, that is what I am suggesting, without any political bias or partisanship. We want adequate representation. We want a representation which will truly reflect the mentality, the spirit, the will, the intelligence and the aspirations of a province within confederation.

Mr. Chairman, if the Speaker of the house can select able men and women to preside over redistribution, I will be the first one to help him, but I think the government should see to it that each province may decide for itself; whether it is the small province of Prince Edward Island, the province of Newfoundland, British Columbia, Ontario, Manitoba or the province of Quebec, the main thing is to contact responsible people in those provinces so that we may finally reach an agreement on a national basis which will not only be respected by part of the country but by the whole Canadian nation, especially by all the provinces which are now constituting Canada as we know it.

Mr. Chairman, all we are suggesting is that appointees should not already be committed to some political organizations. We are asking for the appointment of impartial people who will see to it that boundaries of federal constituencies will be readjusted according to the hopes and the will of the Canadian people and the people residing in each Canadian province.

Those then are the remarks I wanted to make on the present resolution; namely, who should choose the members of the commission? The Speaker, the leader of the opposition, or the leader of the government? In the province of Quebec, the official opposition is not Conservative, for the Conservatives are fewer than we are. There are more Créditistes than there are Conservatives in the province of Quebec. Things being so, why not suggest the appointment of a delegate from the opposition which is represented by the Ralliement Créditiste in the province of Quebec?

Mr. Chairman, we do not ask to appoint these people; on the other hand, we do not want the leader of the official opposition in the house, or the leader of the government, to dictate to the province of Quebec the decision to be taken concerning the electoral redistribution in our province.

It is not results we are seeking; we want to be treated justly. The leader of the official opposition has nothing to do in our province at this time. The government can accept our suggestions, but on the other hand we can challenge those allegations that the government is introducing as an amendment to the elections act.

Mr. Chairman, I have said and repeated a little while ago that we do not want to

interfere; we want justice not only for the province of Quebec, but for the whole of Canada.

If it is better for the Speaker to select the members of the commission, if he can give us the assurance that there will be no political interference in the appointment of the members of the said commission—these Mr. Chairman, are the comments I want to make on clause 6 of Bill No. C-72—we will not object to redistribution.

But we will object if we find that there is political interference at any level, in the discussion which is taking place at this time.

We do not want the people appointed by political parties to decide about redistribution.

We want genuine Canadians, just plain Canadians, to be duly and respectably represented in the House of Commons. This is our hope in the best interest of the future of Canadians.

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few words to what has been said so far on this matter.

When Bill No. C-72 was introduced, at the beginning of this session, we reached the conclusion after a few hours of debate that clause 6 should be amended, because its wording indicated obviously—and directly—political partisanship in the appointment of persons who would be entrusted with the task of redistribution in Canada.

That is why, when the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) presented his amendment, we thought that it might be better for our group to support it, since it was in fact an improvement over the government's proposal.

But today we are faced with another amendment moved by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) which I feel is equally acceptable, because it is clearly much better than the initial proposal made by the government. Some people here claim that it is possible to eliminate political partisanship entirely from that commission.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not fooling myself; I am convinced that, no matter how this commission goes about it, there will be, in one way or the other, some degree of political intervention. Let us not deceive ourselves about that. No matter how those people are appointed, since I do not think there is in Canada a single person that is not active in some way on the political level—everyone has opinions—they will certainly make their ideas and opinions felt one way or the other. Therefore, I do not think we can find in Canada people entirely free from political prejudice. In my opinion it would be useless to continue this discussion indefinitely and, as far as I am concerned, I shall limit my remarks on this point by saying that I will vote against the amendment moved by the members of the New Democratic party, and I support the resolution as it is now put before us, without, however, foregoing the right to consider any further amendment which could be brought to it during the present debate.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Chairman: The question is on the amendment as proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre on April 16, 1964. Does the committee wish the chairman to read the amendment?

Some hon. Members: Read it.

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

The Chairman: Dispense.

Amendment (Mr. Knowles) negatived: Yeas, 22; nays, 80.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder whether, without any explanation or anything else, I could now move:

That Bill C-72 be amended by striking out clause 6 thereof and substituting therefor the following:—

Since I think nearly all hon. members have "the following" perhaps I could dispense with reading it except to say there is an error in the last line of subclause 2. A word is omitted. After the word "among" there should be the word "such". I have inserted the word in my copy which I am sending to the Chair.

Mr. Thomas: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman; some members have not received copies of both of these amendments. Will the minister tell us which amendment we are dealing with?

Mr. Pickersgill: I think the hon. gentleman is perhaps right. I will read it.

Mr. Knowles: Could we not compromise and have it read either by the minister or by the chairman? We do not need it read twice.

Mr. Pickersgill: The chairman has a far better voice.

The Chairman: Perhaps it would be easier if the Chair were to read it. Mr. Pickersgill moves:

That Bill C-72 be amended by striking out clause 6 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

Appointment of chairman

6. (1) The chairman of the commission for a province shall be appointed by the chief justice of the province from among the judges of the court over which he presides or, after consultation with the chief justice of any other branch or division of that court or any other superior court in that province, from among the judges of that branch, division or other superior court, but in the event that there is no such judge able or free to act as chairman or where for any other reason no such appointment is made within the time provided therefor by this act, the Chief Justice of Canada or in the event of his absence or incapacity the senior puisne judge of the Supreme Court of Canada shall make the appointment from among such persons resident in that province as he deems suitable.

Appointment of other members

(2) The two members of the commission for a province other than the chairman and the representation commissioner shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons from among such persons resident in that province as he deems suitable.

Notice of appointment to be given

(3) Forthwith upon the making of any appointment as provided in this section, the person making the appointment shall notify the Secretary of State thereof.

References to chief justice and Speaker

(4) A reference in subsection (1) to the chief justice of a province includes a reference to the acting chief justice of the province or any person performing for the time being the duties of the chief justice thereof, and a reference in subsection (2) to the Speaker of the House of Commons includes a reference to any person performing for the time being the duties of the Speaker.

Mr. Knowles: I rise for the purpose of moving an amendment to the amendment, which reads as follows:

That the amendment be amended by changing the period at the end of subclause (2) to a comma, and by inserting immediately thereafter the following words:

"provided, however, that at least one of the persons appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons shall, if possible, be appointed from among such persons coming within the following class, that is to say: the chief electoral officer, the surveyor general or the registrar of vital statistics of the province, or the holder of any similar office in the province."

[Mr. Knowles.]

I do not believe it is necessary to argue at length for this amendment. Hon. members will realize what it seeks to do. It is still my view, as it was the view of the Minister of Transport and his colleagues when they sat on this side of the house in the parliament before the last, that parliament should know if not the actual persons, at least the kind of persons being put on a commission of this kind. It is my view also that we should not leave this all to the Speaker without giving him some guidelines to give him an indication of the kind of person parliament has in mind.

My earlier amendment, which has been turned down by the committee, suggested that there be two categories and that whoever made the appointments should pick the two members, one from one category and one from the other. The committee having turned down that proposition, like the hon. member for Bow River I am offering a compromise. I suggest that we lay out at least one type of person from whom the Speaker ought to make the choice. I have in the amendment used the words "if possible", for the obvious reason that these persons are not federal employees and hence, if the Speaker is not able to get the consent of the chief electoral officer of the province or such person to take on the assignment, the Speaker will need to have the right to pick someone else in that province whom he deems to be suitable.

As was pointed out this afternoon by the Minister of Transport, the whole idea that I have put forward is based on the very successful experience we have had in the province of Manitoba, where we have the only province-wide independent, impartial commission working in this field. In that province the commission consists of the chief electoral officer, the president of the university and the chief justice of the province. It has worked very well there. I think it would be good for us to suggest to the Speaker that if he is going to make these appointments parliament would like something along that line. I hope, therefore, it will not take as long to deal with this subamendment I am proposing on November 12 as it took to deal with the amendment I moved on April 16. I hope that the Minister of Transport, who took this position when he was in opposition and has said he thinks a method like this is a better one, will support the subamendment.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I commend the hon. gentleman for his brevity and I will

try to make my observations equally brief. I must say, to start with, that I do believe the persons described in this subamendment are the kind of persons who, if they were available, would be the kind of persons who would be suitable for a commission. I would be swallowing myself if I did not say that, because I have said it over and over again, and that is the way the Manitoba commission is formed. I do think if all three appointments were to be made by the same person, namely the chief justice of a province, who as I pointed out earlier today once he is appointed is not under the jurisdiction of this parliament, it would be necessary for this parliament to indicate guidelines of this sort.

I do really believe, sir, that if we are going to accept the amendment that I have put forward and entrust to His Honour the Speaker, who is our servant and who is subject to this house and would of course be subject to censure by this house if he did anything wrong, that the Speaker, knowing what has been said about this matter and knowing as he does what we have said in all our debates, does not need this guideline. I do not believe the amendment would serve any useful purpose. I really feel so mildly about this, which is not altogether usual for me, that I do not believe it would do any great harm if the committeee accepted it. However I believe that, like a lot of things that are relatively harmless, it is also relatively useless.

For all of these reasons, I just do not think in these circumstances I will be the slightest degree inconsistent if I say, so far as I am concerned and I say this reluctantly of course, that I do not believe I can vote for the hon. gentleman's subamendment.

Mr. Howard: May I ask the minister if he would consider a mild Minister of Transport relatively harmless?

Mr. Pickersgill: That, I believe, is a very debatable question and I would be out of order if I debated it now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, taking note of the subamendment just submitted by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), I think that it would change neither the motion nor the main proposition in any significant way.

Indeed, the hon. member pointed it out himself when he repeated two or three times the words "if possible".

At that time, it will be up to Mr. Speaker to decide whether it is possible or not.

A subamendment like this simply means that absolutely nothing will be changed in the original suggestion. The minister who just answered the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is perfectly right, in that we are not here to vote in favour of a subamendment which is neither fish nor fowl, and quite meaningless, but just says "if possible"—as it may, or may not, be so.

Under the circumstances, we shall vote against the subamendment, which means absolutely nothing and just tends to lengthen, or protract, the discussion.

[*Text*]

Mr. Olson: I want to say, first of all, that we still hold the same position we took this afternoon. We believe the important thing is to get the whole bill passed rather than quibble over these amendments. I do believe it would be useful, however, for the Speaker to consider the kind of people who hold the positions suggested in the subamendment. I believe the chief electoral officer of a province would be one of the most qualified persons you could find in a province to put on a commission. I believe the surveyor general also would fall into that category. I hope, whether this subamendment is accepted or not, the Speaker would carefully consider the gentlemen who hold these offices for nomination to the various commissions across the country.

As I say, whether or not it is carried, I hope he would take this into consideration. The amendment says, "if possible", as the hon. member for Villeneuve has pointed out. Therefore all it would require the Speaker to do is inquire whether or not one of these two men was available. That would set the groundwork for one appointment and, since it is not particularly binding because of these words "if possible," we would be prepared to support the subamendment.

Mr. Prittie: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in order to get this thing through the government has given in, in very large measure, to the official opposition.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Prittie: Well, Mr. Chairman, these people who yell "question" are those who held up parliament for months. I would like to ask the minister if he or his advisers have given much thought to the procedure

the Speaker would use in finding persons in each province to act on a commission. He cannot be acquainted with persons in all ten provinces. He must turn to someone for advice and I ask where this advice will come from?

Mr. Pickersgill: Before answering that question I would like to make one observation about what the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond said. His party, the Social Credit party and the Ralliement Créditiste all took some exception to the bill in its original form. If my amendment is adopted the bill will not remain in its original form and therefore I do not think it is quite fair for the hon. gentleman to say that the government is giving in to anyone.

We are doing what we said at the very beginning we would do. We said we would try to listen to any reasonable suggestion from any quarter and try to get a consensus that would give us as good a measure as possible. I have tried not to question the motives of members in any quarter and I hope mine will not be questioned either.

As to the method in which the Speaker would make these selections, I would point out that the Speaker is a grown adult. He is not a child; he has lived in the world for a long time. He will certainly be thoroughly familiar with these debates and I, like the hon. member for Medicine Hat, hope he will seriously consider persons such as are suggested in these categories here. I do not think anyone in the chamber thinks these persons are not suitable, but I am not prepared to go to the length of supporting a motion prescribing him to do so.

Mr. Churchill: May I say I am in agreement with the Minister of Transport. As a matter of fact during consideration of this bill there was no difficulty in processing it through second reading and committee stage until the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre introduced his amendment to clause 6, as I recall it, on April 16. At that time we were prepared to complete the bill by that night, had it not been for the amendment introduced at that time.

Mr. Knowles: How long did you talk on that amendment?

Mr. Churchill: I have the record here. There were two days debate on it, and it was an unnecessary delay occasioned by him at that time, just as there is unnecessary delay right now. The burden of talk today has been carried by members of the New Democratic party and by the Créditistes, who constantly complain about delay in the house but who are now showing how delay is brought about by their chatter during most of today.

The subamendment attempts to limit the jurisdictional power given to the Speaker, and mentions persons such as the chief electoral officer, the surveyor general and the registrar of vital statistics in a province. May I point out that in the bill we give to the commission in each province the authority to employ such technical advisers and other staff as may be necessary. We have also indicated that the dominion statistician and the director of the surveys and mapping branch of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys shall perform that function if required. The persons mentioned in the subamendment are the type I think a provincial commission might wish to employ as technical advisers because of their special knowledge of the provinces they serve. Consequently I see no reason why any of them should be named as a member of a commission. Their knowledge, ability and experience could be made available as technical advisers, and in fact a provincial commission would likely be well advised to call on the services of persons like these.

On April 17 I drew attention to the experience in the United Kingdom where at one time they had the registrar general and the director general of ordnance surveys as members of the commission. This was changed and they were made technical experts or officers of the commission. Therefore I suggest that the subamendment might well be rejected because it does not exclude the persons mentioned from acting in some capacity as advisers to a provincial commission.

Mr. Pickersgill: Question.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment on the remarks just made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. There is no question, as he has said, that he and his colleagues in the Tory party were prepared in April of this year to give passage to clause 6 which we are now being asked to amend, but their support for its passage was based on a purely selfish attitude of having a finger in the pie. They wanted to give political direction to the people who would be doing the redistributing, and that was the same attitude as the Prime Minister had when the bill was introduced in the first instance.

The bill originally proposed a definite assurance that the Leader of the Opposition would appoint one of the commissioners other than the chairman, and what else could one expect but that the Tory party, with its history of trying to direct everything from a partisan political point of view, would accept that proposition, just the same as the Liberal government thought it desirable to have the Prime Minister select one of the other commissioners.

It is not at all surprising that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre says he and his party were prepared to pass clause 6, but it is something for which he should not take any credit. He should not gloat too much over his desire in April to give speedy passage to this because it simply meant that he was prepared to have some sort of long, sticky, political finger in the appointment of the commissions in the various provinces.

It was that position which we argued against, because we said then, and we say now, that if you are going to try to establish a non-political or non-partisan redistribution commission, let us go all the way and make it non-partisan; let us not try to have it both ways. It did not surprise me a bit when the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre stated that which he just stated. He only surprised me by having the gall to state it as a peerless point of view, which it was not.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, according to the remarks made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), the members of the New Democratic party and of the Ralliement Créditistes would be the ones who prevented the passing of that legislation, and who, so to speak, delayed the legislation.

I would like to make it clear that if there is one member in this house who delays passing of legislation by discussing just about anything, it is certainly the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre who wastes our precious time by his interventions, usually as serious as those he made a while ago.

While subsection 2 of clause 6 of Bill No. C-72 suggests that two members are to be appointed by the leader of the government and the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons, I wonder whether the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has considered the way the Leader of the Opposition would choose a member in the province of Quebec.

Would he appoint the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer), the member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent), or the one for Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière (Mr. Paul)? Who would he propose for the province of Quebec?

Mr. Lambert: The law says no, on clause 8. Read your bill.

Mr. Caouette: The law says no. The law is not passed yet; then, it does not say anything for the time being.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre is making much ado about the filibuster carried out by the New Democratic party, the Social Credit and the Ralliement Créditiste. Nevertheless, he is not saying that he is, himself, conducting a general filibuster for the whole of the legislation across the country. Therefore, the hon. member should be more consistent instead of blaming others; he should look in a mirror; he would recognize himself.

Why does he not bring forth something logical, instead of talking all kinds of nonsense as he did a few minutes ago.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: Is the committee ready to vote on the subamendment?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Chairman: The question will be on the subamendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. Does the committee wish the chairman to read the subamendment?

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Knowles) negatived: Yeas, 20; nays, 84.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost.

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Chairman: The question is on the amendment moved by the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether before this amendment carries we might not refer to it according to that grand old Yankee custom and call it the Pickersgill-Woolliams amendment?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question on the amendment?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Pickersgill) agreed to: Yeas, 92; nays, 11.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment carried. Shall the clause as amended carry?

Clause 6 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 12 agreed to.

On clause 13—*Rules to be applied in preparing report.*

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. Members: Filibuster.

Mr. Churchill: —I judge this is the last clause that is in front of us and it has to do with the tolerance figure. We spent some time discussing this earlier when the bill was before us for second reading.

We suggested a higher figure than the one which appears here. Some people suggested a lower figure. Others on the government side suggested something in between the two. I am wondering what is the general attitude on the part of the government tonight with regard to this. We have as a committee worked together on many of the clauses here and reached a consensus, as it is called, and I was wondering whether the Minister of Transport has any suggestion to make to us on this particular clause in order that there may be achieved here, as has been achieved with other clauses, an element of compromise between the varying points of view.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, so far as I myself am concerned I think it would make relatively little difference to the actual distribution which would take place whether the tolerance was 20 per cent or 25 per cent. Certainly I would not be prepared to support any figure higher than 25 per cent. I think we should face the fact, regardless of what is the actual tolerance, that if these commissions do their job conscientiously, they will try as far as possible to hew to the line. A tolerance is a tolerance. It is not meant to be a licence to go as far as possible away from what parliament wants. It is to meet hard situations that may arise. Without hard situations it could be done not by commissions at all but by I.B.M. machines, computers or something of that sort. That would be the fairest way of all to have redistribution, except that it would be utterly inhuman and would produce ridiculous results. It is to meet these human situations that there is a tolerance at all and that we depart from the strict rule of representation by population.

I do not think there is anyone in the committee who would argue that there should not be some tolerance; there is in every country where this kind of redistribution exists. It varies from one country to another, and the tendency over the years has been to make the figure smaller. But speaking for myself I would not in the least object if the general view was that it should remain at 20 per cent or if the general view was that it should be 25 per cent. As far as I am concerned I am quite prepared to support either position.

I think the best way of deciding this question is this. If someone wants to vary it he could move—I do not mind doing it myself and am quite prepared to do so if that is the general feeling—that the tolerance be 25 per cent. Then if the committee wants to turn that down they are free to do so. Each member may vote as he pleases. I know there are some hon. members who feel very strongly that it should not be higher than 20 per cent. Others have expressed the view that it should be 30 per cent. Of course if I move a motion I will vote for it, and if there is the general feeling that we should take the sense of the committee on this point—

Mr. Knowles: Before the minister moves an amendment, how does he come to the conclusion that there is a general feeling he should move it?

Mr. Pickersgill: Perhaps the hon. gentleman, who is more precise than I am, is right there. If there is any strong feeling in the committee that we should take the sense of the committee on this point I am quite prepared to make the motion and let the sense of the committee be taken.

Mr. Fisher: Why could the minister not let us find the sense of the committee on the 20 per cent?

Mr. Pickersgill: I am very familiar with these questions about "Have you stopped beating your wife?"; but if we vote on the 20 per cent and accept that figure there is no chance whatever of the 25 per cent even being considered. In order to let the committee decide whether or not it should be 25 per cent I think—

Mr. Knowles: I rise on a question of privilege. Throughout the debate in committee on this bill both when the Minister of Labour was piloting certain clauses through and since the Minister of Transport has been back on the job we have followed the practice of having a general discussion. We have even departed from the rules—and it has been a tough role for the chairman—by having proposals made and discussed before they

were moved. We did this several times. Then after discussion something else has been put in.

Now the minister, who is the first member to speak to this clause—I am sorry; there was the brief comment from the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre—and before there has been any general discussion proposes to move an amendment to the bill. He has already said it does not matter to him whether the figure is 20 per cent or 25 per cent, but he also said that if he moves an amendment he will vote for it. I suggest that we are not treating this clause in the same manner as we have treated the others which have been the subject of contention in this committee. In fact it smacks of something which I do not like.

Mr. Pickersgill: I think the hon. gentleman has a point and I would be glad to sit quietly and listen to four or five members express their views, and then make up my mind after that.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Bow River.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, it is nice even to have the unanimous consent of the splinter parties. I can be quite brief on this tolerance clause. Let us think of some of the provinces which have a special tolerance. For example, the maritimes cannot have less members—and I am sure everyone agrees—than the number of senators from that area. Then we have the amendment to the British North America Act with which I dealt last April, I think it was—but anyway, a long time ago—where a province like Saskatchewan, if it lost a certain number of its members, would have less constituencies than provided for by the tolerance figure, even if the tolerance figure was zero.

There has been a lot of misunderstanding about the tolerance figure. If there is a tolerance of 10 per cent it does not mean that you would have 70,000 people plus 10 per cent. If the tolerance is 20 per cent it does not mean you would have 70,000 people plus 20 per cent. If you had a tolerance of 25 per cent it does not mean you would have 70,000 people in each constituency plus 25 per cent. All constituencies should consist of 70,000 people. It might be 72,000 now because the population of Canada has gone up since the last census. The figure could be zero; it could be 1 per cent. But a percentage is called for in the bill. Let us understand that a tolerance does not mean you will have a greater figure up to 25 per cent, 20 per cent or 10 per cent.

Mr. Fisher: Make it 100 per cent.

Mr. Woolliams: The hon. member for Port Arthur said, make it 100 per cent. I think it was the hon. member for Port Arthur; I am not used to these big round figures. But if the hon. member is following me, if it is 100 per cent it does not mean a constituency will have 140,000 people. If the commissions do their work we will get as near as we can to having 70,000 people in each constituency, or 72,000, depending on the population increase.

However, there are certain problems. There are as many rotten boroughs—I use the word in its historical sense—in the city of Montreal and the city of Toronto as there are in the rural communities of western Canada, and certain problems arise where certain areas require a given tolerance. Certain provinces need a fairly high tolerance, although we hope the commissions will keep it down to the minimum. We hope the commissions will keep it down to a minimum of perhaps 1 or 2 per cent.

Surely we can compromise again and expedite the business of the house tonight. In my opinion we have expedited our business today by compromise in reference to redistribution, and I hope we can continue to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I am now prepared to move—

An hon. Member: Seconded by Mr. Pickersgill.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I can tell my friend that I did not draft this amendment. It was drafted by the hon. member for Edmonton West. In view of the fact it was drafted, following discussion at a meeting, it is in his writing, but if there is any question about it I will allow the hon. member for Skeena to have a look at it.

Mr. Howard: I am sure it would not convince me.

Mr. Woolliams: Nothing would convince you.

Mr. Knowles: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I always like to hear questions asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Knowles: I should just like the hon. member to clear up a point with reference to the meeting to which he referred. I think

I know the answer to this question, but I should like to have it on the record. What meeting does the hon. member have reference to?

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, sometimes one has to drive points in with a hammer. I could repeat the story told by the leader of the party to which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre belongs, but I do not intend to waste time. It seems that sometimes one has to say things four or five times to get them across to some people.

I have said today on several occasions that the Conservatives have met, as a result of what the Minister of Transport said in the House of Commons at the time we asked that this bill be put aside for consideration. We met and discussed the bill as a party. I hope the party to my left has also met to discuss this bill. We had a meeting this morning, as a result of which we agreed to certain compromises. We intended today to get down to business, and we have got down to business. I do not think anyone can criticize us in that regard.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, in view of the exuberance shown by hon. members to my left I should like to state that when it comes to filibustering I cannot run a close second to the members of the New Democratic party. I remember the kind of filibustering they carried on in respect of divorce bills. I also remember the former member for Assiniboia, Mr. Hazen Argue, who was the best filibusterer ever to hit this House of Commons, but he was busted out as a result of an election.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to get sidetracked. I should like to move my amendment, which is as follows:

That subclause (b) of clause 13 be amended by deleting therefrom in lines 49 and 50 the word "twenty" and by substituting therefor the words "twenty five".

An hon. Member: Where is your seconder?

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment briefly about the amendment to subclause (b) of clause 13 as proposed by the hon. member for Bow River. I am not sure of the proper procedure to be followed regarding a subamendment, but I think the 25 per cent figure would be much more palatable, at least to me, if we could change subparagraph (i) of paragraph (b), clause 13, by substituting the word "or" in line 2 for a comma, and adding after the word "density" the words "or growth", so the paragraph would read:

[Mr. Knowles.]

—special geographic considerations, including in particular the sparsity, density or growth of population of various regions of the province—

I think that would be much better, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nielsen: How about adding the word "diminution" as well?

Mr. Woolliams: What is the difference? It escapes me.

Mr. Moreau: The hon. member asks what the difference is. We are now working on the 1961 census figures. In my riding particularly, and I am sure in other areas where there has been a rapid increase in the population of communities, we are now dealing with far out-dated figures. I feel by the addition of the words "or growth", we would give the commissions enough latitude that they could take this factor into consideration.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I think a procedural point is involved in this suggestion. I wonder whether the hon. member would withhold his proposed subamendment until we deal with the amendment, and then perhaps put his suggestion forward in the form of another amendment. What he has suggested does not really constitute a subamendment because, although it proposes a change to the same clause, it deals with a completely separate item.

Mr. Moreau: I appreciate that fact, Mr. Chairman, but I think the two items are related, and if we add the words "or growth" that would make the tolerance aspect of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bow River much more acceptable.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, clause 13 clearly states the rules by which each commission for a province shall be governed. Clause 13 (a) reads as follows:

The division of the province into electoral districts and the description of the boundaries thereof shall proceed on the basis that the population of each electoral district in the province as a result thereof shall correspond as nearly as may be to the electoral quota for the province—

I had the good fortune of seeing the map prepared by the office of the chief electoral officer. In our area of northwestern Quebec, that is in the counties of Chapleau and Villeneuve—and I am not only concerned about my own riding here—emphasis has been laid on clause 13 (b) which reads as follows:

(b) The commission may be depart from the strict application of rule (a) in any case where
(i) special geographic considerations—

We explained that Chapleau county went up to James Bay and that in view of geographic considerations, we should divide the two counties, or even the three counties of Pontiac-Témiscamingue, Villeneuve and Chapleau, leaving Noranda in Villeneuve county, Rouyn in Pontiac-Témiscamingue county, adding Villeneuve to Amos, St. Marc de Figurie and Senneterre, and then leave in Chapleau county the northern part of the province where there are hardly any inhabitants except Indians, perhaps 1,500 to 2,000 at the most, which would not change much in the next ten years.

At present, changes are made in the ridings because it is said that population is no longer important and that geography is the basis of everything.

Then, I found that the proposed solution was perfectly unreasonable, namely to add to the Villeneuve riding the towns of Amos, St. Marc, Senneterre, Barraute, Belcourt, and make a Chapleau riding from the Ontario boundary, that is from La Reine, La Sarre, Malartic, Taschereau, then, turning above Amos, and following the railway line to Parent, and then going north to Chibougamau.

Those are geographic considerations where there is no population, where the towns and villages I just mentioned are taken away from Chapleau.

We cannot admit that. The Pontiac-Témiscamingue riding is all right as it is, the Villeneuve riding is all right as it is and the Chapleau riding is also well as it is, even if the territory of Chapleau is twice as large as that of Villeneuve and Pontiac-Témiscamingue, because there is no population. If we were to include in the Chapleau riding all the Baffin land, for instance, where there is not a living soul, what would that mean as far as the increase of total votes is concerned for Chapleau riding?

That is what we find illogical. Changes might be necessary in urban areas such as Montreal, where one riding has 150,000 to 200,000 voters, while a small riding, has only 25,000 or 30,000. Then, changes must be made; a redistribution is necessary, but not in rural ridings such as ours in the northern area.

In subparagraph (i) of paragraph (b) of clause 13, it is said that:

—special geographic considerations—

The bill says exactly what the chief electoral officer told me. The bill is right as the chief electoral officer was when he explained to me the situation in our area

(i) special geographic considerations, including in particular the sparsity or density of population of various regions of the province, the accessibility of such regions or the size or shape thereof, appear to the commission to render such a departure necessary or desirable, or

(ii) any special community or diversity of interests of the inhabitants of various regions of the province appears to the commission to render such a departure necessary or desirable.

Mr. Chairman, which commission decided that? We read:

—appears to the commission.

But the commission has not been appointed yet. We are at clause 13 of the bill. There is no commission as yet and we are asked to approve a bill that a non-existent commission decided to introduce to the House of Commons.

Is there anything more stupid, more idiotic than that? Are we here to be laughed at?

Which commission has been appointed in the province of Quebec at the present time in order to work with the Ottawa organization, as far as the establishment of electoral boundaries is concerned in that province? Which Ontario commission now works with the Ottawa commission to establish the electoral districts in Ontario in the north, at Cochrane, or anywhere?

We are told:

The commission suggests.

Which commission? There is not even a commission and we are told in the bill that the commission suggests such and such principle or procedure.

Mr. Chairman, are we being taken for sidewalk superintendents in the House of Commons? Are we being taken for irresponsible people, or people who do not know where they are going?

Mr. Habel: Come now.

Mr. Caouette: I hear my very good friend, the hon. member from Cochrane say: Come now.

Well, which is the commission for the province of Quebec?

Mr. Habel: May I ask a question?

Mr. Caouette: With pleasure.

Mr. Habel: You voted for clause 6 which contains exactly the same words: "the commission", and when the bill is passed, the commission will be appointed and will act under the legislation passed by the house.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, in putting a question to me, the hon. member for Cochrane states positively that after clause 6 had

been agreed to, the commission decided to submit to us clause 13—

Mr. Habel: It will be part of the bill.

Mr. Caouette: It does not exist.

Mr. Habel: It will.

Mr. Caouette: It does not exist, it is not mentioned, but in clause 13, we are told that the commission must establish the electoral boundaries on the basis of population on the one hand and of geographic considerations on the other hand.

Mr. Habel: It will decide.

Mr. Caouette: Who will decide? The commission or parliament?

Mr. Chairman, I continue reading subparagraph (ii):

—but in no case shall the population of any electoral district in the province as a result thereof depart from the electoral quota for that province to a greater extent than 20 per cent more or 20 per cent less.

The proposed amendment aims at increasing this margin from 20 per cent to 25 per cent. In my opinion, 25 per cent is more acceptable than 20 per cent. But even there, why should we consider on the one hand the population and on the other hand special geographic considerations to establish the size of a territory where there is nobody, where there are no voters, where there are no Canadians to be represented?

Such is the case in my area, Rouyn-Noranda, Villeneuve, and also Chapleau and Pontiac-Témiscamingue.

I do not think that a commission, either federal-provincial or just federal, could make an intelligent decision by taking into account geographic considerations only in our area.

If we take the population into consideration —and the chief electoral officer knows it— we do not need to change the boundaries of the ridings as they exist at present in the northwestern part of the province of Quebec nor, probably, those of the northeastern district of the province of Ontario. However, we should not be deceived or misled with geographical problems, when there is no population in those districts.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment raising from 20 to 25 per cent the electoral quota should be adopted. The Minister of Transport said a while ago that he had no objection to it and that he would even move that amendment or motion himself. If he is ready to do so, we are also ready to accept that a figure of 25 per cent be substituted for 20 per cent.

[Mr. Caouette.]

The only thing is that it is entirely inadmissible—and I wish to draw that fact to the attention of the minister and of those who are entrusted with the administration of the Canada Elections Act—that clause 13 should take the geographical factor into account. Members of parliament are elected by people, not by geography. The geographical map is of little importance. Let us bring the map up to date but it is the electors that count because we represent each and every one of them, not an area. Let us take them into consideration instead of geography as the government would have us do under clause 13 we are discussing at present.

[*Text*]

Mr. Fisher: I am rather bothered by the remarks of the hon. member for Villeneuve because he has taken an interpretation, it seems to me, with regard to the hinterland ridings that I cannot understand. It is my understanding that those of us who represent sparsely settled regions will stand to gain very much by the fact the tolerance is set at 25 per cent, and that this 25 per cent is almost certain to be operating as a minus factor rather than a plus factor. Whether it does or not, great changes are certain in the hinterland areas, much more so than almost any other part of the country including the large cities.

As I interpret this, it is actually to my advantage or to the advantage of the electors in my area if I support the 25 per cent tolerance rather than the 20 per cent. However, I intend to vote against the amendment. I would put it to the members in the house, particularly those who represent cities that, although the effect may be small, if you go along with the 25 per cent tolerance you just get that much farther away from the one man, one vote and one representative concept. I myself would support, even though again it is going to be more difficult to change some of these hinterland areas, a tolerance of 10 per cent. I just wanted to express the fact that I am going to vote against the amendment, and I know some of my colleagues will. I believe one or two of them would be prepared to have an even larger tolerance.

I wanted to refer to the point raised by the hon. member for York-Scarborough which had to do really with the idea of rate of growth.

Mr. Moreau: That is the way the amendment will read.

Mr. Fisher: I think it would be a good idea to have that point in this provision, for the

reason that redistribution commissioners, in effect, will have an office going all the time. We know that office is already conscious of some of the transitions that are taking place. We would hope, since we are likely to have two redistributions within much less than a decade, that there will be some experienced personnel. For that reason, I think it would be quite valuable to have this rate of growth concept embodied in the provision.

One of the things that has bothered me about the approach of the minister tonight as I have understood it, not least about the general line that is going around about this question of tolerance, is the line that it really does not matter that much whether the tolerance is set at 35 per cent or 25 per cent; that it is at the discretion of the commissioner. It may be all very well to give them that discretion, but I suggest the larger we make the tolerance the more likely there is to be strong representation for more changes, and jockeying from people outside and inside the political arena. I believe, therefore, the government would be well advised to stick with 20 per cent. I hope there will be enough members in this house who support that idea to defeat the amendment that has been put forward by the official opposition.

Mr. Pickersgill: Since the hon. gentleman has mentioned me, perhaps I could explain my stand in one sentence. I would find the amendment much easier to vote for if the committee were also disposed to accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for York-Scarborough. I do believe we have to consider the very rapid rate of growth. The hon. gentleman from York-Scarborough and I have been discussing this very point. He had to revise his amendment to put in the rate of growth because we do know that this suburban growth has been very rapid since the redistribution of 1951. It is a factor, and if there is to be anything like a fair redistribution the first time, some account must be taken of it.

I have said that I do not think there is much difference between 20 per cent and 25 per cent. I did not say 35 per cent. I think that would be quite ridiculous, and I could not support that at all. I would not be willing to support even 30 per cent. I think it is possible that 25 per cent might meet a few hard cases that would otherwise arise, and particularly if we were willing at the same time to accept the suggestion made by the hon. member for York-Scarborough, that would meet the situation. I would, on balance, want to support the amendment.

Mr. Leboe: I will only take a minute, as usual. I should like to say that we, in this group, are quite prepared to support the amendment. I think it is a move in the right direction. As a matter of fact, I would have said that 25 per cent is about where it ought to be.

In so far as the amendment it is understood the hon. member for York-Scarborough is proposing is concerned, I would think that amendment would certainly be already in the mind of anybody who is going to make this assessment. For instance, it would seem to me that there are two places we will have to start with this orientation, and that is in the hard core of the city where there is not going to be any growth worth mentioning. There are places in cities where industrial areas are taking over and people are being moved out. There is therefore a trend away from an increase in population. Certainly, in these areas, the tolerance would be set to take account of not just the population that is possible within that tolerance. Then, when you come to areas of fast growth, naturally the converse would be true. In other words, you would set the smallest amount of population over a larger area. Of course, in a constituency that has a large land mass and a lighter population you can look forward to an increased growth, and rather rapidly in some cases. I suggest, therefore, that the 25 per cent tolerance we are discussing here would be about as close as one could come to that type of consideration in this committee.

Mr. Turner: I am just rising to speak briefly on this rate of growth situation introduced by the hon. member for York-Scarborough. I want to refer directly to the remarks made a moment ago by the hon. member for Cariboo. He referred to downtown constituencies. I want to suggest to the committee that there is a rate of growth problem in these constituencies as well and it arises from two factors. The first is large immigration. When people arrive and have spent five years in this country under status of landed immigrants they can qualify for Canadian citizenship. It is conceivable in some of those areas there will be a large rise in population and quite a dramatic increase in the number of voters available in these constituencies.

The second factor is that in certain of these downtown areas there are projects for urban renewal, housing projects and large high rise apartments. These projects are reviving some of these downtown areas. If this

rate of growth concept is accepted, I suggest that when the commissioner considers it, he keep these factors in mind as well.

Mr. Barnett: I decided I would rise briefly on the suggestion raised originally by the hon. member for York-Scarborough, principally because when the minister referred to it he confined himself to urban areas. Of course, these are the areas in which the hon. member for York-Scarborough is interested. I should like to point out that this rate of growth factor is not confined to metropolitan urban areas. It could apply equally to rural industrial areas, particularly where large industries may be planted in the wilderness. I have in mind, for example, a suggestion in my own constituency under which an entirely new town of 5,000 people is going to come into being very shortly. Whether those estimates are a bit optimistic for the immediate future, I would not want to say offhand, but that is the kind of thing which can happen which would make the inclusion of this rate of growth factor quite valuable.

This is apart from the redistribution which lies immediately ahead of us. There is always likely to be some time lag in the actual carrying out of redistribution following a census, and in many areas the quota may be somewhat out of line. I am quite prepared to support this when it comes before us in the form of an amendment, but I would like to reiterate my own belief that 20 per cent is preferable to the amendment before us at the moment.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak briefly in regard to this amendment. The suggestion put forward by the hon. member for York-Scarborough is quite in order, and I will support the 25 per cent figure. However, I recall the debate that took place some time ago in this chamber when we were speaking about growth rates, and I remember the hon. member for York-Scarborough speaking in an uncomplimentary way about some rural areas and the way in which they were represented.

I suggest that the Minister of Transport use his influence with his colleagues with respect to the decentralization of industries to areas where they would promote growth. This would be of great benefit to many rural areas, and we in the rural areas of Ontario would certainly like to have a measure of the growth rate about which the hon. member for York-Scarborough complains.

I know this does not lie within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Transport but I believe he should use his influence in this matter. As you may recall, initially I supported a larger

tolerance figure and I felt all along it would be a much better proposition for a commissioner to work on the larger tolerance.

I would ask the minister to take note of what I have said because we in the rural areas of Ontario are interested in these population changes, and in population growth provincially and municipally. The recent figures that have been issued show we have a reasonable right to consideration in this respect.

Mr. Howard: I support the ideas put forward by the hon. member for Port Arthur so far as the percentage tolerance is concerned. We have ridings which are somewhat similar geographically and which will be similarly affected by this proposal. Apart from that, I want to say how much I enjoyed the obviously unrehearsed show which went on earlier when this amendment was put before the committee. If it were not so awkward to accept this naked show of power displayed by the two old line parties, when they do not give a hoot whose toes they trample on when they want to put something into effect, it would be comic.

Mr. Woolliams: Try and be nice.

Mr. Howard: I am trying to be nice, Eldon, but it is difficult. We saw the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre crow for a little bit, and put forward the suggestion which was immediately grasped by the Minister of Transport, who picked up a prepared document from his desk, ready to put this preconceived plan into effect. But then he ran into a little difficulty—he should have realized he would anyway—and graciously withdrew. Then came the clincher from the hon. member for Bow River to help him out. Obviously it was a deal which had been worked out in advance. I suggest to the two old line parties that, in future, if they want to connive in this way they had better rehearse a little better.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is like the things said about me and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre by the hon. member for Bow River. They are both wrong.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Pascoe: Mr. Chairman, I regret it is nearly ten o'clock but I feel constrained to speak in support of the province of Saskatchewan, which will suffer the most seriously under this redistribution. I was prepared to ask for a greater tolerance than 25 per cent but I will accept the 25 per cent in certain instances. However, I think it

should be more than 25 per cent in the case of some areas of Saskatchewan.

The Minister of Transport said he was in favour of limiting the tolerance to 20 per cent and then asked for our opinions. I have quite a lot to say on this, Mr. Chairman, but I note it is ten o'clock.

Mr. Woolliams: I wonder if we should extend the time tonight so that we might be able to finish the debate, as everybody seems in such agreement.

Mr. Howard: I do not see how we can proceed when it is ten o'clock. You gentlemen wanted to filibuster, and you will have to put up with this.

The Chairman: Is it the wish of the committee that the chairman call it ten o'clock?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Howard: It is not the wish of the committee; it is ten o'clock.

Mr. Woolliams: We can extend the time by unanimous consent, and if the N.D.P. want to veto that consent then we know where they stand with reference to getting business through the house.

Mr. Howard: No matter how hard the hon. member digs he will not get himself out of the hole he got himself into.

The Chairman: Since the committee does not have the unanimous agreement required it is my duty to rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the house leader about the business for tomorrow and Monday.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with what I hope will be the completion of the bill we have been discussing tonight. When it is completed we will proceed with the estimates as indicated on Tuesday night in *Hansard*; that is, the estimates of the Secretary of State, followed by the estimates for which the Minister of Forestry is responsible, then the estimates of the Department of Public Works and the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

NATIONAL PARKS—AMENDMENT OF REGULATIONS RESPECTING ZONING AND BUILDING

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, when I am through with what I have to say tonight it will prove that there has never been any marriage between myself and the Liberals, or if there was that it has now been dissolved by an act of divorce.

Mr. Peters: What about annulment?

Mr. Woolliams: I do not know anything about annulment; you might know something about that. I now want to deal with a question I put to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Laing). I asked him today whether there were any changes in orders in council in reference to the zoning of parks and a building permit. There are various areas zoned in the townsite of Banff for business, and certain sections are zoned as residential areas. I suggest to the minister that the Bow River project, which is going to be a three-storey hotel with a cocktail lounge, is being built in the best residential part of Banff townsite and in an area which has that beauty that makes building on it contrary to the terms and conditions of the National Parks Act. But the worst thing of all is that the minister said today these orders in council were not rescinded; they were only rescinded in regard to this particular project. I want to read to the minister something for which he has perhaps a great deal of respect, namely the words of Mackenzie King, when it comes to passing orders in council, particularly in secret. That is why I wanted them filed in the house. We noticed that the minister was most reluctant today to answer the questions. This is what Mackenzie King said in reference to these secret orders in council. This was the statement quoted by Senator Power who was then a member of parliament in this House of Commons. He was dealing with the law and he said, in brief, that the law should be known to every Canadian. This is what Mackenzie King said:

> Now let us come to another point, which I wish particularly to stress. I refer to the right set out in Magna Carta that no man shall be dispossessed of his rights without the lawful judgment of his peers under the law of the land; not the law as made by the governor in council, not the law as made by some unnamed and as yet unexisting

body, but the law of the land as known to everyone. It is an essential principle of liberty and freedom that the law of the land should be known, that it should be so known that every man as he runs may read. The law should not be something which is to make its appearance in the Canada Gazette after some board or governor in council, not parliament, has passed a regulation; it is something that should appear in the statutes of the country.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, we have certain orders in council known to the council of Banff, an elected body, and the minister in order to give—and I suggest to him this is suspicious—certain people the right to build certain things in Banff, amended those laws unknown to parliament, unknown to the people of Canada and unknown to Banff, and refused today to table them until pressed by myself, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the former minister. I wish I had time in the seven minutes at my disposal, but I have not, to read from the minutes what the minister said at his meeting with the council of Banff. I have a copy of the minutes, which give word for word what took place between himself and the elected body of Banff. He said to that body, in brief, in Calgary recently, "You apologize to the Prime Minister and myself, because you asked for my resignation from the Prime Minister. If you don't apologize, I won't even listen to you. You mean nothing to me", I am going to read what he said to these people. This is what he said as reported at page 8 of these minutes, taken right at the meeting. I would say it was the most disgraceful performance of any minister in this country, to speak to an elected body in the manner in which he spoke to them. I cannot believe the minister was serious on that occasion; I can only think he must have lost his temper. Fancy speaking to an elected body in this manner:

Mr. Laing:—

This is what he said to an elected, democratic body in this country:

I want to tell you I am not particularly small on my own integrity.

We do not question the minister's integrity about this.

I think it is time that somebody dug their heels in against irresponsible talk such as this against people who offer themselves to public life and, by and large, are giving service to a higher calibre than the people they serve.

Then the president of the council, Mr. Roberge, said:

We are giving a service too, where we receive no recognition or pay, nothing. We are living with the problem and advising to the best of our ability.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Now, what did the minister say to the council? He said that they had better improve their manners before he would listen to them. That is not good enough for a minister of the crown in speaking to an elected body in Banff. I say that he blackmailed the council. Regardless of the kind of project we are talking about I say he had no right to go to a democratic organization and tell them to apologize and withdraw the wire which called for his resignation, and unless they did so he would not listen to them.

Worse than that, he bluffed them. He said he would give further consideration to this matter. He never gave any consideration to it. He learned from them that there was an order in council in this regard which said he could not do what he was doing. He broke the law by allowing these people to start building this project, and then he said to them: "Look, I have not rescinded this order in council which protects the liberties of these people; I only did this in connection with this project".

Then he wrote a letter—and what an arrogant letter it was—on November 4, 1964, and I only wish I had time tonight to read the terms of that letter. It is a disgrace for any minister to talk to a democratic organization in this way. I thought they had overstepped themselves in calling for the minister's resignation, but when I read carefully through the 24 pages here and discovered the things he said to that democratic organization I can only say I think they were right in calling for his resignation.

I am not saying that we need no development of the parks, but these people do have rights and the minister has run over those rights. I would say to him what Mackenzie King said in this House of Commons, that when you pass secret orders in council behind closed doors, unknown in this case to the elected council of Banff, you are running slipshod over the rights of the people of Canada. I want to hear the minister's explanation. He blackmailed them and I am suspicious of the kind of project which we have in Banff at this time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member's time has expired.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I almost admire the righteous indignation of the hon. member for Bow River. I am sure he followed the advice of the minister who once said that if you have a weak argument you should shout loudly. I will be glad to

answer the hon. member regarding the actions of the advisory council of Banff, one of whose members had said there was obviously a pay-off here. I told these people that before I discussed anything with them they would have to retract that statement. I told them I was defending not myself, because I was not anxious about myself, but the great body of public servants in this country who are doing the best they can by the public. They retracted it. They also said they had wired the Prime Minister telling him they would withdraw their request for my resignation; I had asked for that too.

Then we got down to some discussions and I think we are working along pretty well. We are in the process of revising the regulations at Banff in accord with the Oberlander report. They are not yet published. There is no order in council yet covering them. But all the things we are doing and the regulations and actions we are taking are directly in conformity with the recommendations of the Oberlander report. We will have to make a number of other regulations, and the land use code which will be published will take care of the whole matter.

I am astonished that the hon. member should even mention Bow View lodge, because I have here a letter which he wrote to the owners of the Bow View lodge property on December 5, 1962, as follows:

> Messrs. Bassie, Kempo, Hochachka & Shewchuk... Re: Proposed motor hotel at the site of Bow View lodge, (lots 22A and 23A, Block A, plan Banff 1301 FW)
>
> We are having a meeting tomorrow morning with the minister, Mr. Dinsdale, to discuss Dr. Oberlander's report, and we should know within a few days the zones that are going to be accepted for the building of motels and hotels in Banff.
>
> Your application is before me and has been fully discussed. You can rest assured I am pressing for your interests.

Yet the hon. member stands up here tonight full of hot anger because of the fact I have now assisted his friends in doing that thing he promised to do in 1962. Accusations have been made that these people are from Edmonton and that they should not be allowed to carry on this development in Banff. The hon. member has made accusations that one of the people behind this is the mayor of Edmonton. I am satisfied that he is not remotely connected with it in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Woolliams: Have you checked through the registrations at the registrar's office in Edmonton?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Laing: I used every possible means of finding out who are the owners, and I am satisfied that he is not in any way connected.

Mr. Woolliams: The Banff council does not agree with you.

Mr. Laing: The Banff council and I are getting along very well, and I would not want that fine relationship hindered by the hon. member for Bow River. I hope from now on we will be able to get along very well.

If exception is taken to the fact that we have issued this licence without having an order in council, I might say again that this is old stuff, because when my hon. friend was sitting on this side of the house in 1960, the Spruce Grove motel in Banff had its building permit issued on May 3, 1960, and it was not until August 28, 1963 that we rectified the situation, approved the issuance of that permit and authorized it by order in council. Over three years elapsed between the time the permit was issued and the order in council passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. minister's time has expired.

PUBLIC SERVICE—SUPERANNUATED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—REQUEST FOR INCREASED PENSIONS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on orders of the day this afternoon I asked the Prime Minister whether he could disclose the terms of his answer to those who saw the government two weeks ago concerning the need for an increase in the pensions of superannuated civil servants. The Prime Minister indicated briefly what those terms were, and press reports have spelled them out in more detail and indicate in fact that the government's answer to this very urgent appeal was no.

Mr. Speaker, I express on behalf of superannuated civil servants and widows of superannuated civil servants great disappointment that the government has again given this kind of an answer. Earlier during this session representations were made to the government. They were dealt with by the Minister of Finance, and after a period of time he gave a negative answer. As the weeks and months of this session have passed, further representations have been made. Finally two weeks ago Tuesday, I believe, representatives of two or three bodies speaking for superannuated civil servants met with the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, and I believe one or two other ministers, and

presented their case. They were assured that their case would be given consideration. Now again they have been told that this government can do nothing for them.

The arguments which are given are not new, and I suggest that they are no more valid today than they were when given on past occasions. The principal argument that the government seems to use again and again is that superannuated civil servants should not expect anything better than pensioned employees of other employers in the country. Surely if that argument carries any weight, then no one in the government service can expect better salaries or conditions than those found elsewhere in the country. Surely this argument is full of holes, and what the government ought to be doing is to be leading rather than dragging behind other employers.

The suggestion that other employers do not do this is also made from time to time. I find that an increasing number of employers, particularly municipal organizations, some of the provinces, as well as employers in other countries are recognizing that retired employees have a right to share in the increased productivity of the society or nation of which they have been a part. I suggest that this principle was in fact accepted by parliament in 1959 when it passed the Public Service Pension Adjustment Act. This of course was when a Conservative government was in power but the Liberals of that day did not oppose the measure. In other words, any suggestion that it is a sin or a crime to raise the pensions of former government employees was surely set aside by the action that parliament took on that occasion.

One of the other suggestions made by the Prime Minister, according to press reports, is that the government is doing things for older people generally and that superannuated civil servants must be satisfied to share in these general improvements. Apparently one of the improvements cited is that the old age security pension is going to have built into it a cost of living bonus. We now know what that means. It means that in 1968, if superannuated civil servants drawing the old age security pension are still alive, they stand a chance of getting an increase in their old age security pension of 75 cents a month or if the cost of living has gone up high enough they will get $1.50 a month but no more. When we talk about 1968 in relation to old people obviously many of them will be dead before that time comes.

[Mr. Knowles.]

I submit that the government is being callous and unfair to these former employees and that it is being unfair to the desire of Canadians as a whole to be decent to our employees. I submit that the government is completely wrong in its failure to give a lead of any kind. This very day the Prime Minister, in response to a question from the Leader of the Opposition with regard to veterans pensions, admitted that perhaps with respect to veterans pensions the time had come for a cyclical review of these pensions every two years. Indeed, even the cost of living bonus in the Canada pension plan and in the Old Age Security Act is an admission there is a case for these amounts to be reviewed and increased after pensions have been put in payment.

I submit that on all counts the government is being most unfair to its former employees, the superannuated civil servants, retired members of the services, of the mounted police and others, in continually saying no to these faithful former servants. This is supposed to be a question, Mr. Speaker, and obviously I have been making a statement expressing my disappointment at the announcement made by the Prime Minister today on orders of the day. I close with a question. What has the government got to say to give some hope, some encouragement, to these former employees?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in expressing himself suggested that the government was callous in its attitude toward this question. His criticism affords me the opportunity to remind him that no one has a more sincere regard and deeper concern for pensioners and other retired people in this country than the Prime Minister, and as head of the government he has translated that concern into constructive action on more than one occasion.

The Prime Minister, with real regret, was impelled to make the decision in regard to this matter which he announced to the house. We transmitted that decision in the form of a letter to Mr. Fred W. Whitehouse, national secretary-treasurer of the federal superannuates national association, in a letter similar in substance to Mr. F. T. Gough, national secretary-treasurer of the civil service association of Canada and in another letter to Mr. J. G. Dumouchel, first vice-president of the civil service federation of Canada. I stated that these letters are similar in substance although they vary somewhat in form. The

variations are due to the fact that the associations submitted briefs that were different in some respects, and consequently they had to be answered in a slightly different manner. With the indulgence of the house I should like to read into the record the answer the Prime Minister sent to Mr. Whitehouse and which will also cover the replies to the officials of the other associations. The letter is dated November 10, 1964, and reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Whitehouse:

My colleagues and I have studied the brief which you left with me on October 27 when we had a discussion concerning your proposal to adjust the pensions paid to superannuated civil servants.

After reviewing the principles involved in your proposal as well as the facts which you have cited, we have come to the conclusion that any steps which the government should propose to parliament to alleviate difficulties faced by retired persons should be general in character and not confined to former employees of the government of Canada. I am sure that your association will recognize on reflection that there have been a number of general actions taken which have benefitted members of your association as well as other retired people in Canada; the main ones, of course, have been the increases in the old age security pensions. Already those over 70 will have received benefits increased by $240 per year per pensioner over the level that pertained at the time the Public Service Pension Adjustment Act was passed in 1958. In addition, there have been corresponding increases in old age assistance for those who require it between the ages of 65 and 70, as well as other measures—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, the parliamentary secretary's time has expired.

Mr. Pennell: May I ask the indulgence of the house, Mr. Speaker, to complete this letter? I believe it is of great interest to the members of the house.

Mr. Knowles: It is irregular, but perhaps he could be permitted to just put it on *Hansard.*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is this agreed? The rules under which we are operating after ten o'clock are rather strict, as all hon. members know. If we make exceptions at any time to go beyond either the seven minutes allowed to a questioner or the three minutes allotted to the member replying on behalf of the government, we may get into difficulty. The suggestion has been made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre that the parliamentary secretary be allowed to include the balance of this letter as part of his speech.

Mr. Knowles: May I make an alternative suggestion? Could it be agreed that it be made an appendix to today's *Hansard,* that is the whole letter?

Mr. Pennell: I would be pleased to agree to the suggestion of the hon. member if I could just finish the sentence so it will appear in proper form in *Hansard.*

Mr. Knowles: It will be in *Hansard.*

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For text of letter referred to above see appendix.*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; the hon. member for Skeena.

GRAIN—PRINCE RUPERT, B.C.—INCREASE IN ELEVATOR CAPACITY

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I raised by way of question today, and have done so on many other days in the past, the subject of the grain elevator in the city of Prince Rupert, a terminal point on the Canadian National Railway. On each of the many occasions upon which I have asked the minister about prospects for doubling the capacity of that elevator he has said, either directly or in effect, that the matter is under consideration.

The elevator at Prince Rupert, by the admission of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) himself, is one of the most efficiently operated terminal elevators in Canada. It has a working capacity of about one million bushels. Grain handling ships today are of a size now that they can carry upwards from three quarters of a million bushels in one cargo. This leaves the elevator in a position of being unable to load more than one ship at a time. It would have to wait, after one ship is loaded, for an influx of grain by rail, then have the grain cleaned, processed and stored until the approximately three quarters of a million bushels capacity was reached again, which would be sufficient for another ship of similar size.

In recent years we have seen tremendously large sales of grain to other countries, notably to China and the Soviet union, which have resulted in the west coast ports being used to the maximum. They have also resulted in the city of Vancouver, as it were, getting the gravy. A further result was an announcement just a few months ago of a large increase in the capacity of one of the elevators in Vancouver, and as a consequence the city of Prince Rupert and the operation of the grain elevator there are being pushed more and more into the background.

Nearly every argument or reason that one can think of is in favour of doubling the

capacity of the elevator there. Incidentally, it was built with this thought in mind in 1926, at a cost—and I am guessing—of between $1½ million and $2 million, so that its capacity could be doubled. On March 31 of this year we had a debate in this chamber about the Prince Rupert elevator and the minister answered me as follows:

> I am quite sympathetic to what the hon. member has said, and I am sorry that I cannot say tonight some of the things I should like to say. But I can say this, that all of the storage facilities which are controlled by the Canadian government in one way or another have been carefully discussed, and I hope in the not too distant future that we will be able to present something to the hon. member which will be satisfactory in so far as the Prince Rupert terminal is concerned.

That was at the end of March and now it is pretty near the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, the people in Rupert have been waiting and living in hope since that day, and even before that day. Each time we pose the question to the minister the only answer we get is the same as we got today, namely that it is under consideration. It has even got to the point where the minister says this laughingly, as if it were a joke. But it is not a joke; it is a very serious matter.

Maybe it was appropriate that the minister made those comments on March 31, the eve of April Fool's day. Perhaps he had in mind perpetrating an April Fool's joke on the people of Rupert. I hope not, and I hope that he will soon finish his consideration. Surely it does not take months and months of dragged out consideration to come to a conclusion. I ask him to tell the people in Rupert whether the government is going to double the elevator capacity or not? This is the simple answer the people want. They think this consideration has gone on far too long. It is long past the time for action. They would like to see this take place, and so would I.

Mr. Bruce S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for Skeena for his continuing interest in this question of the terminal elevator at Prince Rupert.

Mr. Howard: Action is what we want.

Mr. Beer: I also want to assure him that the Minister of Agriculture is interested in every aspect of agriculture, and not the least of his interest is in the provision of proper facilities for the handling of grain, including the terminal elevator at Prince Rupert.

The minister of course is justified in this interest in view of the fact that in 1963 we harvested the largest crop of wheat and grain in our history, amounting to some 725 million bushels, and of this total some 632 million bushels were sold for export. When you add to that the amount of grain used domestically, which amounted to another 155 million bushels, this indicates our total output for that year was more than the total amount harvested, which of course means we have eaten into our reserves.

The hon. member for Skeena will realize that by asking this type of question he is inquiring into what government policy might be, and I have no alternative but to reply that this matter has been given very thorough consideration and is being considered constantly, and when an announcement is possible it will be made by the minister in the house.

Mr. Howard: Thank you very much.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.32 p.m.

APPENDIX

PUBLIC SERVICE—REPLY OF PRIME MINISTER TO FEDERAL SUPERANNUATES NATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Ottawa, November 10, 1964.

Mr. Fred W. Whitehouse,
National Secretary-Treasurer,
Federal Superannuates National
Association,
2696 MacDonald Drive,
Victoria, B.C.

Dear Mr. Whitehouse:

My colleagues and I have studied the brief which you left with me on October 27 when we had a discussion concerning your proposal to adjust the pensions paid to superannuated civil servants.

After reviewing the principles involved in your proposal as well as the facts which you have cited, we have come to the conclusion that any steps which the government should propose to parliament to alleviate difficulties faced by retired persons should be general in character and not confined to former employees of the government of Canada. I am sure that your association will recognize on reflection that there have been a number of general actions taken which have benefitted members of your association as well as other retired people in Canada; the main ones, of course, have been the increases in the old age security pensions. Already those over 70 will have received benefits increased by $240 per year per pensioner over the level that pertained at the time the Public Service Pension Adjustment Act was passed in 1958. In addition, there have been corresponding increases in old age assistance for those who require it between the ages of 65 and 70, as well as other measures taken by the provinces to meet the situation of those in need. In addition to this, hospital insurance has become available to retired persons on a national basis since that time. Since retired people constitute a high-cost group under such insurance, the establishment of hospital insurance programs is of quite substantial help to them.

Under the provisions of the Canada pension plan bill which has just been made public the amount of the old age security pension available to all Canadians meeting the residence qualifications will be adjusted to take into account changes in the cost of living. Consequently, when this bill is enacted by parliament members of your association will be able to rely upon the real value of their old age security pension being maintained.

The government believes that it would be unfair to the great majority of retired Canadians who have not worked for the government to make special provision to protect the former employees of the government of Canada itself against increases in living costs. Pensions paid to former government employees under the Superannuation Act or under other similar acts must be looked upon basically as part of the remuneration received by these employees for the services they rendered when they were employed. They are not payments based upon need, nor should they be regarded as payments that are subject to increase on compassionate grounds. To make them such would be to favour this minority of retired people by comparison with the majority of other retired Canadians who cannot expect such treatment either from the government as such or from employers for whom they had worked in the past. In this sense, to accede to the requests of your association would constitute a form of discrimination against the majority.

It is with real regret that I send you a decision which I know will be disappointing to you and to the members of your association, but I feel it would be unfair to them to leave the situation uncertain once the government had reviewed the principles involved in your proposal and come to the reluctant conclusion that it could not accept them.

Yours sincerely,

L. B. Pearson.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, November 13, 1964

The house met at 11 a.m.

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF JOINT ADDRESS OF SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that a message has been received from Her Majesty the Queen, signed by her own hand, which reads as follows:

I have received with heartfelt pleasure the joint address which the Senate and the House of Commons of Canada have sent me.

It has been a source of profound satisfaction to me and to my husband to be in Canada during the centennial celebrations of the first meetings of the Fathers of Confederation at Charlottetown and Quebec city.

We both deeply appreciate the kind and loyal sentiments which you have expressed and we send you our sincere good wishes.

Elizabeth R.

NATIONAL PARKS

JASPER—TABLING OF REPORT ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table two copies of the report on the urban development plan for Jasper, Alberta.

WATER RESOURCES

ELLIOT LAKE, ONT.—REPORTED RADIOACTIVE POLLUTION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George C. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister about a matter in which I am sure he has more than an academic interest. According to news reports this morning there has been extensive pollution of the waters in and around Elliot lake, and I am wondering whether this matter has been a subject of study by the branch of the government of Canada which has the responsibility for dealing with radioactivity, or is this a matter which is entirely in the hands of the water resources commission of the province? What report has the government received in this regard?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the matter to which my hon. friend refers is, of course, one under provincial jurisdiction; but as soon as I read the report and, indeed, as soon as I heard about this possibility last night I got in touch with the officials of the federal government concerned and we are examining what can be done to co-operate with the provincial government if such co-operation is required.

But, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call your attention to the headline of the story that appeared this morning: "Elliot Lake Contaminated by Radioactive Mine Waste". I regret that headline greatly, because it is misleading and can do very serious damage, as can the story itself if it is misinterpreted, to a community which has already suffered a great deal of misfortune and whose people are struggling to establish a new future for the community. I say this because the waters involved—the story itself shows this and that the headline is misleading—are not Elliot lake at all, that being the lake on which the community is situated, but Quirke lake and the Serpent river watershed; and Quirke lake is not connected with Elliot lake at all.

So while the matter must be taken seriously and investigated because of the story, I would hope it could be made clear that Elliot lake as such is not involved. I would also call attention to the statement of the premier of Ontario in commenting on this matter yesterday to the effect that he was satisfied there was no danger. However, I myself am getting in touch with Mr. Robarts personally to make sure the matter is looked into.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the mining and sale of uranium is controlled by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, and in view of the fact that Atomic Energy of Canada Limited has most of the knowledge with reference to the disposal of uranium waste, does the Prime Minister not think the federal government has some responsibility for making sure that this waste is properly disposed of? Second, may I ask the Prime Minister if there are any other cases across Canada that have been kept under wraps, as this one apparently has been for some two years?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the statement that this matter has been kept under wraps in any wrong sense at all. I have admitted, of course, that the federal government has a responsibility in these matters, but as I have said the jurisdiction is primarily provincial. I accept that responsibility, naturally, and I am in touch with the atomic energy authorities and we will be in touch with the provincial government. What I am anxious to remove is the wrong impression conveyed by the headline that Elliot lake itself is involved in any way, shape or form, because it is not connected with the lake where the radioactive material has been deposited. I would also point out that while there were 11 uranium mines in operation in this area some time ago, which undoubtedly constituted a problem and one that was recognized at the time, there is only one mine in operation now.

Mr. Douglas: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am concerned not only about Elliot lake but as to what extent this condition may be prevalent across Canada. Is it the intention of the government to work out with the provincial governments adequate supervision of the disposal of waste from the processing of uranium?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I have already stated that as soon as I heard of the report I made inquiries. As a result of those inquiries I hope to be able to make a full statement at the earliest possible date. I appreciate the importance of this matter and that the fears of my hon. friend and others must be removed. Perhaps the statement I will be able to make will in itself help to remove some of those fears that have arisen in regard to this matter.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Prime Minister consider conveying, on behalf of the members of the house, congratulations to the public health officer who pursued his investigation of this matter against the reported objections of the mine management involved?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, it would be quite wrong to do that until I have got all the information, because the only information we have now is the story in the newspaper which is being investigated.

[Mr. Douglas.]

PENSIONS

CANADA PLAN—CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES ON COST OF LIVING TIE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): In the absence of the Minister of National Health and Welfare perhaps I could direct my question to the Prime Minister. Can he advise the house whether any of the provinces were consulted prior to the announcement by the Minister of National Health and Welfare that the general pension scheme would be tied to the cost of living index? Further, was any consideration given to the effect this would have on the general welfare programs across the country?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Not to my knowledge. Matters concerning old age security are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the federal government, and just as the raising of the old age security pension by $10 last year was done by the federal government, so this particular change was within the responsibility of the federal government. I doubt if there was consultation or if consultation would be required, unless we had the same kind of consultation with the provinces when they took action on those matters which are within their jurisdiction.

[*Later:*]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister in connection with the question asked by the hon. member for Edmonton West, which the Prime Minister answered. This deals with the subject of old age pensions and the statement made by Premier Robarts. Do I understand from the right hon. gentleman's answer that the government now takes the position that the federal government has exclusive jurisdiction over matters of old age security and pensions?

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker. I think my answer was quite clear. In matters of this kind, where the federal government has to take responsibility for making a decision, that responsibility is not always discharged only after consultation with the provinces. Otherwise the decisions might be delayed for a long time, because consultation with one province would necessitate consultation with all provinces. That does not mean there is not always continuous consultation with the provinces on economic matters, including pension matters.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

ROYAL COMMISSION REPORT—INQUIRY AS TO CONFERENCE WITH PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): I should like to direct a question to the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Now that the government has decided to meet with the medical representatives regarding the Hall commission report, will they announce a date for a conference with the provinces?

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): I will be happy to take the question as notice and bring it to the attention of the minister in order that there can be a reply at the beginning of the week.

PRIVILEGE

MR. LESSARD—REPLY OF AGRICULTURE MINISTER RESPECTING DAIRY POLICY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to draw the attention of the house to an answer given to me yesterday by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays) after the question I put to him on this new policy with regard to the dairy industry.

As recorded on page 9996 of *Hansard*, he answered as follows:

[*Text*]

I would be glad to make the announcement just as soon as we have one.

This is a clear implication that there is no policy as such, but the French version does not say the same thing at all.

[*Translation*]

Whereas the answer is as follows, as reported on page 10184 of the French edition of *Hansard*:

Je ferai volontiers l'annonce en question dès que nous y serons autorisés.

There is a marked difference here. I wanted to point this out to the house in order that the correction might be made in *Hansard*. I do not suggest that the minister changed anything, since the English version is precisely what was said in the house. I believe the mistake was made when the text was translated from English into French, since the minister did reply that he had no policy at present with regard to the dairy industry.

[*Text*]

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): I am prepared to accept the French version, Mr. Speaker.

IMMIGRATION

TORONTO—STATUS OF PERSONS CONCERNED WITH NEWSPAPER STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): I should like to ask the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration if he has an answer as yet to the question I posed yesterday regarding the I.T.U. strike in Toronto.

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the persons concerned were requested to leave Canada after the minister's statement on October 26. The majority have left and the persons remaining, three in number, have been allowed until the end of this week to effect departure. In the event of their failure to leave by that time the provision of the Immigration Act respecting special inquiries and deportation if necessary will be invoked.

REFUSAL OF ENTRY TO UNITED STATES AUTHOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration a question of which I have given him notice. It relates to a story in the Toronto *Telegram* of Wednesday entitled "U.S. author thrown out of Canada". The article alleges a great deal of authoritarian conduct on the part of immigration authorities in rejecting this visitor because of a conviction which he had 25 years ago. In view of his threat to go on United States television programs and make quite an issue out of this, I wonder whether the minister could make a statement to the house giving us some facts about the matter.

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the facts in the case of Mr. Sands are as follows. He applied for temporary admission to Canada at the international airport, Malton, in the evening of November 10 in order to be interviewed for a C.B.C. program and in connection with the promotion in Canada of his autobiography.

No advance arrangements had been made with the Canadian immigration authorities. The questions regarding his appearance on television in the United States and his authorship of a book were designed to establish his identity. Mr. Sands admitted that he had been convicted of a crime and had served a prison sentence in the United States. This placed him within the category of persons prohibited by statute from admission to Canada. His deportation was ordered on those grounds.

Mr. Sands was informed of his right to enter an appeal against the order for deportation but declined to do so. He asked to be allowed to return to the United States that evening if possible; ordinarily he would have been accommodated in a hotel near the airport overnight and departure would have been made the next day. The C.B.C. and his publisher in Toronto were aware of the circumstances, and he was visited by the latter's representative. By no means was he held incommunicado. A flight to Cleveland was available later in the evening, and he elected to return to the United States on that flight. Should any request be received from Mr. Sands for admission to Canada the department would be prepared to consider making special arrangements for his temporary entry under a minister's permit.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

QUEBEC—INQUIRY AS TO REPORT ON TERRORIST ACTIVITIES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice.

Did he receive a report from the R.C.M.P. concerning the dynamiting of the automobile of the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, and can he tell the house if the said report establishes a link between this criminal and the one who dynamited a railway line in my riding with a view to making an attempt on the life of the former prime minister who is now the leader of the official opposition?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received any report on this matter, but inasmuch as additional facts have been brought to my attention I shall inquire further into this affair.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question in a humorous vein.

[Mr. Badanai.]

Does the Minister of Justice intend to order the R.C.M.P. to guard the residence, the automobile and the family of the member for Villeneuve, who is an avowed monarchist?

[*Text*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

REPORT ON POLICE ACTIVITIES DURING ROYAL VISIT TO QUEBEC

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the minister has yet received a report from the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. regarding the activities of the police in general in Quebec city on the occasion of Her Majesty's visit? Some time ago the minister indicated that he expected such a report. Has he received it, and does he intend to make it public?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): I have not yet received such a report, and when it is received a decision on whether to make it public will be made at that time.

DISCIPLINARY MEASURES RESPECTING APPLICATION OF FUNDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Justice. The minister will recall that on July 17, 21, 24 and 27 I put certain questions to him with respect to the trial, conviction and appeal of two mounted police officers in Montreal with respect to the misuse of government funds. I understand that the appeal has now been dismissed, and I wish to ask whether the minister can inform the house if he has received any recommendation from the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. on the dismissal of these two officers, and whether that recommendation has been acted upon?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, there are two disciplinary cases in respect of which I am still receiving representations and which therefore are still presently before me for consideration. All steps are being taken which are necessarily inherent in a full consideration of such cases, and it would be quite inappropriate for me to say anything more about the matter at the present time. At the proper stage I shall make an appropriate announcement about it.

Mr. Nielsen: As a supplementary question, since news reports would seem to indicate

that the two officers concerned are Chief Superintendent Belec and Sub Inspector Poitras, and since these news reports seem to carry a good many other details about the case, could the minister give the same type of information to the house, in particular whether he has received a recommendation from the commissioner urging the dismissal of the two officers concerned? If so, when was that report received and has it yet been acted upon?

Mr. Favreau: With respect to the merits of the matter, I must stand by the answer I have just given. With respect to the news reports to which the hon. member for Yukon has referred, if he cares to send them to me I should consider it my duty to look into the matter.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a further question to the Minister of Justice. The minister will recall that last night in his office I did discuss with him this matter of the previous question I asked. Is it still his intention to report fully to the house with respect to all the circumstances surrounding the trial, conviction, appeal and dismissal of the two R.C.M.P. officers concerned?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I should think this supplementary question is fully covered by the answer I have given. When the hon. member reads my answer he will notice I said that at the appropriate time I would make a statement on the matter.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVITATION TO GENERAL DE GAULLE TO VISIT CANADA

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister.

Can he tell the house whether the invitation of General de Gaulle to Canada, as expressed by the premier of the province of Quebec, represents the views of the Canadian government?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen a report of the invitation in question, but if it was made by the premier of the province of Quebec I am sure all Canadians would be very glad if President de Gaulle were able to accept it. As a matter of fact, when I was in Paris some months ago in January, I extended the same invitation myself.

CYPRUS—RATES OF PAY OF PEACE KEEPING TROOPS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In light of reports of concern and some dissatisfaction with the difference in rates of pay between our Canadian troops in Cyprus and those paid by the United Nations, who are reported to be paid almost three times as much as the Canadian troops, has Canada made any representations to the United Nations in this regard in view of the fact that Canada does pay its contributions to the United Nations and then sees United Nations troops paid three times as much as our own troops, who are self-sufficient?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this is a complicated question which I do not think lends itself to reply on orders of the day. When my estimates are up I will be glad to deal with it.

UNITED NATIONS

CANADIAN PROPOSAL FOR SOLUTION OF FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Could he inform us officially of the proposal Canada advanced at the United Nations in an attempt to resolve the non-payment of dues or assessments problem that exists, and would he also advise the house of the reaction to that proposal?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the initiative taken by the Canadian representatives at the United Nations yesterday had to do with an announcement by the government of the United States that until such time as the financial problem in the United Nations was resolved it would not agree to pledge its contribution, which represents 40 per cent of the total amount, to the United Nations voluntary assistance programs.

The government of Canada has indicated to the government of the United States that it did not take the same view of the relationship between this conference and the defaulting position of certain members of the

United Nations. We suggested therefore that the conference be postponed so that further consideration could be given to the whole question. However, it was not possible to obtain general agreement, and the meeting is taking place on Monday next.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Can the minister advise us whether what took place yesterday was the only Canadian initiative toward resolving the financial problems of the United Nations, or may we look for another?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Any idea which the Canadian government may have as to how this problem may be resolved is, of course, a matter for negotiation. Such negotiations are now under way. The problem yesterday had to do with the request by the secretary general for commitments by contributors to the voluntary assistance programs of the United Nations.

SHIPPING

REQUEST FOR INCREASE IN SUBSIDY ON WOODEN VESSEL CONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. What action does the minister intend to take on the proposals set forth in the brief from the maritime lumber board requesting that subsidy payments toward the capital construction costs of wooden vessels be increased to equal those paid in respect of the construction of steel vessels?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I intend to see that the proposal is very fully considered.

PIPE LINES

REPORTED INTENTION OF TRANS-CANADA COMPANY TO BUILD LINE THROUGH U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): May I direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and ask him whether the government has considered a policy attitude with regard to the intention announced by Trans-Canada Pipe Lines to construct a line from western to eastern Canada through the United States.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Trans-Canada Pipe Lines, as the hon. gentleman knows, has declared its intention to apply to the national energy board

in Canada and to the appropriate authorities in the United States for the necessary authority to construct this line. This is the proper procedure, and I do not think it would be proper for me to express an opinion on the merits of the case at the present time.

Mr. Fisher: Would the minister indicate whether the government is considering the question from the viewpoint that the Canadian line at the present time is running to capacity, and there is certainly much doubt and questioning in parts of Canada through which the present line runs about the intention to build through the United States.

Mr. Sharp: The national energy board is charged by parliament with the responsibility for hearing applications of this kind and for making its recommendations, and I do not think it would be appropriate for me to say more than that at the present time.

NATIONAL PARKS

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF REGULATIONS RESPECTING ZONING AND BUILDING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): My question is directed to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. Yesterday the hon. gentleman agreed, I believe, to table certain orders in council or regulations rescinding orders in council governing parts of Banff park. Has he filed or tabled those documents today in the house?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): I thought I had convinced the hon. gentleman last night that no order in council has been passed. I told him also that decisions which have been taken with respect to permits granted there have been strictly in accordance with the recommendations of the Oberlander report and that action would be validated by order in council later.

Mr. Woolliams: In other words the minister said there were licences or permits issued but there is no law permitting those same licences to be issued.

Mr. Laing: We have no intention of waiting for three years as the previous government did in this respect.

Mr. Woolliams: That is no answer.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TO DEAL WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

Considering that the figures released yesterday by the dominion bureau of statistics show that unemployment increased considerably during the month of October, have the Prime Minister and his cabinet decided to take concrete steps to check this situation which could become serious next winter?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The rise to which the hon. member refers has been made public, but I would point out that though unemployment in October represented 3.7 per cent of the labour force as compared with 3.1 per cent in September, the figure in October one year ago was 3.9 per cent, and it was considerably higher in the years before that. While we regret, of course, any rise in unemployment, measures are being taken every day by the government to ensure that maximum employment is created.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance.

Since the minister held the 11 per cent tax on building materials which he established last year responsible for the improvement of economic conditions in Canada, does he intend to propose other measures of what nature to reduce unemployment?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend will undoubtedly have read the report and the reasons for this unfortunate increase in unemployment in the month of October, so he will know that it was largely due to lay-offs in the automobile industry occasioned by labour disputes, difficulties and disruptions in the United States.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance who has just drawn the attention of the house to a report which had already been published, to the effect that the rise in unemployment was due to a strike in the automobile industry, that is at General Motors in the United States.

Now a strike is on at the Ford Motor Company. May we expect another wave of unemployment in the automobile industry as a result of the strike at the Ford Motor Company in the United States and, in this connection, will the minister decide to take necessary steps to show that the Canadian automobile industries are really Canadian and independent?

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to make a broad generalization of that kind, but if the hon. member has anything specific in mind which he would like to suggest to me in order to accomplish that objective, I would be very glad to see him afterward.

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. A few moments ago he mentioned measures which the government is taking to overcome unemployment. I wonder whether he could inform the house of the nature of some of those measures.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, if I inform the house of some I should inform the house of all, and that would take the rest of the morning.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): All I ask is for one or two.

[*Translation*]

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

In view of the fact that the Prime Minister mentioned that he would make a statement concerning steps to be taken by the government to alleviate unemployment and that it would take all morning to make that statement, could the right hon. Prime Minister tell us when he will be making that statement and when will those steps be taken?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Every time I make a speech I give an indication of what is being done, as do my colleagues. At present I am heavily engaged in preparing a report for my own information on all the measures which have been taken by the government concerning unemployment. I would be very glad to send a copy of that to my hon. friend.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there might not have been a failure in the interpretation system, but that is not an answer to the question I put to the Prime Minister.

I asked him when he would announce what steps he intends to take, not the ones which have been taken already, with a view to remedying the unemployment situation?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pearson: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, if I misinterpreted my hon. friend's question. Any new measures, of course, will be matters of government policy and will be announced as we go along.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: May I put a supplementary question to the Prime Minister?

Could the Prime Minister be a bit more specific? I feel that his statement is rather vague, while the increase in unemployment is far from being vague, in fact it is a concrete thing, and I feel—

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I had grave doubts that the original question was in order, but with a view to getting on with our business the Prime Minister did reply. I do not think it is reasonable at this time to expect any further illumination.

TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR RETURN OF RAILWAY STOCK CARS TO WESTERN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, last Monday the Minister of Agriculture undertook to make representations to the railway companies to see whether there was anything which could be done to expedite the return of livestock cars to the market places in western Canada. I should like to ask him now what was the response from the railway companies to his request, and also whether there are now sufficient cars in the market places of western Canada to move feeder livestock as they come in.

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to give the hon. member a report, but I have not yet seen the report since the inquiry was made.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR MEETING RESPECTING HASTINGS-PRINCE EDWARD REGIMENT

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 National Defence, and ask whether he would be willing to arrange an early meeting with a committee representing the Hastings-Prince Edward regiment.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I would entertain a suggestion for a possible meeting, but in all fairness to my hon. friend I would discourage him from arranging such a meeting if it is to take place on the basis that there would be a change in the decisions which have been announced.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON ATLANTIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Transport relating to the Atlantic development board. In view of the fact that the $100 million fund made available to that board is being rapidly depleted, can the minister inform the house when we can expect a statement from the government as to the future of this very important board?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, that would be a very good subject for discussion when my estimates come up for consideration.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

GALLERY OF PORTRAITS OF BRITISH PRIME MINISTERS

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 Public Works, but in his absence perhaps I should direct it to the Prime Minister. In view of the impending visit of Prime Minister Wilson, will the minister ensure that the gallery of British prime ministers in the sixth floor corridor is brought up to date before that event?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we must always keep up to date on this matter of prime ministerial pictures if we possibly can. I had notice of this

question, for which I thank the hon. member, and I can inform him that I have consulted His Honour the Speaker, who has informed me that the two pictures in question are under order and expected to be received shortly.

REDISTRIBUTION

PROVISION FOR BOUNDARIES COMMISSIONS AND READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION

The house resumed, from Thursday, November 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-72, to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions to report upon the readjustment of the representation of the provinces in the House of Commons and to provide for the readjustment of such representation in accordance therewith—Mr. Pickersgill (for Mr. Pearson)—Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

The Chairman: When the committee rose last evening we were considering clause 13 and the amendment proposed thereto by the hon. member for Bow River.

On clause 13—*Rules to be applied in preparing report.*

Mr. Pascoe: Mr. Chairman, when I rose last night just before the ten o'clock adjournment I did so because I considered that the last debatable clause of Bill No. C-72 was going through the committee stage too quickly. There are problems raised by this whole bill which should be brought out as fully as possible before the bill is finally passed.

I indicated last evening that I wanted to make several brief remarks on clause 13. Had I been granted a few extra minutes last night I am sure I could have completed my remarks, which are of interest to all rural constituencies and of particular concern to the province of Saskatchewan. I intended to speak earlier during our consideration of clause 12 in regard to the threatened loss of four federal seats.

Under clause 12 the number of representative members for a province in the House of Commons is subject and according to provisions of section 51 of the British North America Act and the rules therein. In this clause 12 of the bill there is no provision for special consideration for special areas.

The Chairman: I should like to remind the hon. member that clause 12 of the bill has been passed by the committee and we are now considering clause 13.

Mr. Pascoe: I understand that, Mr. Chairman. I was just suggesting that there was no mention in clause 12 of the bill about special consideration for special areas, and that is why I am making my remarks on clause 13 where there is provision for special consideration. I realize that the tolerance referred to in this section has regard to the population totals in particular constituencies, and I should like to base my remarks on this phase of the situation.

I consider the arguments which I intend to use about tolerances for individual constituencies are also applicable to provincial representation, and I should like to make one reference in this regard to the fact that we are considering constitutional changes. Under the proposed formula the provinces will have to be consulted about the number of seats in the House of Commons allocated to them. Because of that fact there should not be any drastic changes made now in respect of provincial representation.

To get back to a consideration of clause 13, the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bow River suggests a tolerance of 25 per cent in the electoral quota for constituencies in the provinces. I am prepared to support the amendment in its general application, providing the commissions in particular provinces have the recognized right to exceed this tolerance in special cases as mentioned in paragraphs (i) and (ii) of subclause (b) of clause 13. These two paragraphs relate to special geographic considerations and special community interests. It is in this regard that I wished to speak last evening, because there should not be an absolute tolerance limit of 25 per cent in respect of every special geographic consideration or special community interest. In other words, I cannot subscribe to the wording of clause 13 which says that in no case shall the allowable tolerance be more than 25 per cent. There must be special consideration in special cases.

Mr. Chairman, now that we have more time available than was available last night I intend to speak at greater length. I should like to answer some of the questions posed by previous speakers to the effect that there should be a great deal more representation of cities in the next parliament with less representation of rural areas. I do not speak for Saskatchewan alone, but for all rural areas of Canada. An editorial which appeared in the *Financial Post* of April 31, 1963 must also be answered. Part of the editorial stated:

> At the best of times, because of an old custom that has no rational defence, Canada's rural voters

have too many M.P.'s, its urban voters too few. By tradition, two persons living in the country have about the same political power as three in the city.

The editorial also commented on the 1952 redistribution which it said "gives the agricultural and small town minority roughly the same weight as the industrial majority". These are the kind of arguments we have been hearing from city interests, the contention being that representation in parliament should be strictly on a population basis.

The hon. member for Danforth, in an earlier speech advocating strict adherence to population figures in constituency redistribution, said:

There should be the lowest possible variation in population figures in order to abolish finally the rural tyranny that has dominated this parliament for decades.

I realize, of course, that he was speaking for urban constituents just as I am asking for equitable treatment for rural constituents. As others have pointed out large cities have other effective means of representation in addition to representation in parliament. Each city has a mayor and council, an active chamber of commerce, a labour council and professional associations to help look after its citizens. City residents have somewhat uniform interests and problems and, as I said earlier, they live in a compact community and can present their views by means of small or large delegations or meetings.

Rural residents have diverse interests, and they are scattered over large areas. They do not have the same contact with or representation by chambers of commerce or other citizens' groups. It is more difficult for them to meet with their member of parliament or for him to contact them. In this connection I should like to refer to the 1964-65 statement of policy by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, page 69. With regard to the redistribution of federal constituencies, paragraph 291 of their statement of policy reads in part as follows:

There should be factors other than population used in determining equitable representation.

That is the point I am trying to emphasize here. I contend that the agricultural and small town portion of our population should have roughly the same weight in parliament as the urban population. There are others in the house who support this view, including the Liberal member for Renfrew South, who spoke out against his own party's apparent indifference to fair rural representation. I should like to quote a couple of his statements in this regard. As found on page 859 of *Hansard* for March 12, 1964 he said:

Might I point out, Mr. Speaker, that representation by population is one of those pat cliches which makes a nice sound.

He went on to say:

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that merely to cry representation by population without recognizing the factors extant in our constitution, and without taking a very careful look at geographical, social and economic conditions as they exist in Canada today, is but a hollow, empty and futile cry.

He also said:

I suggest that the tolerance clause will merely give a wider latitude, a greater discretion to those gentlemen who form the commission to do those things that are best, in the interests of providing the best possible representation in the various areas of Canada.

I agree with the hon. member for Renfrew South. Clearly defined regions or sections of Canada with common interests should have a fair share of spokesmen in parliament. This may be straying from the question of constituency tolerances, Mr. Chairman, but I think western Canada should have representation in parliament equal to Ontario or Quebec. With regard to the question of city and country representation there was a statement by an earlier speaker that he had one of those tightly knit city constituencies. That statement outlines very clearly why there is need to work out some form of equitable adjustment in the population formula as between compact urban constituencies and huge rural ridings.

I have a map here, Mr. Chairman. I cannot file it, but it shows the distribution of population according to the last census. It indicates that the population is concentrated particularly in two very small areas of the whole of Canada. The point I am trying to make on this question of tolerance is that there should be some better system of providing equitable representation in the house. Population should not be the only basis for redistribution.

As I said earlier, I am speaking in general terms for all areas of Canada, not just for Saskatchewan. But I want to point out again that the arguments I am using for special tolerances and special consideration for rural ridings apply equally as forcefully to predominantly rural provinces. In the 1952 redistribution bill there was a special provision that the province of Saskatchewan should only lose a certain percentage of its representation. There are senatorial floors for New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and I

think there should be some way of making the tolerances in section 13 apply to areas. I believe the Minister of Transport recognized this himself at an earlier stage in the discussion of the bill when he proposed four commissions, one for Ontario, one for Quebec, one for the maritimes and one for the western provinces.

In the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* of December 11, 1963 there is this statement:

> It seems inevitable that future parliaments will be dominated by members from heavily populated urban centres and the voice of the farmer will be lost in the tall grass.

I contend again, Mr. Chairman, that the voices of the farmers and of the residents of towns and villages must not be lost. Parliament should make it very clear, by definitely established rules and regulations for redistribution, that rural ridings must receive fair consideration. In an article in *Weekend Magazine* for November 29, 1963 Robert McKeown stated:

> Much more is involved here than simply drawing squares on the map to equalize the population of the ridings. The commissioners will have to take into consideration a number of racial, religious, geographic and other factors in deciding where to put the boundary lines. Parliament will have to give the commission strict instructions on these matters if it is to avoid stirring up hornets' nests of opposition.

Again on the question of tolerances I should like to refer to an editorial in the *Family Herald* of September 26, 1963, which reads in part as follows:

> The legislation to initiate redistribution of Canada's electoral ridings will widen the rift between rural and urban representation, as has no other similar legislation in this country's history. As in 1952 when a city-bound population movement had already begun to take its toll of rural seats, Saskatchewan will again be the focal point of this conflict. But unlike 1952 the problem of a declining rural population, as opposed to an exploding city population, will make itself felt not only in the allocation of seats among the provinces, but also in the shift of seats within provinces. The combination of these two forces will seriously affect the farm vote.

I have taken the time of this committee, Mr. Chairman, by the indirect method of referring to tolerances for individual constituencies, to emphasize the special considerations that should be given to provincial representation as a whole while amendments in this regard may be coming forward under constitutional changes. We should try to maintain the status quo to as great a degree as possible until provincial representation has been decided by the dominion-provincial constitutional conference.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready to vote on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Bow River?

Amendment (Mr. Woolliams) agreed to: Yeas, 60; nays, 11.

Mr. Moreau: I have a further amendment to clause 13, Mr. Chairman, to which I referred briefly last night. The principle I should like to introduce into the bill is the relative rate of growth of a constituency. I do not feel this should be interpreted as necessarily a rural-urban issue. I think, primarily, what I should like to aim at would be perhaps a city riding as against a suburban riding that is growing very rapidly while the centre of the city is shrinking in population. I feel that particularly in a riding like York-Scarborough, and there are many of this type in Canada, the 1961 census figures are already very much out of date. I realize it is very difficult to forecast the projected growth, but by the time redistribution is completed the population of these ridings would exceed the tolerance that we have in mind when we use the 1961 census figures.

I do not want to get into a long debate on how we determine the rate of growth. I should like to feel that we can rely on the discretion of the commissioners to apply common sense in a situation of this sort. I feel that if we had the principle indicated in this clause of the bill the commissioners could then use their common sense in applying it to the 1961 census figures in a riding like York-Scarborough. It might be that in these suburban type ridings they would use the tolerance on the down side to accommodate a situation which already exists or is certainly going to exist within the next year or two.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move:

> That clause 13 be amended by striking out lines 34 and 35 on page 4 and substituting therefor:
>
> "special geographic considerations including in particular the sparsity-density or relative rate of growth."

The Chairman: Is the committee prepared to vote on the amendment?

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, members of this party have already indicated that we are in support of this principle and I think this amendment will meet the views of the house generally. It strikes me, however, that the commissioners might like to know just what we mean. I appreciate the point made by the hon. member for York-Scarborough when he said he did not want to get into too much detail, but when the phrase "relative rate of

growth" is used, what basis does one have in mind?

Perhaps I might shorten my remarks by putting what I have in mind in the form of a question, either to the member for York-Scarborough or perhaps, if he does not mind, to the minister. Does not the minister think, even if we do not write the complicated details into the statute, that there ought to be something in *Hansard* so the commissioners will know what parliament has in mind? Is it the rate of growth between 1951 and 1961, for which the official figures are available? Is it the rate of growth between 1961 and now or some other date, the figures for which are not official? What direction is it we are giving to the commissioners?

Mr. Moreau: I appreciate the point made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I think we can get into considerable controversy on what figures we are going to use. I suggest that one official and regularly available figure would be the interim census every five years. This may be used as a measure of growth and would be projected from 1956 to 1961, for instance, which would be a factor. This is an official census taken by the federal government, and I feel it could be very valuable.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder if I might say a word. I indicated last night that I would support the hon. member's motion if he made it, and indeed that it would make it much easier for me to support the 25 per cent tolerance. I would remind hon. members of the committee that the hard, governing fact is the 25 per cent tolerance which the committee has just adopted.

These special geographic considerations are merely indications to the commissions of what was in the minds of hon. members here. "Sparsity" and "density" are just as relative terms as "rate of growth". They are the kind of things found in the preamble to a bill. They are an indication of the kind of considerations that ought to be taken into account in using the tolerance, and that is all.

The tolerance is the only hard rule in this clause. No matter what the rate of growth might be, the commissions cannot go above or below the 25 per cent tolerance. If I were a commissioner this would indicate to me that in a constituency which seems to have a relatively static population and looks as though it would continue to have that, I could not make any particular allowance unless it was such a huge constituency that because of the tremendous area covered there should be a tolerance on the low side so far as population is concerned.

As the hon. member for Comox-Alberni pointed out, the rate of growth is not purely urban growth around metropolitan areas. Some of the fastest growing constituencies are like his and the constituency of my hon. friend the member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador where, because of the phenomenal growth of the woods industry in recent years, there has been a large increase in population and the appearance of whole new towns. These are practical considerations that I imagine would influence the commissioners, but this cannot be regarded as anything more. "Considerations" is the main word, and I suspect commissions would take these into account even if this were not included in the bill.

I also suspect they would take into account sparsity and density, but so far as the legal effect of this is concerned I do not believe it would make any difference if we just said the tolerance was to be 25 per cent and added nothing more, because that is the only mandatory part. That is the only part on which a commission can break the law if it creates a constituency larger than 25 per cent above or 25 per cent below the norm.

Mr. Barnett: To make sure my understanding of this point is the same as the minister's may I point out that you might have a situation where, according to the official census figures, the population of a constituency is shown to be 10 per cent below the norm, whereas in actual fact at the time of redistribution its population is 10 per cent above the norm.

Mr. Pickersgill: I can only say that if I were a commissioner that is the kind of consideration I would take into account.

Mr. Woolliams: Although I cannot think of any at the moment, I take it that if there were other circumstances than those outlined a commission could look at them also?

Mr. Pickersgill: I can think of one very special consideration. I tend to think about the place where I was brought up, Manitoba, which has four corners. There is one constituency all across the north but there are three areas where the tolerance would almost certainly become a factor. How big a factor I do not know, but two of the southern corners are also sparsely populated areas and the constituencies cannot run into Saskatchewan, northern Ontario or the Northwest Territories, at least not until Manitoba

annexes the latter and apparently it is not seeking to emulate some other provinces.

Mr. Fisher: I wonder whether the minister and the hon. member for York-Scarborough have considered that under clause 25 and other clauses where we provide for members of parliament making protests to the House of Commons about reports and decisions, we almost force the group of members of parliament who will protest to base their objections on a referral back to clause 13 in order to justify them. Probably I am anticipating more trouble than is likely to ensue but it seems to me, particularly at the first shot, that it will be fairly easy to get one third of the members from a province to make some objections.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder if the hon. gentleman recalls the amendment passed the other evening. I think he is basing his contention on the original bill and not on the amendment.

Mr. Fisher: I am still for the amendment, but it would be fairly easy to get ten members to object. The present amendment gives one more reasons for making objections. Ordinarily whatever we may say about what becomes the law does not really matter a damn. We have encountered that many times, particularly with reference to sections of the Railway Act. One can go back and read the debates and note what members thought those sections meant, but by the time the courts got through interpreting them they did not come out the same way at all. This is an unusual statute in that it is going to give members of parliament the possibility of practising delaying tactics and interpretation tactics. Has the minister considered what this amendment dealing with the rate of growth can lead to? It is really nebulous, and almost any member of parliament could hinge an argument on it and thus raise an objection. Given the fact that objections are likely to be certain, this is a small point, but the minister should consider it.

Dealing with this clause and the bill generally may I say I gathered, particularly from listening to the hon. member for Moose Jaw-Lake Centre, that some members and some of the people who are commenting on redistribution have not yet grasped the enormity of it all. There is just not going to be the same pattern in Canada again.

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. member permit a question? Would he not expedite the passage of the bill by saving that part of his speech for his next article after we have adopted this clause?

Mr. Fisher: If I ever thought the minister would deign to read the article, I might consider it.

Mr. Woolliams: Oh, they are reading them.

Mr. Fisher: Perhaps they are, but I do not flatter myself. It is like rocking a boat in a lake without producing any ripples.

Mr. Knowles: After the fine commercial the minister gave you—

Mr. Fisher: Well, the minister is good at giving himself and the Liberal party commercials.

Mr. Woolliams: His estimates come up next.

Mr. Fisher: Whose estimates come up next?

An hon. Member: The C.B.C.

Mr. Fisher: I should not have these distractions. There is not a constituency in Canada, except for Prince Edward Island or Newfoundland, which will not be much changed; and I expect that anything we do here will only add to the complication. My hon. friend sitting next to me said he was looking at this density matter, and that some constituencies were more dense than others.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: Was he thinking of Port Arthur?

Mr. Fisher: No, he was thinking of Newfoundland. I merely wish to suggest to the minister that by this amendment, which I still intend to vote for, we may be creating a complication which will be remembered in a year or so when the protests against the new boundaries are mounting in this chamber.

Mr. Harkness: I am glad to see this amendment introduced. When I spoke on this bill some months ago in the earlier stage of its consideration I expressed the view that some account should be taken of population growth, that is the growth which had actually taken place since the census on which the redistribution was based.

There is no doubt in my mind that the absence of such a consideration at the time of the last redistribution in 1952 is one of the main reasons we have such an inequitable position at the present time as far as the suburban areas of our cities are concerned. Had any consideration been given to the known growth factor in those years we should

not be confronted with the problem of these enormous constituencies such as York-Scarborough. I believe that in many ways this is one of the most important provisions which could be written into the act in order to secure an equitable redistribution, and I am glad to see it impressed upon the minds of the commissioners as one of the factors to which consideration should be given in the determination of what the boundaries shall be.

Mr. Knowles: I have only a brief word to say. I wish mainly to thank the hon. member for York-Scarborough for giving his answer, at any rate, to the question I posed earlier. It seems to me that the Minister of Transport cannot write off these subclauses. My hon. friend from Port Arthur has made the point that the commissioners will in effect, have to justify any departures they may make by referring to the guide lines given to them by parliament. If we are giving them another guide line, namely the rate of population growth, we should surely be as clear as possible about our intentions. I will settle for not putting the detail into the statute, but the commissioners may well ask the question, what did parliament mean by this relative term "rate of growth"?

The hon. member for York-Scarborough answered the question when he said "You compare official sets of figures". I think it is good to have that on the record in *Hansard*; that this should be done not on the basis of guesswork but on the basis of official sets of figures. On that understanding I am prepared, as is everybody else, I believe, to support the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Macquarrie: There is another matter which arises with reference to clause 13. It has to do with the question of dual ridings of which there are two now in Canada; at one time there were a number of them.

It is noteworthy that down through the years the dual constituencies of Queens and Halifax have been retained. It is obvious that there were reasons, reasons considered good and sufficient, for the retention of these constituencies, whether they were sociological, historical or geographical. In Prince Edward Island at one time the reasoning was mathematical. One of the reasons our province was reluctant or, indeed, unwilling to enter confederation was the opposition put forward to its demand to be represented by six members. Sir John A. Macdonald asked why the province wanted six members. Why not five? The answer was "We must have six because we have three counties, and you cannot divide three into five". So, with exceptions only for very brief intervals, a dual constituency has been retained there.

It is not for me to prejudge whether there should be a dual riding retained in Prince Edward Island or in Halifax. But I am inclined to think that in the one I know best, in such a small province where the population is large but not dense, there will be no great gain from changing the well known boundaries of the constituencies. I do not want to prejudge the issue and I do not think this house should do so, or trammel the commission in its work. Perhaps the commissions, when set up, may decide it is unwise to have dual ridings in Prince Edward Island and Halifax. They could conceivably reach the conclusion that a better pattern of representation would follow from the establishment of a dual riding somewhere else in the country. But this is a matter for the commissions to look into. We expect good work from good commissions, and I believe it would be a mistake for this legislation to train its guns on two of the existing constituencies, to say that two of the constituencies must be altered and that the commissions shall have no choice, no scope at all to consider whether all the good and sufficient reasons which prompted the retention of these ridings still apply.

I would therefore ask—and surely this is not a controversial matter—that we reserve for the commissions the right to decide whether the existing dual ridings be retained or whether in fact the pattern of representation might be improved by establishing others. Perhaps the commissions will end by abolishing them all; perhaps they will not. But I would think it unfortunate if at this stage we were to legislate two existing ridings out of existence, and I wonder if this could not be prevented.

Mr. Pickersgill: Perhaps I could say a word about this matter. Since the hon. member for Halifax is unable to be in the chamber himself today, he made very strong representations to me along the lines of those the hon. member for Queens has just made to us.

I have been giving a lot of thought to this question and, like one of the questions I had to consider last evening, it is a difficult one. It is like one or two questions I considered last evening. There are arguments on both sides which are very strong, and if hon. members would be patient with me for a few moments

I should like to put them so we can consider both sides of the question.

It is quite true, as hon. members such as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who have been in the house for a long time, will recall, that at almost every redistribution the question of dividing Halifax and dividing Queens comes up, and in the end this is not done. At least the hon. gentleman said it was done long ago, but it has not been done for a long time. There is a certain pattern, and I think that is true in both places. Perhaps I am a little more familiar with the kind of considerations which were put to me so strongly and so recently by the hon. member for Halifax in connection with conventions in Halifax applying not merely in the federal field but in the municipal and provincial fields as well. I think all of us would be very reluctant to disturb considerations of this sort by general legislation unless there is a strong argument on the other side.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think there is a strong argument on the other side. It is much stronger in the case of Halifax than in the case of Queens, but I think it applies in both cases. In the case of Halifax, by itself Halifax county, not taking into account the relative rates of growth, would be almost entitled to three members. So if the law is to be followed there is no possibility anyway of retaining the historic constituency of Halifax; only part of that constituency could remain a dual riding. I certainly do not think we would want any triple ridings; at least I would not have thought it possible in legislation of this kind, which is not dealing with the election law but is dealing with redistribution, to seek to make an amendment of that kind to the election law. I think that would be an altogether bad thing to do.

In the case of Prince Edward Island I have not done the arithmetic—I have no doubt the hon. member has—but I have the impression that Kings county, even with a 25 per cent tolerance, would probably have too small a population to be a constituency. So the historic riding of Queens will not remain the historic riding of Queens if the law is carried out. I have not done the arithmetic, so if the hon. member says I am wrong I will accept that right off, but I think that is the case. Probably Prince county has too large a population for the existing tolerance having regard to what would be the norm for Prince Edward Island.

Since I had been warned about this matter I did have something drafted so that we could look at it, but before we decide whether we should move an amendment perhaps we should consider rather carefully whether, even if we did seek to do this, we would be carrying out what are the hon. gentleman's real intentions.

There is another consideration that is of some importance. I might say that the method suggested by the gentleman is the only method I would support at all. I would not be prepared to say to the commission that there must be dual ridings. All I would be prepared to say is that if they saw fit they could preserve them in these two cases only. That is the most I would vote for, though I am not saying that I would even want to vote for that.

Mr. Fisher: Is the minister going as far as saying that he would put this in the statute? Is that the suggestion?

Mr. Pickersgill: Well, it could not be done unless there were an amendment to this clause. If we leave the clause as it is now amended in this way, it will not be possible for any commission to establish a dual constituency anywhere. The only way this could be done, as the hon. member for Queens has indicated, is by moving an amendment to provide an exception. Well, it could be done in two ways. It could be made a general power of commissions all across Canada, although I would not be in favour of that at all. I do not think we want to introduce these things where they do not exist. I think the only way which could be justified would be by giving the commissions power to perpetuate as far as they legally could these two particular situations.

I am also a little troubled—and I am trying to be very frank and dispassionate—about delegating a legislative power of this kind to the commissions. It is one thing to tell them to draw the boundaries fairly, but I am wondering whether it would be quite right for parliament to tell these commissions that they might in these two cases, one in Prince Edward Island and one in Nova Scotia, if they saw fit, preserve their dual constituencies in the new boundaries which were drawn, one of which would be the heir, so to speak, of the present constituency of Halifax. It could not be the whole of the present constituency; that would be impossible. The same would be done for Queens.

I have sought, Mr. Chairman, to put the arguments on both sides. I appreciate that I am an import to a part of the country where history and traditions are perhaps cherished more than in other parts of the country.

It is a part of the country where one hates to upset old and established customs; at least, the kind of historically minded person that I happen to be hates to do this. I can understand the point of view of the hon. member for Queens very well. I confess to having a certain sympathy for his argument, but such logic as I possess does not seem to run in the same direction as my sympathies. However, I do not think, having said that, that I should say anything more because I am sure there are other hon. members who want to say a word on this matter.

Mr. Macquarrie: If I may just say a word, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. and learned minister has himself very well demonstrated the importance of having this matter considered by the commission. He has put forward arguments pro and arguments con, and that is all I would ask we arrange for. We certainly could not insist on making it mandatory for the commission that there be dual ridings; but I think in view of the sort of process through which the minister went a few moments ago without, as he admitted, having the figures, that the commission, with its experts and their figures, might look at this situation.

I am not going to burden other members of this committee with the details of the situation in Prince Edward Island, but it is obvious that there will only be four seats there. There are only 107,000 people in that province. I think it would be unfortunate if, before the commission moved into the constituency-drawing process in Prince Edward Island, we said to them—in effect this is what we would be doing—that no matter how logical it may appear to have a dual riding in the area surrounding the capital city, or perhaps some other urban population centre, this was not to be the case. I think it would be an unnecessary and unfortunate restriction upon the commission which will find, as all commissions will find in every province, some demographic problems when it gets to Prince Edward Island, where the population spread is not as mathematically neat as it might be for purposes of constituency drawing. So I say that we would improve the potential work of the commission by giving them the opportunity to study the situation, to peruse their figures and to do in detail what the minister has done himself so well during his discourse to us.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Chairman, I should like to say one or two words in this regard, and make it clear that there are four members of this committee, only two of us here today, who have a special concern in this matter. Because we are the only members of the house who represent dual ridings we are all very much aware of the special considerations and traditions that affect those ridings.

I think our general feeling and concern is that the committee is not being sufficiently careful if it passes the bill as it is, because by so doing it will make it mandatory for the commissions to eliminate dual ridings. I want it understood immediately that I have no thought that the commission should have the privilege of instituting dual ridings where none now exist, nor do I suggest that it should be mandatory that the present dual ridings be continued. I do think it would be reasonable, in light of the fact that these dual constituencies have survived every redistribution in this century, that the arguments pro and con in each case be carefully studied by the commissions in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

Personally, from a theoretical point of view I favour single constituencies, but I realize that in these special cases the general advantages of having single constituencies are outweighed by other considerations. Therefore I feel we should introduce an amendment at this time, and I think this is non-controversial, which would allow the commissions to look into the matter carefully. If they find it reasonable they should have the option to come up with single constituencies or, if they find heavy arguments in favour of the other side of the question in these two cases, they should not be categorically precluded from the privilege of continuing dual constituencies in one or both cases.

Mr. Chairman, I should be very pleased if the minister would let us know what amendment he would consider appropriate.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that although the Minister of Transport tried to give the arguments on both sides, his argument was very strong that parliament should not toss this legislative decision to the commissioners. I should also like to add one argument which I do not think he made, unless he did so when I was called away to the telephone. If we give this discretion to a commission, are we going to give it to all the commissions, or just to the two in question?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I did make that point very clear as far as my position is concerned. I would not approve of any amend-

ment which extended this in any way whatsoever.

Mr. Knowles: May I then proceed one step further. If this discretion is being given only to the two commissions, we must remember that these commissions operate independently. It is true there is one man who is on all of them, but what happens if one commission, say the commission for Prince Edward Island, decides on a two member seat for Queens but the commission for Nova Scotia decides on a single member seat for Halifax?

Mr. Pickersgill: That situation would present no problem, because they would have an option, as the senior member for Queens just indicated.

Mr. Knowles: The minister suggests this would present no problem, but I think those who are on the opposite side of the decision might think it presented a problem.

Mr. Pickersgill: It would not be a legal problem.

Mr. Knowles: The other point I wished to touch upon is the issue raised by the two members for Queens when they made a point of their desire not to have serious changes in something which has been a fact of history. May I point out to them that the members and people across this country are going to receive the shock of their lives when the boundaries of the constituencies are drawn in light of the rules that we are laying down. I suspect the constituency which is now the constituency of Queens, although it will be divided as a result of this legislation into two parts, will probably be geographically closer to the present constituency of Queens than 90 per cent of ridings.

The hon. member for Port Arthur started to say a moment ago, when the Minister of Transport told him to write it in his column, that hon. members did not realize the enormity of changes which will take place under this legislation. I do not think what will happen to the constituencies of Halifax and Queens, if these areas are divided into single area ridings, will be anything compared to the enormity of change which will take place generally.

Whatever does take place, Mr. Chairman, I think this decision should be made by parliament, and we should not leave legislative decisions of this kind to the commissions.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I am getting into bad company and becoming argumentative. Neither the senior member for Queens nor myself has been arguing that the status quo be preserved, but if it should happen that the commission in any province finds that a certain constituency should remain unchanged, surely the commission should have that right. We are asking that the commissions not be prevented from deciding, suggesting or recommending something which happens to coincide with an existing fact, namely the existence of dual ridings. That is all we are asking, and I am quite confident that the commissions can deal with this matter. Although conservative, I am not an unrelenting champion of the status quo. I am trying to look for the maximum efficiency for a commission as it deals with these problems, which I know is going to be saddled with some difficulty.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Chairman, in this connection I think it should be pointed out that in the constituency of Halifax there are established traditions and principles which have been in effect for many, many years, whereby a dual constituency has been maintained. More than the usual geographical problems would be presented if that constituency should be changed now, because there have been very easy relationships and working arrangements established throughout the years. There can be no question whatsoever raised as to representation. If a commission should decide to divide that constituency, and perhaps make some additions, into two watertight compartments, it would have to draw a line through established principles which have been maintained for over half a century. I think the course followed by the cow which Laura Secord drove through the woods at the time of the war of 1812 could be considered a surveyor's line compared to any line drawn by a commission which attempted to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is some merit to the suggestion that we should leave to the commission the right or responsibility of making a decision in those cases where dual constituencies have been established heretofore, Queens and Halifax. The commission should be allowed, if it so determined, to maintain dual constituencies rather than create two single constituencies. Personally I have had experience in another theatre of a dual constituency, and I would not wish that kind of experience on my worst enemy, because it involves a very difficult task. There are many entrenched problems associated with this question, particularly in Halifax, and I should like to see something

done whereby the commission would have some latitude in reaching its decision.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I should also like to add a few words by way of support. We are dealing here with exceptional cases, but I think in many instances an exceptional case removes us from the blandness of a purely uniform and mathematical formula. After all, Prince Edward Island already has a constitutional floor, and this proposal is not going to impose any burden on the representation from that province. The numbers are not going to change. I do not think anyone is going to suffer any injustice. I would say that the same applies in Nova Scotia.

To me there is no compelling argument to make the change. There may be pros and cons, but none of them is of sufficient weight to justify a change. Under these circumstances I think we should provide the commissions for these two provinces with the opportunity of choice in this regard. We are not asking for it elsewhere in the country.

I should like to refer to what is perhaps a similar situation. When the city of Edmonton decided to number its streets and avenues it adopted a very monotonous, rectangular, mathematical plan of streets and avenues north and south and east and west and gave them numbers. I say thank goodness that somebody was instrumental in retaining Jasper avenue, running right through the middle of the city.

I would say the same thing in this connection. This exception does not hurt the rule. There is also a strong historical background, and I do not see why we should destroy history in so far as these two provinces are concerned. If the province of Newfoundland had had some historic dual ridings at the time it entered confederation I am sure this would have commended itself to the Minister of Transport, and that he would have found compelling arguments to retain that right to individuality rather than ruling it out absolutely by the stroke of a pen or by the printed word as we are proposing to do today. Therefore I heartily recommend that hon. members should support any amendment put forward on behalf of the members for Queens and Halifax.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, obviously I do not want to prolong this debate, but may I say I do not feel I could propose such an amendment. On the other hand, I have one drafted here that is slightly different from the one shown me by the hon. member for Queens, who was good enough to send me the one about which he was thinking. I would think that the one I have here would be preferable if this is going to be done, because the only real difference between the two is that in the one case it just says that the commission "may" and in the other case it says "may if it sees fit to do so".

[Mr. Nowlan.]

In view of the queer interpretations sometimes placed on the word "may", if that additional phrase was not included I think there might be a suggestion that parliament's inclination was to have it done. My own inclination is not to have it done. I say that quite frankly. I really feel about this matter, and it is going to be very difficult for me to vote. I have been thinking I might do something that I thought only members of the N.D.P. did, sit on my hands, if there is a vote.

I have not made up my mind yet, but I certainly do not want to influence the judgment of any other member of the committee. Particularly because of the objection reiterated by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre I do not feel it is fair to impose upon the commission the making of another decision which in my bones I feel we ought to make ourselves if it is to be made at all. I think it would be very hard for me to vote for this. On the other hand I am rather impressed by the argument put forward. I want to reiterate, however, that these historic constituencies will not survive anyway. Halifax county is far too big to be one constituency, so we will not be preserving the historical situation there and probably not in Queens either. However, if the hon. gentleman wishes to do so I think the simplest way would be for him to move his amendment in order to test the committee on it and get the agony over with.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Chairman, I think this is certainly fair enough. In my opinion the minister's suggestion as to an amendment is an improvement on the one I had in mind. For the information of members of the committee who are not familiar with the maritimes I might say that this is not an anomaly in the maritime setting. In the legislatures of the maritime provinces, unlike other provinces, virtually all the constituencies are multiple constituencies. In New Brunswick some of them have as many as four or five members. In Prince Edward Island they are all dual constituencies, and in Nova Scotia there is a similar situation. I do not know whether it is necessary for me to read this amendment.

Mr. Knowles: Move it. We would like to hear it.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I am buying this in a poke because I have not read it yet. I think I will read my own amendment and in doing so can add to it what the minister has suggested. I move:

That clause 13 be amended by deleting the word "and" in line 31 and inserting a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) where, immediately before the coming into force of this act, any electoral district in a province was represented by two members of the House of Commons, the commission may, if it sees fit to do so, recommend the continuation of such representation, in which case the division of that province into electoral districts and the description of the boundaries thereof in accordance with rule (a) shall proceed subject to such adjustments as are necessary in order to give effect to the continuation of such representation;"

and that the present subsection (b) be designated subsection (c) and that in line 46 thereof there be inserted after the word "case" "except as may be necessary in order to give effect to rule (b)."

Mr. Pickersgill: Since the other one has been vetted by the law officers of the crown I wonder whether the hon. gentleman would mind having it formally moved so that we will not get into any possible legal troubles.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I believe it is the same wording. I have not read it, but I would move it as the official amendment.

The Chairman: Mr. MacLean (Queens) moves:

That clause 13 of Bill C-72 be amended

(a) by striking out lines 30 to 33 on page 4 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"(b) representation commissioner under section 12; where, immediately before the day this act was assented to, provision was made for any electoral district in the province to be represented by two members of the House of Commons, the commission may, if it sees fit to do so, recommend the continuation of such representation, in which case the division of the province into electoral districts and the description of the boundaries thereof in accordance with rule (a) shall proceed subject to such adjustments as are necessary in order to give effect to the continuation of such representation;

(c) the commission may depart from the strict application of rules (2) and (b) in any case where"

(b) by striking out lines 46 and 47 on page 4 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"but in no case, except as may be necessary in order to give effect to rule (b), shall the population of any electoral district in the province as a result thereof"

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I recall an earlier observation of the minister that perhaps those who come from the eastern part of the country may have a greater appreciation of historic traditions and customs than others. As someone who was born, brought up and has lived all his life in western Canada, may I say that at least some of us have some appreciation of the historic traditions and customs not only of our own areas but of other parts of the country.

However, Mr. Chairman, the point on which I wish to rise in speaking against the proposed amendment is that while I may have a good deal of sympathy with the point of view of members who have suggested this amendment out of respect for their own local customs and traditions, nevertheless I think it should be obvious that in spite of that sympathy we in this house have to recognize that this amendment, if it passes, is not going to be confined in its implications and results to Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia.

Mr. Nowlan: Yes, it is.

Mr. Barnett: Hon. members are trying to tell me I am wrong, but perhaps they should listen to my conclusion. I think we recognize that each provincial commission is going to be autonomous in respect of its operations within a province under the provisions of the legislation. Nevertheless, I think we recognize also that there is provision in the proposed legislation for objections to be raised in this house.

The point I should like to make is that accepting an amendment such as is proposed may very well develop arguments as to why certain customs and traditions with regard to county boundaries and other historic considerations in respect of constituencies in other parts of the country should be retained by commissions in the respective provinces. It strikes me, therefore, that this is not purely a local issue with regard to Halifax or Queens, but one to which consideration should be given because of its general effect across the country.

It is with that sort of consideration in mind and, as I say, with some sympathy for the point of view that has been advanced for the respective traditions, that I feel it would be most unwise for us to adopt this amendment. It would serve to put not only the commissions in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island on more of a hot seat, but indirectly the commissions in other provinces across the country.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question on the amendment?

Amendment agreed to: Yeas, 24; Nays, 17.

Clause agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the bill be read a third time?

Some hon. Members: Next sitting.

Mr. Knowles: In view of the many amendments that have been made, I think we should not have third reading until we see a reprint of the bill.

Mr. Pickersgill: I very much regret that hon. members do not see fit to give it third reading now. I would have liked to get this thing completed today, but of course the rules are against me.

Mr. Lambert: If the minister will just cast his mind back a few years to the time when he was on this side he will recall that he took the same position with regard to bills of this importance and complexity in which many changes had been made, notwithstanding the pleas of the government. This is not with the idea of getting back at anybody. I think a bill of this nature, with this number of amendments, should be reprinted before it is given third reading. We give an undertaking that we will see it Monday afternoon.

Mr. Pickersgill: I would not like it to be thought I was complaining, but one can always hope.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the bill be read a third time?

Some hon. Members: Next sitting.

SUPPLY

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

The Chairman: It being one o'clock I do leave the chair.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 2.30 p.m.

SECRETARY OF STATE

Office of the chief electoral officer—

1. Salaries and expenses of office, $106,000.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the item carry?

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, as hon. members know, the position of chief electoral officer is being filled on an acting basis by Mr. Castonguay, who is also representation commissioner. In fact I think the latter is his principal job because it is for it he gets paid. Up until this point it would seem to present no difficulty in having Mr. Castonguay fill both these positions, but now that the redistribution bill may soon be passed Mr. Castonguay will have to devote a great deal of time to his work as a member of ten provincial commissions. That being the case, would it not seem desirable to make an early move toward filling the position of chief electoral officer?

I am not fishing for a prediction as to the date of the next election. The Secretary of State is probably no smarter than the rest of us on that point.

Mr. Lamontagne: We would not want to move on this until the redistribution bill has been finally approved, but the hon. member may be quite sure that we will try to find a suitable replacement as soon as possible.

Mr. Knowles: Does "as soon as possible" mean within the next few weeks so that Mr. Castonguay may devote his full time to the representation job and not have to worry about the possibility of having to conduct another election?

Mr. Lamontagne: Provided we can find a suitable candidate for the job, it will be within the next few weeks.

Mr. Winch: Do I understand that on Mr. Castonguay's appointment as representation commissioner he will not have authority as chief electoral officer? If that is the case, then I want to register my opposition because I believe he and his father before him have done wonderful work as chief electoral officers.

I should like to speak briefly about Mr. Castonguay himself. One may not always agree with his decisions, but based on my years of experience campaigning for federal office I doubt if in the history of Canada there has ever been anyone like Mr. Castonguay, with such a knowledge of the Canada Elections Act and with such decisiveness in reaching conclusions when required during the heat of an election.

Though I can appreciate the reasons he is to have such important responsibility in the matter of redistribution, personally I would very much dislike it if some person is named as chief electoral officer without Mr. Castonguay having overriding responsibility. Does passage of the redistribution bill mean that we will lose the services of Mr. Castonguay as chief electoral officer? I repeat that I would hate to see the day come when he will not have some responsibility in the electoral and campaign system of this country.

Mr. Lamontagne: I am sure we all share the views expressed about Mr. Castonguay by the hon. member but, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, his important new responsibilities as representation commissioner will require a lot of his time if we are to implement the new redistribution system during the next few years. Mr. Castonguay will continue with his present responsibility as chief electoral officer until we are in a position to make a new appointment. However, I am afraid it will be impossible for him to carry on the two jobs indefinitely.

Mr. Winch: After the redistribution is complete, will Mr. Castonguay carry on in the office of commissioner or will he return to carry out the duties of chief electoral officer?

Mr. Lamontagne: I understand that when a new chief electoral officer is appointed he will be responsible to the representation commissioner, so we may not lose the services and the experience of Mr. Castonguay completely.

Mr. Winch: Do I understand that whoever is given the new appointment will be responsible to Mr. Castonguay and that final authority will still rest with him?

Mr. Lamontagne: I believe that if the hon. member would refer to the act he would find this to be the case.

Mr. Nesbitt: I gather that the concern in the mind of the Secretary of State and, indeed, in the mind of the government is that if Mr. Castonguay is made representation commissioner he could not obviously carry out his duties in the event of an election taking place at the same time. However, if a federal election were to come before Mr. Castonguay had completed his work as commissioner there would obviously be no great hurry for him to complete the task of redistribution. What would be the objection to his having leave of absence, as it were, so as to take charge of the election arrangements? Afterwards he could return to complete his other job.

Mr. Lamontagne: I understand that the act requires each commission to end its work within a year. Moreover, once we have made the appointment of chief electoral officer it would not be easy to ask the new man to vacate his responsibilities.

Mr. Nesbitt: The Secretary of State is correct in accordance with the present terms of the legislation but there are a great many of us in this house—in fact, I think, most of us in all parts of the house—who would hate to lose the services of Mr. Castonguay as chief electoral officer. It is true that in his other appointment he may have a supervisory capacity but many of us are disturbed about the thought of losing his services in this regard, and I am wondering whether the Secretary of State could not consult with his colleagues and insert some amendment into the redistribution bill which might allow Mr. Castonguay to take temporary leave of absence to carry out the duties of chief electoral officer before returning to his duties as representation commissioner, if a general election were to come after the appointment had been made.

Mr. Lamontagne: Should an election come before the new appointment is made then, of course, Mr. Castonguay would be in charge of that election. However, we certainly cannot delay this appointment indefinitely; and I might add that no date for the new election has yet been announced.

Mr. Nesbitt: Perhaps the whole difficulty could be obviated if the Secretary of State were to consult his colleagues over the week end. Possibly some minor amendment could be made in the redistribution bill which would allow Mr. Castonguay to leave the one office for a temporary period so as to act as chief electoral officer should an election take place. In that event it would not make much difference if redistribution were completed within one year or say, 15 months after the election had been called.

Mr. Lamontagne: I will be happy to discuss this with my colleagues during the week end.

Mr. Macquarrie: There is one small matter. I will not ask the minister to tell us the date of the next election, but the senior standing committee of the house, the committee on privileges and elections, did a great deal of work on the Canada Elections Act last session and I wonder if it would be correct to assume that since the chief electoral officer has sent supplies out to the constituencies it is the thinking of the government that no further consideration shall be given to the elections act, and the careful scrutiny the committee gave it. Important suggestions were made as to the lowering of the voting age, and so on. I have been trying to elicit some information on this subject from the leader of the house. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could bring us up to date as to the government's thinking in this regard.

Mr. Lamontagne: The decision taken by the chief electoral officer recently was an ordinary administrative decision taken by him without any kind of instructions from the government. It was, I understand, a routine exercise.

Mr. Knowles: I was just about to say there was one question the answer to which might solve the problem we were discussing a moment ago. In view of the high regard we have for the work done for us by Mr. Nelson Castonguay and in view of the equally high regard we have for the work done for us previously by his father, Mr. Jules Castonguay, the question is: Are there any more Castonguays?

Mr. Leboe: I am interested in the question raised by the hon. member for Queens—what will happen to the work of the committee on privileges and elections? Will the work of the committee be finished, or will it be left in abeyance.

Mr. Lamontagne: We hope that the work of this committee can go on, perhaps before the end of this session, but certainly at the beginning of the next session, so as to enable the government to introduce changes and revisions in the act in 1965.

Mr. Knowles: When will the next session start?

Mr. Barnett: It seems to me that the hon. member for Oxford and the hon. member for Queens have put their questions to the Secretary of State the wrong way round. I should like to ask the Secretary of State whether he will confer with his colleagues and bring us an assurance that the work of the redistribution commissioner and of the commissions will be completed before we shall require the active services of a chief electoral officer.

Mr. Lamontagne: I am afraid I cannot answer that question.

Item agreed to.

Civil Service Commission—

1. Salaries and contingencies of the commission including compensation in accordance with the suggestion award plan of the public service of Canada $5,516,500.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay the passage of these estimates, but I wish to take this opportunity to make a few remarks concerning the civil service commission.

Could the minister tell us whether he intends to have the civil service act amended during the course of this session or the next one to provide a bonus for any civil servant who is bilingual, in other words for those who speak French and English.

In my opinion, that would be a positive step since it would contribute to the spread of bilingualism within the federal civil service.

There are many disadvantages to the fact that a good many senior officials, in various services, are unilingual but that situation goes way back in the past.

I know it will be a tremendous job for the minister to remedy that situation.

When, for instance, a farmer from the province of Quebec wishes to approach the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays) or a departmental section chief who is unilingual, it is very difficult for him to obtain the information needed. That may be one of the reasons why agriculture in Quebec, more particularly, is in a state of inferiority; means of communication are lacking between the federal Department of Agriculture and the French speaking farmers in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that if the government granted a bonus to bilingual persons, at all levels of the federal administration in Ottawa the situation would improve. It is not a question of rushing things, of changing the policy overnight, but rather of implementing it gradually for those who are already bilingual and for those who are applying for civil service positions.

I also feel it to be important that all deputy ministers of the federal administration, in every department, should know both languages, in order to make their own contribution towards the improvement of the situation within the various departments.

May I point out that in many countries across the world, in foreign affairs, applicants are not only required to know the language of the country, but also to have some knowledge of French and English.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, in the United Kingdom applicants for a job in foreign affairs are required to learn another language, either French, German, Spanish, Italian or Russian.

The same situation applies to France, and also to Belgium, which is a bilingual country and where not only the knowledge of French and of another language is required, but also of English and Dutch. The Federal Republic of Germany also requires sufficient knowledge of English and French, apart from the official language of the country. The same situation exists in Holland and Austria.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of External Affairs reflects the cultural character of a country, and it would be important, particularly in that department in Canada, that candidates be bilingual so they can assert, on a world-wide level, the bilingual and bi-racial character of our country.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that the minister has endeavoured to create a school where French will be taught. I think that school is located in the province of Quebec.

But I am wondering if the fact that that school is run with public funds is fair and reasonable since the Canadian government, supposedly to help our English speaking compatriots, puts at their disposal professors paid by the government to teach French to civil servants also paid by the government during their working hours.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, French Canadians had to spend their own money for the courses they had to take to learn English.

That fact may not be of prime importance but it is worth mentioning.

I wish to point out that there are at the present time in all the departments of the federal government deficiencies in the French section of the information services. I think there should be some way of improving the situation.

I have another suggestion: That the translators and interpreters, who are bilingual and carry out important and indispensable work for the government be given a higher salary than they are receiving now.

I also ask the minister whether there is no means of increasing the number of translators, so that all the house committee reports might be published simultaneously in their English and French versions, and all other government publications be issued at the same time in both languages, under a single cover. In this way, there would be no exceptions, and the minister would be sure that French and English publications were issued simultaneously in every department, as they would be under one and the same cover.

Mr. Chairman, those were the few remarks I wanted to make in the interest of national unity.

I feel that this constructive action would make it possible to stem the separatist wave which is now on the upsurge in some parts of the country.

A last remark. Does the government still intend to allow civil servants to incorporate as a union, like the other workers of the country, in order to negotiate a labour agreement?

I know that several members of this house would be happy if there were such legislation.

I would be glad to know what the minister intends to do so far as bilingualism is concerned in the federal civil service.

[*Text*]

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, there are a few observations I would like to make to the Secretary of State on the question of the civil service commission. The minister is in a rather unique cabinet position inasmuch as he transmits messages to, or replies in this house on behalf of, two creatures, or perhaps I should say creations, of parliament, one being the civil service commission and the other the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. On the latter creation of parliament I shall have some observations to make later on, but on the civil service commission I have a few to make at the present time.

Mr. Fisher: Among a dozen others.

Mr. Nesbitt: Yes; as the hon. member for Port Arthur says, among about a dozen others.

When the civil service was created it was my understanding that the intention—and it is a very commendable one—was to get rid of what had become a black mark on the face of Canada, namely political patronage in the civil service. In former days I am told that every time the government changed while everyone in the government service was not removed most of the important jobs changed hands. The result, of course, was that it eventually became impossible to get people of any competence to do these jobs, and no one for one moment wants to see a return to that state of affairs.

On the other hand, I think in its efforts to make the civil service commission completely independent of political patronage—and as I say I think the theory behind this is very commendable—the civil service commission itself has bent over backwards almost to the point of breaking in half in order to try to show that it is not influenced by any kind of political patronage. Those of us here who have sat on both sides of the house know that this is true; as far as political influence is concerned I have heard of very little political patronage in the civil service commission in connection with making appointments.

However, with the good which may go with this sort of arrangement there is also the bad. In order to keep political inter-

ference out of the civil service commission, the commission itself has as a result now become responsible to nobody. I know that in theory the civil service commission is responsible to parliament as a whole, but that is a rather nebulous status. In fact, the civil service commission like the C.B.C. has become a law unto itself, does what it likes and is probably the greatest example there is in Canada of the so-called establishment. Any time anybody makes recommendations in connection with the C.B.C. he is either brushed aside, as though no one is supposed to know anything about it except those who sit on the civil service commission, or else it is suggested that the proposals are some kind of political interference, no matter what they may be.

I think in most cases—and I want to make this perfectly clear before I continue further; the theory and principle behind the civil service commission is excellent—the commission generally speaking does a very good job and has done a very good job over the years; but like any other organization composed of human beings problems arise, errors are made and improvements are required. It is in this latter regard that I have a few suggestions I should like to make.

Regardless of where members of parliament sit in this house, they do from time to time receive letters from constituents who are applying for jobs and are asking for recommendations. A new member to this house very naïvely, and almost invariably writes a letter of recommendation and forwards it to the civil service commission. Members always receive very polite acknowledgments and an undertaking that the commission will keep the member informed as to what takes place. I must say at this time that the commission always keeps its word in this regard. It has been my experience, as I am sure it has been the experience of a good many members of parliament, that the longer one is here the more wary he becomes about writing letters of recommendation as to character and background on behalf of those individuals who make such a request, because it is my impression, and it may be an inaccurate one, that a letter from a member of parliament to the civil service commission in recommendation of an applicant is tantamount to the kiss of death. I have yet to hear of many individuals being successful in applications for a civil service job who have had the dubious advantage of letters of recommendation from members of parliament. Most of us in this house feel we are second class citizens as far as making recommendations are concerned, even for the most trivial positions. Perhaps we are developing an inferiority complex in this regard. That certainly is the feeling one gets, and it becomes stronger the longer one is here.

Mr. Chairman, in the event the civil service commission officials are not aware of this fact, it is time they were told in plain language that regardless of where members sit in this house they have the feeling that their recommendations are unheeded. I have heard individuals state in private that if the civil service officials accept the recommendations of members of parliament they are allowing political patronage to creep into the system. While I realize that may be true, and that is something we do not want, I should like to make it quite clear that there is a more practical approach to this problem. In respect of positions which are of a strictly local nature, and perhaps I can use the position of postmaster in a rural or semi-rural community as an example, quite apart from certain qualifications required, there are other important characteristics, such as the ability to get along with the people of the community, record of honesty and the like, which can be assessed by the local member of parliament as well as or better than anyone else. Surely a member of parliament is qualified to know about these things, or in a position to find out about them. If a member of parliament makes a bad recommendation the electorate can rectify that error at the following election.

What actually happens in fact is that an individual from the establishment makes a trip to the village or the community and very often consults with people who are not in a position to know whether an applicant is qualified, and then sends in a report which as often as not is quite out of touch with the general feeling of the village or community in question. I think the civil service commission could perhaps make greater use of recommendations from members of the House of Commons in this regard, particularly when considering background, integrity and general ability of applicants.

An individual who is elected to this House of Commons surely has some status of responsibility in the community which he or she represents here, and in light of that fact I cannot understand the consistent attitude taken by the officials of the civil service commission at this time of ignoring recommenda-

tions of members of parliament, regardless of the party to which they belong.

Perhaps one of the most serious things we must face in respect of the civil service is the fashion or mode now in vogue in Canada, that an applicant for a job in order to succeed must have a great number of paper qualifications. I hesitate to cite specific examples, as this does not prove anything, but the one I have in mind is a case in point. This is not related to the federal civil service commission. I noticed in a Kingston newspaper several weeks ago an advertisement for a garbageman. One of the required qualifications was grade 13 education.

An hon. Member: For a garbageman?

Mr. Nesbitt: Yes, one of the required qualifications for a garbageman, according to this advertisement, was a grade 13 education. In my opinion that is going just a little bit too far. I suppose a prospective garbageman must have some appreciation of logarithms to count the orange peels in each bundle of garbage. That is the kind of thing that makes legitimately required qualifications appear rather ridiculous in certain instances.

I have certain notices of competitions for various positions in the civil service. I do not think I need to go into too many examples, because most hon. members are familiar with the type of thing I have in mind, but almost all of them contain long lists of required paper qualifications, and these qualifications are rigidly applied. I should like to know what are the qualifications of the individuals who draw up these qualifications. Several years ago representatives of the civil service commission appeared before a parliamentary committee at which time we had difficulty obtaining much information in this regard. In reply to this type of question these representatives said that the people who draw up these qualifications were experts of one kind or another. I should like to know who draws up these qualifications and who determines what qualifications are required for specific jobs. I know the answer we will receive in a moment or two is that these people are highly qualified, holding degrees A, B, C, and D from technical schools X, Y and Z. I think the rigidity of the application of these qualifications should be considered very carefully.

There is a problem in existence today as a result of automation, which makes it very difficult for anyone over the age of 35 years who has not had the advantage of a formal or technical education to get a job. This is perhaps due to the fact that individuals in this age group for various reasons were not in the position to obtain the kind of general education now afforded today's students. There should be a little more elasticity to the application of these regulations, as to qualifications for positions. Surely there is nothing wrong with allowing a certain degree of discretion to the officials of the civil service commission. We all have a high degree of respect for the ability of the officials of the civil service commission and our complaints are not directed toward them individually but toward the establishment or scheme of things which has been developed over the years.

Examples do not prove principles, but they do show the kind of thing about which I am complaining. Competition No. 64T1075 for an auditor for the unemployment insurance commission at the London, Ontario branch sets out the duties and qualifications, the number of years experience in accounting or auditing, as well as a requirement in respect of the principles of accounting, including the double entry system, and also suggests that integrity and personal suitability are required. The competition notice then sets forth certain basic educational requirements, grade 11, I believe. I do not wish to mention anyone's name because I do not think that is fair, but an applicant for this job had all the necessary qualifications with the exception of a junior matriculation certificate. He had 11 years experience with one of our principal banks in this country as an accountant. He had also carried on a successful merchandising operation for a number of years, but because of ill health had to give up that business. He is a very well thought of individual in the community. Unfortunately several years ago he was unable to obtain a junior matriculation certificate, as a result of which he was unsuccessful in his application for this position.

Mr. Chairman, that is the type of thing many of us complain about, but there is little benefit to be gained by complaining without offering some constructive suggestions to correct the situation. In a number of these jobs the application could state, in respect of educational qualifications, that such and such a level was required, or the equivalent thereof, and the qualifications of an applicant could then be left to the discretion of the officials of the civil service commission. A great many very excellent people are lost to the civil service because of some really minor technical requirement. I can remember very well what happened some years ago during world war II when officers were being selected for the navy. At one time I had some connection with that operation and I remember person after person being turned down because of colour blind-

ness. The reason given was that they allegedly could not distinguish between rocket flare signals at night. From a practical point of view it made no difference at all, but dozens of good people who would have been excellent in every other way were turned down because of this requirement. Eventually the navy got away from the requirement when they found it did not really matter.

This is the kind of thing one has to watch and I would hope there would be a little more elasticity in the qualifications and a little more discretion left to the members of the commission so that a good many people who are qualified in many ways will not be turned down because of some minor technical requirement. I think this is something that could improve the situation for many people. I wish that the members of the commission and the Secretary of State would bear in mind that one of the biggest problems any member of the house has is in trying to find employment for so many people who are over the age of 40. They lack the technical training to get jobs in industries now, and have to try to get other positions which often they are really very well qualified to fill except for some very technical requirement.

There is one other matter about which I should like to ask the Secretary of State and which he perhaps can deal with after he discusses it with the members of the commission. I refer to the question of bilingualism in the civil service. I know this is a very touchy and sensitive subject these days but I think it would be less touchy and less sensitive if the policy in this regard was made absolutely clear by the Secretary of State. There is a great deal of suspicion and concern on the part of many people because the policy does not seem to be clear.

I think all of us will agree that for many civil service positions it is absolutely essential that the applicants be completely bilingual. With regard to people who work in Ottawa, certainly those who work in the province of Quebec, and also in parts of Ontario and other parts of Canada such as New Brunswick, there are many jobs which require these people in their daily contacts with the public and in correspondence to be completely bilingual. I do not think anybody would quarrel with that.

However, I have had a number of civil servants approach me in this regard. They wish to remain anonymous and I can understand their point of view in that respect. They have expressed concern to me, in that with regard to many competitions, which seemed to involve branches of the civil service that really did not require people to be bilingual at all, it was provided that only bilingual applicants would be considered. There is great concern in many parts of Canada where the French language is not spoken that the only people who will be allowed to apply for these positions are people who speak French as well as English. From a practical point of view this gives a very decided advantage to people who come from the province of Quebec and parts of Ontario adjoining Quebec—

Mr. Grégoire: Why do they not become bilingual?

Mr. Nesbitt: I hear an interesting question from the hon. member for Lapointe and I am going to reply in a minute—as well as people who live in New Brunswick. The hon. member for Lapointe has asked an obvious question. Why do people not become completely bilingual? If the hon. member for Lapointe lived in Vancouver, Calgary or London, Ontario, he might find it rather difficult to find people there who speak French very fluently. It is just a matter of practice. I can tell the member for Lapointe that I have studied French for nine or ten years and I can read and write the language almost as well as English, but because of lack of practice in speaking the language in my own part of the country, and this applies to a good many members, it is not easy to become fluent in speaking the language unless you have the opportunity to speak it daily.

Mr. Grégoire: There is no more opportunity in my area to speak English.

Mr. Nesbitt: I think the hon. member for Lapointe realizes that his arguments are not all that logical. Taking the total population of both Canada and the United States, English is the predominant language in commercial relations, and because of necessity, I realize, many people in Quebec have a greater opportunity to learn English than people in parts of Canada not adjacent to Quebec have to learn French. I do not think there is any argument about that. It is a fact of life. Maybe it should not be that way but it is a fact of life that exists whether one likes it or not.

There is a great deal of worry among many people that persons from parts of Canada not adjacent to Quebec may not have the opportunity to join the civil service in the future. If the policy in this regard were laid down clearly I think there would be a lot less worry and concern. There is not only

concern on the part of those who fear they may not have the opportunity to get into the civil service but also on the part of those who are already in the service and fear they cannot get promotions.

I say again we must find some practical way of approaching this problem. It is quite clear that for many positions in the civil service people must be bilingual. I think we all agree with that. On the other hand, there are clearly some positions where it should not be necessary at all and between the two extremes, of course, there are other positions where it is a little harder to define whether or not it is necessary. Again I say it is a fact of life, whether one likes it or not, that if one lives in a part of Canada where it is not easy to find the opportunity to speak French it becomes very difficult for one to do so. If the Secretary of State would lay down some policy in this regard on behalf of the civil service commission I think there would be a lot less worry and concern because people would then know what was going to happen.

In concluding this subject may I say it is quite clear that in the part of the country from which I come it would not be necessary for persons working in the national employment office for example, to speak French because I do not believe there are half a dozen people in the whole area with a reasonably fluent approach to the language. On the other hand, it is quite clear that people must speak French fluently in many parts of Ontario, particularly in the Ottawa area. I should like to hear a definite statement of policy in this regard because the matter is causing concern among those already in the civil service and also among those who will perhaps be applying for positions at some time in the future.

I think that covers most of the questions and remarks I have in mind and we would like to hear some replies from the Secretary of State as to these matters.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Chairman, I too should like to say a few words at this point with regard to the matters raised by the hon. member who has just spoken, and his predecessor, the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm. I am concerned about the application of bilingualism in the public service, recognizing that this is one of the declared objectives of the government toward which we are all trying to work as consistently, fairly and equitably as possible.

When we look at the stock of bilingual persons in Canada we see according to the 1961 census that one out of every eight persons declared himself or herself to be bilingual in the two official languages, English and French. Sixty per cent of the persons who so declared themselves resided in one province, the province of Quebec. Four out of five of the persons who claimed to be bilingual can be found in the few contact areas of English and French culture, the Ottawa valley, metropolitan Montreal and northern New Brunswick.

The recruitment of an adequate stock of bilingual persons in the public service does raise serious problems of regional discrimination in the selection process. We must recognize that this is merely the measurement of the challenge because many parts of Canada have simply not faced the problem of teaching the second language adequately. This is a provincial responsibility in the first instance. A great deal could be done at the provincial level if the provincial departments of education would undertake measures to encourage competent teachers in the second official language to come from the parts of Canada where they can be recruited and to teach within the school systems of those provinces where such persons are lacking in supply.

I think for example, of the provinces of western Canada and the province of Ontario. They could make a very great contribution to national unity by encouraging people to join the elementary school systems of those provinces who have lived and have been trained in the province of Quebec. Such persons whose native tongue is French or who were perhaps unilingual people in the first instance, could go into other parts of Canada and make a contribution toward a better quality of French, a better understanding of French in the elementary schools. The problem has to be met in the school system and has to be persistently followed up through such instruments as the C.B.C., the film board, the television programs and so on which are available to us.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I do feel there is one area in which the civil service commission is to be criticized at the present time, and very sharply criticized. I refer to the determination of proficiency in two languages amongst bilingual applicants. The procedures for the measurement of language proficiency are not consistent, they are not objective. They lead to results which cannot be equivalent from one instance to another. In my opinion there is only one obvious remedy, and I would be anxious to hear the opinion of the minister on this matter. The remedy lies in the application by the civil service commission of methods of testing language

proficiency in English and in French, orally and written. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the civil service commission has got to break new ground and establish for applicants for jobs that are rated as bilingual, the degree of proficiency in the two languages.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm when he claimed that a bilingual bonus should be applied to those who speak the two languages. I could not agree more, provided they really know the two languages. I once asked the hon. member in an earlier debate if he considered himself to be bilingual and he said he did. I am going to say to that hon. member that I do not think his English is any better than my French and I do not believe they could rate either of us as being completely bilingual, much as we would like to be. This illustrates again the problem the civil service commission faces. A mere acquaintanceship with the two languages is not good enough in relation to the jobs that have to be performed, and the civil service commission has not faced the problem with the objective of determining a measurement of language accomplishment.

I would be very interested, Mr. Chairman, in hearing the views of the minister as to how the civil service commission attempts to make a policy rule in terms of recruitment of bilingual candidates. When it advertises for bilingual candidates, how does it test the bilingual proficiency, what methods does it propose to undertake to make sure the applicants who are recruited for bilingual jobs are in fact bilingual according to the requirements of the position?

Mr. Nielsen: I just want to add one or two comments before the minister replies. My concern arises with bilingualism in the civil service but from an entirely different angle. In a recent civil service competition poster advertising for the position of northern service officer, there was included a statement in the qualifications subheading that applicants would be more favourably considered if they had a knowledge of both English and French languages. It seems to me that a knowledge of French among the Eskimos of Coppermine or a knowledge of English amongst the Indians at Old Crow, is just about as useless as horns on a boar. Rather than requiring that the applicant for a position in the department of northern affairs for service amongst the Indians and Eskimos be bilingual, perhaps additional credits might be given if the applicant were of Indian or Eskimo origin, or perhaps if an applicant of English or French origin had a knowledge of the Indian dialect or the Eskimo dialect in the area concerned.

It seems to me that a poster that holds forth additional credits for people who speak the French language in order to obtain preference in a job for northern service is rather ridiculous. Rather than adopting this course, the commission and the department should be adopting the course of attempting to recruit from amongst the native peoples themselves in order to fill these positions, whether or not these people speak the two languages. There is a lot of excellent material there.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pigeon: Just a few words, Mr. Chairman, to mention that when I talked about granting a bonus to bilingual employees, I was referring to those working in the federal service in Ottawa where all the requests from English and French are converging.

We must not go from one extreme to the other. I know that some colleagues from other parties in the house share my opinion that a bonus should be paid to a civil servant filling an important position or working in a department in Ottawa. That he should be given a bonus because he is bilingual, this is quite normal, but if some people are opposed to this, if English speaking citizens think that it is illogical. I wonder whether they find it more logical to demand that French Canadians working in Ottawa should speak English.

When a person who has the required qualifications is employed in the civil service, we cannot expect an English speaking Canadian to speak a second language, but on the other hand, we should not require that a French Canadian who wishes to obtain a position in Ottawa be able to speak English. Let us be fair. If we wish understanding and unity to prevail in this country, what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander.

We should not require that a French Canadian civil servant speak English, nor that an English Canadian speak French.

Why should we compel most of the French Canadians who work in Ottawa to speak English, while we do not ask the English speaking candidates who wish to obtain a civil service position in Ottawa to speak French?

The blame should not be attached to either government in particular, because the same situation existed under all governments, but I wonder why French Canadians should be placed in a special category.

Why require that they be bilingual when both languages are official in this country? If both languages are official, let us be fair towards all Canadians, whether they be English or French speaking.

I hope that the minister will remain favourably disposed without ever becoming an extremist. We do not expect an English speaking Canadian stationed in the Yukon to know French. We only wish that a premium be granted to a bilingual civil servant who works in the central administration at Ottawa.

French Canadians or English Canadians should not be forced to speak a second language because the future of Canada will suffer from it. As a matter of fact, if there is now, unfortunately, a wave of extremism in some areas of Canada, a situation which I deplore very much, it is precisely because there might be a lack of understanding and a lack of justice on the part of some Canadians.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, just a few words to answer some questions asked by hon. members.

First I want to point out to the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon) that I made a preliminary report to the committee last week about bilingualism within the civil service, and I am convinced the hon. member will benefit from reading the statement I made then.

Indeed, the progress made in that field during the past year is only a start and I am sure that during consideration of my estimates next year, I will be in a position to report that other important measures have been taken in that respect.

I should like to point out to the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Francis) that the question he mentioned, that of examinations to determine the degree of bilingualism, does constitute an important and complicated problem.

I am convinced that the school of languages which has now been set up in Hull will provide us with new data and, possibly, with a new method of determining the various degrees of bilingualism. I am equally confident that the civil service commission will benefit from the progress made in that field and that it will be able to improve its present examinations for civil servants.

[*Text*]

The hon. member for Oxford listed a series of grievances with respect to the civil service commission and I am sure the commission will give serious consideration to what he said. As I stated last Thursday evening, the whole system of classification is now under review, and I am further informed that the commission is setting up a new division to re-examine this situation, especially with regard to collective bargaining which is on its way.

Dealing with older employees I would like to point out that 25 per cent of the appointees in 1963 were over 40 years of age. Perhaps there may be some improvement necessary but at this stage I think that is quite an achievement. I would hope private industry could show a similar record.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, in respect to the civil service commission, the whole Canadian civil service is concerned. In my opinion, there has been an improvement in the last two years in the field of bilingualism. I think that this commission shows a lot of good will.

There is no question, as a few members said a while ago, to try and ask all civil service employees to be perfectly bilingual. I think that one cannot ask those who carry the mail in Toronto or Vancouver to speak both languages. It is the same for letter carriers in Jonquière or Quebec city; I do not feel that it is essential for them to speak English.

Today problems are facing the civil servant, whether it be in the unemployment insurance commission, the income tax branch, the administration of old age pensions or of the family allowances act, or in any other department. There is the problem of the individual with whom he is dealing and the problem of the act he has before him, an act amended on several occasions in recent years. Then we see a civil servant who is perhaps individually a very intelligent and a very competent man, but because he is faced with many regulations and acts, as well as with numerous persons who come to see him to try and solve their problems, he rather tends to follow strictly the letter of the law—it is a way of thinking which has established itself in the civil service —when in view of the complications of the law and of cases submitted the civil service commission should try and make innovations, instead of considering every government employee as a mere machine in the face of regulations, but as individuals using their judgment, besides enforcing the law, using their imagination and initiative, not only in order to follow the law, but to go beyond and above it, which might be called reasoning according to each individual case placed before them.

I shall give an example to illustrate what I mean: an employee with the unemployment insurance commission enforced the law strictly in a certain case, for which he cannot be blamed. Still, the result was no less than disastrous. A single man was working. Unemployed, he declared that he was supporting a family, but as he did not pay all the family obligations—he was supporting his mother and his brother—when he resumed work, he was asked to reimburse a certain amount to the unemployment insurance commission as he had received a weekly overpayment of $6 or $7 during six months. When the man started to work again, he was asked to reimburse that amount. As he was unable to reimburse it at that time steps were taken to have it deducted from his salary—he was working as a lumberman—and his boss fired him because he did not want to have anything to do with garnishees. At that point the individual concerned, who owed something like $180, went back on unemployment insurance and, instead of being reimbursed little by little, the commission again was forced to pay him unemployment benefits. Thus, the commission loses in the case of strict and rigid enforcement of the law.

I feel that if civil servants are asked to enforce the law strictly and rigorously, without giving at times due consideration to conditions and circumstances, without attempting to give them as much latitude as possible in their decisions, countless examples will be found of cases similar to the one I have just pointed out.

To my mind, the Secretary of State and the civil service commission might somehow guide the official's work and leave him the greatest possible scope in considering each particular case, because he is in contact with each individual and should be able to consider the particular circumstances and data of each situation.

If officials had enough scope to deal properly with certain cases which may not strictly conform with the law, better results would be obtained than the prejudice which often follows a rigid administration of the statutes.

Since we are dealing with the civil service commission and civil servants generally, I think that the commission and those responsible for the civil service in general should seek to adopt a new policy toward the civil servant and try to consider him more like a human being, like an intelligent individual upon whose judgment we can rely, in short, give him more authority in the settlement of problems concerning civil servants.

One may observe that this may lead to complacency. I do not think so, because the civil servant will always have to act according to regulations, but we should let him use his judgment and his intelligence in the many cases where the act should not be applied to the detriment of the individual or that of the commission or the government he is serving.

In other words, and to sum up, the government should endeavour to give more authority to the civil servant so that he may perform his duties, his mission, not only in respect of the act but also toward those who consult him, bearing in mind the circumstances surrounding each particular case, the job he has to perform. For instance, an unemployment insurance inspector often has to say: In your case, I have no authority to rule in such or such a way, although I know that in this particular case the act is not clear. This happens regularly. But this is due to the fact that the civil servant is not authorized to decide for himself what should be done in the case before him.

Perhaps one might say that this would be making innovations in a somewhat daring way; but if we start breaking new ground along those lines, if the civil servant is progressively given more leeway, perhaps our civil service will be more competent in a decade, not because civil servants are not efficient now, but probably because they are not given enough leeway to make decisions by themselves which they are not allowed to make according to their own judgment. In many cases, that would eliminate a lot of bureaucracy and transfers of responsibility that would eliminate the submission of many decisions to mediators or appeal commissions; in short it would get our civil servants used to face the current facts of life and make decisions according to their good judgment, and not always according to a lot of regulations which are amended and make their situation complicated as well as the life of the person who has to deal with the officials in a given department. I think that at this time our Canadian citizens and especially the civil servants in the employ of the Canadian governments are competent and able to show sufficient judgment, intelligence and reasoning to be allowed to use those qualities and make decisions by themselves, even if at times it is not always according to the spirit of the

law, because the law can be complicated and not applicable to all individual cases.

If our civil servants were allowed to decide by themselves in several of the cases submitted to them, this would eliminate the bureaucratic character, if I might say so, ascribed to them.

[*Text*]

Mr. Barnett: I have one or two questions concerning the operation of the commission. I notice the estimates provide for an increase of some $488,000 as compared with last year. As far as I can see, the largest single item in this connection represents an increase in wages and salaries paid to people in the employ of the commission. I notice, also, there has been no significant change in the total number of positions authorized in the establishment of the commission. However, it appears there has been a change in the composition of the commission's staff—a decrease in the number of clerical staff and an increase in certain categories of senior administrative and professional personnel. Could the minister explain to the committee the significance of these changes? What direction are we moving in which would result in a need for a change in the composition of this commission as compared with previous years?

Mr. Lamontagne: I understand there was a significant increase in salaries in effect for part of the year and, in addition, a number of reclassifications which I presume were being made as the commission is redefining its role and getting prepared for certain new arrangements which will be made as a result of the implementation of the recommendations of the Glassco commission. The language school is included in these estimates and it constitutes a net addition to the expenditure and to the staff.

Mr. Barnett: In other words the increase is partly attributable to the development of the language school and partly to the appointment and higher salaries of professional personnel.

I see there has been a relatively substantial increase in the provision for travelling and removal expenses. I do not know whether any special significance attaches to this. Further on in the details of expenditures there is an indication of an increase of $100,000 in the amount provided for advertising for recruiting purposes. The amount has risen from $250,000 to $350,000, which is an increase of almost half as much again. Can the minister tell us the reason for this large increase?

Mr. Lamontagne: This was due, I presume, to the increase in recruiting activity which took place at the end of the austerity program. In particular it was needed to meet the demands of the new Department of Industry.

Item agreed to.

Privy council

Economic Council of Canada—

35. Administration $817,920.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall this item carry?

Mr. Lamontagne: I made a report on the economic council last week and we had some discussion about it. The item was not approved, but at this stage, at least, I have nothing to add.

Mr. Lambert: Let us go back and consider what happened last Thursday when this matter was discussed. The minister's estimates were under consideration from eight o'clock to ten o'clock and the committee dealt with four or five items directly under the administration of his department. I can hardly agree with him that an extensive statement was made.

On a previous occasion, when we were discussing interim supply, we did discuss this matter. We asked what the economic council was doing. We did so because the council had been introduced with a great fanfare of trumpets to replace the national development council, but since that time we have not heard a great deal about it. I notice that as reported on page 9811 of *Hansard* the minister made a few remarks in connection with the council but I suggest he may be in a position now to add to what was said on that occasion. With the greatest respect I do not think that the two-hour discussion on Thursday indicates that this is all the consideration which need be given to the activities of the various agencies which come within the jurisdiction of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Lamontagne: No.

Mr. Lambert: I know he had a few remarks to add this afternoon so perhaps we might have them *en passant*.

Mr. Lamontagne: I have nothing to add to what I said last Thursday about the economic council. All I said at that time was that the economic council had picked up its staff in its first year of existence and that its first objective had been to get into a posi-

tion to present its first annual review, which will appear in December of this year and will contain a forecast and an outline of economic problems for the period between 1965 and 1970. That is more or less the gist of what I said at that time, although I also went on to explain the activities of the council and also to point out the number of meetings, etc.

I do not think I have anything to add at this moment in regard to the economic council itself. The hon. member may know that at this stage I am not seeking to have the estimates of all the other agencies passed. As soon as we can deal with the economic council I intend to make a rather elaborate statement on the so-called cultural agencies of the federal government, including the C.B.C.

Mr. Lambert: There was one point on which I thought the minister might be able to help us some more. I have had an opportunity to read the remarks he made the other day and I think he hinted at this, or touched on it briefly. It seems to me that the national development council had moved to a considerable extent in getting joint studies and shall we say a spirit of co-operation between management, labour and government, which area was most promising. The minister did give a few hints in this regard and I was wondering whether he could elaborate now. Unless he feels that this matter should be held until next month when the report will be coming forward, how far has the economic council gone in furtherance of this particular work? Because we have not heard a thing from the economic council since its foundation.

Mr. Lamontagne: You have not read the papers.

Mr. Lambert: Well, surely the minister is not suggesting that because these reports are contained in newspaper summaries the members of this house must rely on the newspapers for reports from government agencies. I do not think the minister is trying to give that impression.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to tell the hon. member that last Monday and Tuesday there was held in Ottawa an important seminar on management-labour relations. This seminar was held under the auspices of the economic council, and the event was widely publicized in the papers. It was preceded by four major studies in this field, which were considered, analysed and discussed during these two days. There were at least 150 leaders from all sectors of the economy attending. This shows that the work which was started by the national productivity council is being continued and activated by the economic council.

[Mr. Lamontagne.]

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, in relation to the last remarks of the minister I would say that I had an opportunity of talking to one of the people at the conference, one of the labour representatives, who informed me that the session had been rather illuminating and rather interesting. However, the particular point I want to make to the minister has to do with his remarks the other evening in which he said the highest priority in the program of the economic council is being given to the first of the annual reviews on Canada's medium and long term prospects, and he made reference to the fact that its report will be published in December.

The question I would ask the minister is whether or not it is the intention of the government, once this report has been received from the economic council, to revive its action on the proposal for a Canada development corporation, which can perhaps activate some of the studies reproduced in this report on the long range prospects of Canada issued by the economic council.

Mr. Lamontagne: Well, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member knows, this Canada development corporation is part of the program of the present government and its establishment will be announced as soon as possible. It has nothing to do directly with the economic council.

Mr. Barnett: The minister says that it is part of the program of the present government. My observation is that we certainly have not seen much indication of that recently. Some of us are beginning to wonder whether it really is part of the program of the present government. I think the minister will also realize that in posing this question I am implying that any useful outcome of the activities of the economic council is, it seems to me, inevitably related to some form of action along the lines suggested by the Canada development corporation.

Mr. Lamontagne: The hon. member might reserve his question for the Minister of Finance when the estimates of the Department of Finance are before the committee.

Mr. Barnett: The minister is not going to pass the buck to his colleague, I hope.

Mr. Lamontagne: But that is not my responsibility.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Secretary of State.

As there are also economic councils in at least one province, and even in several provinces, and also some regional economic councils, has the Canada economic council been in touch with the regional or provincial economic councils? Is the work done in co-operation by all those councils?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated last week, the economic council of Canada works in close co-operation with similar provincial agencies.

Meetings are being held regularly, and as soon as the economic council of Canada publishes its annual review, it intends to call another meeting of all provincial agencies directly or indirectly interested in its research.

Mr. Grégoire: A further question, Mr. Chairman. Could the Secretary of State tell us whether the economic council of Canada makes use of the work already done by the economic development board, an organization which existed before the council, and whether it makes it a point to pursue the work already started by the economic development board?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, as I said a moment ago, the duties to be carried out by the national economic development board have simply been transferred to the economic council of Canada which is trying, as much as possible, not only to carry out previous projects but to undertake new ones.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State.

Can he give us detailed explanation about the duties of the 11 employees, under the heading "administration and professions" whose salaries range from $15,000 to $19,000? Are they economists, office managers, and so on? Can the minister tell us about it?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, of course I do not have any detailed information at this time.

However, the president of the economic council as well as the vice president, the permanent director and the other members of the council themselves have come to the conclusion that the council should have a very small staff. In fact, there is no intention of going much over a hundred employees and, of course, that number includes office employees, stenographers, secretaries, etc.

However, the council itself wants to concentrate on professional services and that is how it managed to secure the services of a good number of economists from practically all quarters. Some are permanently employed by the council, others are just on loan from other government departments and even from labour unions or private industry.

[*Text*]

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Chairman, I take it from what the minister has said that in addition to the relatively small group to which he has referred there is an intention to obtain the co-operation of private organizations. I believe at one time it was the policy to second, borrow or use the services of individuals connected with corporations to further, or supplement the work of the council. That is the situation as I understand it.

Mr. Lamontagne: That is exactly the situation. A small nucleus of professional people will carry on the work in collaboration with individuals invited from all corners.

Mr. Nowlan: That was the original intention.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the Secretary of State.

Does the economic council of Canada deal specifically with such urgent problems as that of the industrialization of rural areas?

Does the economic council of Canada deem that one of the most vulnerable areas of our economy is eastern agriculture? Even if special agencies have been established, such as the ARDA program, in order to promote eastern agriculture, does the council intend to foster expansion, and if such is the case, what steps, if any, have been taken in this connection?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, as I said in my general statement, the economic council of Canada was created in 1964. Its main objective was to organize a research group and promote research so it could submit a general report on the Canadian economy; this report will be published in December, 1964.

That project had some scope, believe me, Mr. Chairman.

According to its terms of reference, the economic council of Canada will study the regional aspect of our problems, and I trust that as soon as its first report is published, this agency will turn to other aspects, including the regional one of our economic problems.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: Shall the item carry?

Item agreed to.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

1. Grant in respect of the net operating amount required to discharge the responsibilities of the national broadcasting service, $85,900,000.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, as I explained last Thursday evening when I introduced the estimates of my department, I now intend to make a second general statement devoted to the so-called cultural institutions, namely the C.B.C., the B.B.G., the national film board, the national museum, the national gallery, the department of public printing and stationery, the public archives and the national library.

Mr. Nielsen: And the Canadian Liberal federation.

Mr. Lamontagne: That is not cultural.

This statement will be in the nature of a progress report on these various agencies and, although it will appear to be too long, it will certainly contribute to and shorten my participation in this debate.

When the estimates of these agencies have been approved, I propose to make a third and final statement on the estimates of the centennial commission.

Mr. Baldwin: Plus many explanations.

Mr. Lamontagne: That will depend on you.

I hope that the discussion which will follow my report will be a constructive one. In recent months most of the agencies for which I am responsible have been re-examining their activities and their administrative structures in the light of what are or should be their national goals. When these reappraisals are completed, and I hope they will be in the first part of 1965, new legislation will be needed in several cases to bring about necessary changes. That is why I hope we will have a constructive discussion during this debate, and that the members of the committee will not hesitate to make suggestions, so that we can take them into account in drafting the legislation. This is the time to improve and strengthen our national institutions. This is not the time to weaken and destroy them.

[*Translation*]

Before submitting my report on the various federal cultural institutions, I would like hon. members to consider for a few minutes at least, the need of a more co-ordinated and dynamic federal policy, as well as the general aims of such a policy.

As I have said on various occasions, there is a considerable lack of balance between our material and cultural developments, between the body and the spirit of our nation. In the economic field, the pace of our development has been very rapid, more particularly since the start of the 20th century, and we have now reached one of the highest standards of living in the world. To achieve this, of course we called upon private enterprise, but, on the other hand, we did not hesitate to ask for help from the state, either to stimulate individual initiative, or to complement it.

With respect to culture, we have drawn our inspiration far too much from the American tradition, and not enough from the European. We have left our cultural development almost exclusively in the hands of individuals and private organizations, whose potential is necessarily limited, in spite of occasionally outstanding efforts. As a consequence, our cultural life is anaemic and dangerously exposed to American encroachment. Moreover, to the extent that they have progressed, our main cultures have developed in isolation, for a lack of opportunities and financial means constituted the major obstacle to the setting up of frequent and worthy contacts.

Our poorness and, perhaps even more, our cultural isolation largely account for the present tension in Canada which, in many cases, is due to frustration on the part of those who are forced to live on the fringe of our society.

Encouragement to research and creative work in the field of humanities and social sciences is clearly insufficient. In spite of heroic sacrifices on the part of certain individuals, our artistic groups can barely survive and, even in Canada, their influence is mostly local in scope. Popular culture is having a hard time getting organized. Even amateur sport has its difficulties.

This lack of culture is the more tragic in our contemporary society that technical and economic progress leave more time for leisure and creative activities. Our society will truly be a failure if after having taken the human element out of man's work, it does not succeed in uplifting his moments of leisure.

[*Text*]

Moreover, as long as we fail to build a strong cultural life and to develop frequent exchanges between our cultures, I am quite sure we will continue to be uneasy about our country and worried about its future, that many young Canadians will continue to leave Canada and to be more interested in other countries than in ours, and that we will continue to ask if Canada constitutes a nation because we will have failed to develop a real Canadian identity.

On the other hand, Canadian history shows that cultural expansion and more frequent cultural contacts will not come about by themselves or through the sole efforts of individuals and private groups. The experience of other countries, with the possible exception of the United States, confirms our own. This is why I am convinced that our cultural life needs both protection against impoverishment and stimulus to improvement and that a deliberate effort to these ends, in which each sphere of government within its own jurisdiction will play its full role, is not only justified but most urgently needed.

Up to now I have tried to show the need for a cultural policy in Canada and what ought to be its general objectives. I should like now to indicate how it should attempt to reach those goals. In the first place, it should give assistance to individuals and private cultural groups—

Mr. Lambert: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, since the minister's staff has been kind enough to distribute copies of this speech to the press generally and to people in the officials' gallery, I wonder whether copies of this rather long and important statement could be distributed to the chief representatives of the parties in the house. After all, the minister is speaking to the house, not to the press representatives, and if he expects intelligent comment, which I think one can expect both from hon. members on the government side and on this side, copies of this statement should be made available to us. I am not singling out the minister in this regard because I have made this point to some of his colleagues. I have said before that if a minister is going to read a lengthy statement which has been carefully prepared and distributed to outside agencies, then certainly a number of copies should be made available within the house so members may comment on it with a little more care and preparation.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, I was not aware that copies had been made available to the press, but I would be quite happy to have copies made available to the representatives of the parties in the house.

Mr. Lambert: It is not that I am complaining about the press getting it but rather that I should like members to get it too.

Mr. Lamontagne: I have no objection at all and I hope somebody will be able to take care of the matter as I go along.

I was saying that in trying to reach these goals a proper cultural policy for Canada would be, in the first place, to give assistance to individuals and private cultural groups to enable them to improve themselves and to travel and to perform in Canada and abroad. This is an essential element of a cultural policy in a society like ours which relies primarily on private initiative.

The centennial commission has begun to offer assistance for such purposes and I will have more to say about it on another occasion. The government is studying ways and means of fostering a feature film industry in Canada and I have already announced our intention to establish a loan fund, which we think would be very helpful. We have given a special grant to the Canadian conference on the arts to organize a seminar next February on the situation of the arts in Canada. This meeting will give us, I hope, an overall picture of the needs and requirements in this sector for 1967.

The Canada Council was established to help individuals and groups and it has done since 1957 a most remarkable job in spite of its limited resources. More recently it has been suggested that we should increase the funds available to the council. Others have proposed that the council should be restricted to the arts and that a national research centre for the humanities and the social sciences ought to be established. We are considering these various proposals at the moment and we will announce our decision in 1965.

In the second place, a cultural policy for Canada requires public cultural agencies in certain sectors where exclusive reliance on private initiative is undesirable and which fall within federal jurisdiction. These agencies must serve national purposes and help to develop the Canadian identity. They must be acceptable to the greatest possible number of Canadians, not only to the national capital or to a restricted group. They must reflect the true picture of our country and they cannot afford to succumb to extremism. They must encourage creation with due regard to administrative efficiency.

It is in the light of these and other requirements that a serious reappraisal is now in process. Two important steps have already been taken. A cabinet committee on cultural matters has been established and, for the first time in our history, all federal cultural agencies have been brought under the same ministerial roof. Moreover, as soon as the preliminary reappraisal is completed in each individual agency I intend to set up an in-

teragency committee. Such a committee will serve several useful purposes, without reducing or weakening the independence of the institutions. It will enable them to meet at regular intervals to discuss their common goals and problems, to try to improve the co-ordination of their activities, to prevent duplication and fill the gaps that may exist.

In addition, the time may have come to establish the relationship between parliament and those agencies on a more proper and continuing basis. It may have become desirable to establish a standing committee of parliament on cultural matters. All agencies responsible to parliament could be asked in succession to appear before the committee to report on their current activities and on their plans. These meetings could be most useful, I am sure, both for parliament and for the agencies themselves.

I should like now to make a rather brief progress report on each individual agency and, to begin with, broadcasting, the B.B.G. and the C.B.C. As I have said on earlier occasions, and I think it should be repeated here, there are several problems and questions involving both public and private broadcasting in Canada which must be solved and answered as soon as possible. One of the major problems is the lack of clarity and the shortcomings of the Broadcasting Act of 1958. Unfortunately the Broadcasting Act did not solve what Albert A. Shea in his book "Broadcasting the Canadian Way" called "the one basic issue... to which all others are related: what are the aims and purposes of broadcasting in Canada and how can broadcasting best be organized to achieve these objectives?"

Dr. Andrew Stewart, chairman of the board of broadcast governors, has publicly told of the board's distress at this lack of clarity in the act and the resulting confusion and conflict in its other provisions. Hence, confusion exists about the aims and roles of public and private broadcasting in Canada, about the relations between the C.B.C. and private broadcasting, about the powers of the C.B.C. and the B.B.G., and about the extension of television broadcasting.

On the question of the board's authority, for instance, certain clauses of part I of the Broadcasting Act can be interpreted to mean that the B.B.G. has complete jurisdiction over all Canadian broadcasting, but other clauses in part II can be construed to mean that the C.B.C. is independent of the B.B.G. in certain instances. By its vagueness, then, the act has set up potential conflicts between the C.B.C. and the B.B.G., both organizations apparently operating from different, necessarily self-defined premises. The Grey cup issue was a notable example of this confused and difficult situation.

Similarly, Dr. Stewart—quite rightly I think—has alluded to the fuzziness of the act about the extension of television service in Canada. This, too, has caused certain disagreements because the C.B.C. apparently feels that it should decide, with the concurrence of the governor in council, what stations it can establish, while the B.B.G. is not at all certain that this is a correct interpretation of the act.

Should the C.B.C. have first call on all television station applications? Should it have its own stations across the country or should it depend partly upon affiliates? In other words, should the C.B.C. in future work towards a B.B.C. type system of station ownership, or should the C.B.C. system be different to fit a different Canadian situation? More generally, should there be statutory conditions under which television stations can be established by public or private broadcasters? These questions must have answers and the answers obviously depend upon what kind of Canadian broadcasting system is desired —single, dual or mixed.

Apart from these general questions and problems raised by the uncertainty of the Broadcasting Act, there are related subjects pertaining specifically to the C.B.C. The structural organization of the corporation is one of them. The Glassco commission made some general comments about the structural organization of the C.B.C. and if the Glassco inferences are well founded, important changes must be made in the corporation. At the moment the C.B.C. itself has a small "Glassco committee" studying the corporation's structures. Undoubtedly it would be useful to make serious appraisal of the findings of that study.

The government also feels that there should be a serious look at the whole C.B.C. financing picture, both short term and long term.

Included in a study of C.B.C. financing, of course, is the subject of advertising and its ramifications in terms of Canadian broadcasting, public and private.

Also involved in C.B.C. financing are the costs of C.B.C. consolidation projects like those contemplated for Montreal and Toronto. In turn, these consolidation projects may influence the future development of Canadian private producers and technical facilities whose general role vis-à-vis the C.B.C. merits serious study and consideration. The

Glassco commission had something to say about this last item, but again its remarks were rather general. There are other problems, such as the standards of programs both on the C.B.C. networks and in private stations which I do not wish to raise at this stage.

When the present government assumed office, it was already aware of those urgent and complex problems. In May 1963, my predecessor, the Minister of Transport, asked three gentlemen—Dr. Stewart, chairman of the B.B.G., Mr. Ouimet, president of the C.B.C. and Mr. Jamieson, the president of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters—to consider some of the problems and questions I have cited here. The joint report of the so-called troika and the three separate reports of its members were tabled in the house on May 25. We were not surprised to see the limited areas of agreement shown in those reports because when my predecessor had announced the creation of the troika, he had described it as "an essential first step to a new definition of public policy" and as a preliminary step to a public inquiry.

When those reports were tabled in the house, I immediatedly announced the establishment of an advisory committee on broadcasting with comprehensive terms of reference and experienced members. The Fowler committee has since been hard at work. Numerous briefs are being received from individuals and private groups. The most recent developments in the United States and Europe are being carefully considered. Expert consultants have been assigned special studies on particular problems including the structural organization, the methods of operation and the main consolidation projects of the C.B.C. I have and the government has complete confidence in the committee and its work. When its report has been submitted in the first part of 1965 as expected, it will be made public immediately; the government will introduce new legislation as soon as possible thereafter and, at the proper stage, the proposed measure will be referred to a parliamentary committee. The examination that such a committee will then be in a position to make will, I am sure, be most useful.

It would seem that very few people are satisfied at the moment with present legislation and arrangements in the field of broadcasting. Private broadcasters, of course, are here to stay. They have a very important role to play in our community life. They know that this role is not limited to presenting more American shows than the C.B.C. does or programs of lower quality than those of the public network. They are more and more conscious of the fact that they are not exempted from their public responsibility only because consumers may pay a greater share of their costs than taxpayers. However, they also realize that it is very difficult to improve and, at the same time, continue to compete, if common standards are not applied to all.

A number of Canadians believe that the administrative efficiency of the C.B.C. and the content of certain of its programs should be improved and that the corporation should be more conscious of the national and public interests it has to serve. No doubt improvements are called for. Some are being made at the present moment; others will have to wait the implementation of new legislation or the completion of the consolidation projects. It is equally evident that an institution like the C.B.C., operating in such a complex and touchy field of activities will never be able to fulfil its true role with dynamism and creative imagination and satisfy everybody at the same time. This certainly does not mean that the right to criticize the C.B.C. should be denied or that the corporation should not be accessible to parliamentary supervision. It does not mean either that the C.B.C. should become cynical about criticism and negative when sound suggestions are made. It means that criticism and supervision must be such as to strengthen and improve the C.B.C., not to weaken and destroy it.

The C.B.C. has a very high reputation in the world. The rank it has gained among the broadcasting systems of the world and the great number of international awards it has won prove it. It is the envy of a great number of other countries and people including many Americans. The C.B.C. has made a major contribution to the development of our country in the fields of entertainment, information and knowledge. It has enriched our intellectual life by helping our artists and our artistic groups. It has made culture in its broad and truly human sense, more accessible to the general public. The C.B.C. is one of Canada's most vital and essential institutions, at this crucial moment of our history. The C.B.C. must become more than ever before a living and daily testimony of the Canadian identity, a faithful reflection of our two main cultures and a powerful element of understanding, moderation and unity in our country. If it performs these national tasks with efficiency, its occasional mistakes will be easily forgiven; if it fails in that

mission, its other achievements will not compensate for that failure. I know that the management of the C.B.C. has been and continues to be very conscious of those vital tasks and of that great challenge.

Turning now to the national film board:

The philosophy I have just outlined with respect to the C.B.C. applies equally well to the national film board. The board has celebrated its 25th anniversary in 1964. During this relatively long period, its work has reached a very high standard of excellence and its films have faithfully reflected Canada's social, cultural and economic evolution. Over the years, with respect to each of its functions, as laid down in section 9 of the act, the board has made a valuable contribution. This is especially true with respect to its main function which is the production and distribution of films in the national interest and particularly of films designed to interpret Canada to Canadians and to other nations.

During that period, however, our country has witnessed drastic changes which require a new image to be adequately reflected. The advent and the rapid expansion of television has created a new and growing need for films, in addition to the theatrical and community audiences and to increasing government requirements. I do not believe that these changes require a revision of the functions of the board as defined by parliament in 1950. As the new demands were met, however, there may have been a shift in priorities due also to limited resources, and certain functions assigned to the board may not have been discharged as fully as it was desirable. The chairman and the members of the board are aware of this situation. They have begun a reappraisal of the institution itself and they are reviewing its programs and operations in several fields of activity in the light of current demand of course, but also of its national purpose and the relative importance of the functions assigned to it by parliament.

As an agency at the service of Canada and its people in the fields of information and culture, the board has already decided to strengthen its program for community audiences, and to undertake a survey and analysis of its distribution operations in Canada, with a view to identify and evaluate more precisely its audiences, in relation to their needs and to the purposes the board pursues.

The board is also considering at the moment the desirability of a film training center in Canada and the means through which this could be achieved. The board's great reputation abroad has convinced many developing countries that one of the best places to send their future film-makers for training would be in Canada. If this could be done, it would be also to our advantage because it would further increase our prestige and our influence abroad. However, the board does not have adequate training facilities and programs to meet these requests. There is also a growing demand in Canada for such facilities and programs. The provinces are more and more interested in the production of films for their own purposes. Moreover, the private film industry has made real progress recently and will grow even more rapidly in the immediate future, if parliament approves our program of assistance, which will be submitted early next year. In view of these growing needs for trained people both in Canada and abroad, we may have reached the point where it is both feasible and desirable that a comprehensive film training center be established in Canada. As soon as the board will have presented its recommendations in this respect, I will be pleased to announce the intentions of the government.

With the reappraisal of the board's activities which is taking place at the present time, with the assistance program now under preparation to encourage the production of private feature films in Canada, with the consideration being given to the establishment of a film training centre, I believe that we are taking all the preliminary steps which are required for the establishment, on a realistic basis, of a dynamic, well integrated film industry in Canada, which will fill an important cultural gap and will make us less dependant on foreign sources of supply.

Turning now to the national museum:

The national museum is going through a phase of fundamental reorganization which has been too long delayed. In July 1961, the former government directed that a Canadian historical museum be ready by July 1, 1967, which would include the human history branch of the present museum, the war museum and other material; that a Canadian museum of natural history be established; and that a building or buildings be ready for occupation by the Canadian history museum by early 1966 and the natural history museum as soon as possible thereafter.

On January 24, 1963, a resolution respecting the national museum of Canada and the establishment of different branches was moved in the House of Commons but it never came up for discussion. When our government came into office, almost two years had gone by,

since July 1961, without any concrete steps having been taken, beyond the planning stage, to provide the museum with new buildings and a new administrative set-up.

Meanwhile the priorities had changed. The arts alliance of Ottawa had prepared a comprehensive report which showed quite clearly that what the national capital needed most for the proper celebrations of the centennial was a Canadian centre for the performing arts. The government accepted that conclusion. With that decision and the other priorities in the government construction program for the national capital area, it became almost physically impossible to realize the plans made for the museum in 1961.

The government has therefore decided to start the construction of the new museum during the fiscal year 1965-66 but to proceed at a slower pace than previously contemplated. Present plans provide for the completion of the first phase of the project at the Woods building and Roxborough apartments site in 1968. The second phase, which is to take place where the present temporary headquarters of national defence are located, would be completed as soon as possible thereafter.

As to the legislation designed to improve the prestige of the museum and to provide for its reorganization, I intend to introduce it during the next session of parliament.

I regret these delays, which do not mean, however, that nothing will be done in the interval. The government is prepared to enable the museum to increase its activities, to improve its collections and exhibits and to plan for its future development. We are well aware of two immediate needs which must be met.

In the first place, it is not an easy task to plan for the museum complex that we envisage. Although we have complete confidence in those devoted civil servants who are responsible for the museum, they would feel much more at ease and willing to use their creative imagination and their expert knowledge if they could readily seek the views and the reactions of an advisory group. The experience we have had with such groups in planning the arts center has been most valuable in this respect. I think, therefore, it might be desirable to establish an advisory committee composed of experts and of other people interested in this field to review the plans for the new buildings, and to give their views on the preparation of programs and activities which should be initiated by the museums as the new buildings become available.

In the second place, it is quite clear that there is in Canada an acute scarcity of trained personnel in regard to the growing demand of existing museums and the future requirements of new museums which will be completed in 1967 or soon after. I will ask the proposed advisory committee to look at this problem as a matter of great priority and to propose immediate and long term solutions, including if necessary, a special program of grants and scholarships.

More than 500,000 people visited the national museum, the war museum and the aviation museum in 1963. It is expected that attendance records will be substantially higher in 1964. We hope also that the national museum will be able in the future to work in closer co-operation with provincial and other museums and to make available to them some of its exhibits and collection of objects so that this great national institution will be accessible not only to Ottawans and to those who visit the national capital but also to the greatest number of Canadians in various parts of the country.

Turning now to other agencies:

Finally, I would like to deal very briefly with the other cultural agencies. The national gallery needs a new structural organization which will provide greater flexibility and enhance its prestige. New legislation is now being prepared and will be introduced during the next session.

The Glassco commission recommended the separation of the printing bureau from the printing and stationery department and the creation of a new office called the queen's publisher. The separation has been made but special legislation is required to create the new office. The future role and attributions of the queen's publisher are now under review and the new legislation will be ready for consideration next year.

The public archives and the national library are also going through a period of transition. The new building is scheduled to be completed in the latter part of 1966. Apart from its other normal activities, the archives expects to resume in 1965 the publication of documentary volumes which was interrupted by the war. The first volume will be a collection of unpublished documents relating to Champlain and his times. A second volume of Champlain documents should follow in 1966. A comprehensive edition of the letters of Sir John A. Macdonald is in preparation and the first volumes will be published in 1967. They will be the first of a long series

which will include the letters of all the prime ministers.

In anticipation of the completion of the new building, the book purchasing program of the national library is being expanded. In order to avoid needless duplication and to discover the most important gaps in the government's book resources, the national librarian, in co-operation with the chief librarian of the national research council is making a survey of all government libraries in order to secure up to date details of their collections and book purchasing policies. Although the national library gives first priority to the acquisition of publications relating to Canada, the ultimate aim is that in co-operation with other government libraries in Ottawa, it should provide a comprehensive book collection covering all major subjects.

The legislative measures which will be submitted to the house, the elaboration of new programs and the improvements to existing ones, should go a long way in fostering in Canada a new awareness of our immense intellectual and spiritual resources and in developing to the fullest measure our cultural potential.

The debate going on today in Quebec and throughout Canada gives ample proof that cultural and spiritual values transcend the more material exigencies of our Canadian existence. Many of the difficulties in achieving greater Canadian unity, a unity which must be based on moderation, good will and mutual respect, may be traced to a lack of cultural progress and to neglect of our more human values. Government policy in this field has many pitfalls. It must avoid the creation of state regimented cultures by doing too much, and it must beware of abrogating its true responsibilities by doing too little. The government must direct its efforts to assisting in the development of all our gifted creative talents and yet its cultural programs must be established in such a way as to assure a broad popular participation.

Culture has too long been confused in the popular mind with something exclusive, and pretentious. This situation only leads to a wider gap between the cultural level of a few and the cultural level of many. Our efforts should be directed to bridging this gap. Our aim should be to provide the catalyst whereby our diverse cultures, which find expression in many fields, from ballet to folk-dancing, from Camus to Leacock, can grow and flourish through more frequent contacts and exchanges. Government policy must also be directed to making the fruits of our cultural achievements of greater benefit to more Canadians in more distant parts of the country.

The general program I have announced today constitutes not so much a radical departure from previous government policy as it reflects an awareness of the greater need in our complex and troubled society for greater cultural and spiritual efforts. This is a task to which all Canadians of good will must lend their efforts, in which both public and private groups must participate and in which, I am sure, hon. members will find common agreement.

Mr. Nowlan: Many of us have sat here in this place on Friday afternoons when estimates were being brought forward—usually a handful of members from the maritimes and from western Canada were present—and the function of the minister was to make as short an address as possible, to get as much supply as possible, and to have votes passed for as many dollars as possible. This has been the practice on Friday afternoons for a number of years, in fact for as long as I have been here.

This afternoon, however, we have seen a unique departure from that practice. We have seen a minister bringing forward a philosophical, a lengthy and, I will say, a learned and able dissertation on some of the cultural problems with which this country is faced. It is by way of a unique experience and it is an initiative on which I commend the hon. gentleman at this time. Certainly, what he has said is worthy of careful consideration.

Since it is now ten minutes to five, and since private members' hour begins in ten minutes' time, I am sure the minister would be horribly insulted if anybody attempted to deal at length with his estimates in the short time we now have left to us. I had thought the minister would follow the policy pursued by many of his predecessors, some of them seated on that side of the house and some on this, when we attempted to do as much as possible in such a short time. But since he has chosen not to follow that practice—and I am by no means criticizing him for this—any notes I had made on the administration of the C.B.C. would be out of place, at the present time and I do not intend to deal with the subject at any length.

The minister raised interesting questions with respect to cultural development and the development of the Canadian nation as such. I recall reading a paper some years ago by

the president of the Canadian historical association. The writer asked the question: Is there a Canada; is there a Canadian nation? He answered that question affirmatively but he also said, as the hon. gentleman himself hinted this afternoon, that Canadians are prone to take their livers out, prop them up on their knees and examine them introspectively to find out whether they are suffering from cirrhosis or some other ailment. I think there is this introspective quality among Canadians, an inferiority complex even, which requires a careful study. Possibly the minister in his statement this afternoon opened the way to a discussion of that matter at some time in the future, but certainly not this afternoon.

The minister referred specifically to the various agencies for which he is responsible. He referred to the board of broadcast governors, to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and to others and he mentioned the fact that there are conflicts and ambiguities in relation particularly to the act which should be clarified. With that I quite agree. When the minister responsible for that legislation first introduced it into the house he said that it was something of an experiment, that there were bound to be difficulties emerging in connection with its administration.

We were facing a situation at that time which was novel. Up until then the C.B.C. had complete control of all agencies so far as broadcasting was concerned. Pressure was put on the C.B.C., and incidentally on the government, to set up a regulatory body and the government of that day felt its way along the pathway. I think it felt its way fairly well, but undoubtedly far from perfectly. Then they set up the B.B.G. In introducing the legislation the minister at that time stated it would certainly require amendment and careful study, and he thought that within three or four years parliament would have to review the whole situation. I am glad to hear that the minister agrees with the minister of that day and apparently he intends to revise this legislation. There are one or more committees now studying the whole problem, and it is certainly one worthy of very careful study.

The committee of this house has spent some considerable time, particularly on interim supply, in relation to the C.B.C. There were many questions asked during those days which I think the minister is expected to answer. The fact that they were asked and that the minister will deal with them—I hope —will justify at least to some extent what sometimes alleged in certain quarters not too far removed from over our right shoulders—I refer to the press gallery—to be a waste of time on interim supply, because the more these matters are worked over in interim supply and the more the minister answers them now, the less time will have to be spent on the estimates of the C.B.C. itself.

I am not one of those, Mr. Chairman—I am sure I do not need to tell the committee this —who feels that parliament or the government should dispose of the C.B.C. I think the C.B.C. has performed and is performing an integral service in the development of the Canadian nation. I would deprecate any suggestion that we should do away with or should sell, or anything of that kind, this corporation. After all, it was established many years ago; and without indulging in any partisan memories I would just like to say it was set up by a Conservative government under Right Hon. R. B. Bennett. I see the minister is shaking his head; I appreciate some vague efforts were made in this regard by the preceding government, but the government of Right Hon. R. B. Bennett brought it to fruition. Although changes have been made from time to time by parliament and there have been many investigations, complaints and inquiries, every time the answer comes back that the C.B.C. is an essential part of our development and deserves the support of this country. And I agree with that.

However, this does not mean I agree with all of the actions of the C.B.C. at this time. Frankly I feel that the C.B.C. is required to exercise more self-discipline perhaps than it has heretofore. If it does not I am afraid that the government, or even parliament, will be pressured into exercising that discipline, and it will be necessary so to exercise it. I am not talking now about programming. Many of the programs of the C.B.C. I think are excellent; I think some of them are atrocious. But after all, that is only my opinion and I think in this area we are all entitled to our own opinions and the C.B.C. should not be criticized in this regard.

There was a time, Mr. Chairman, when I sat where the present minister now sits, and there was not one day that I did not receive between 25 and 50 letters. Half a dozen of them would be blasphemous. Well, they would not exactly be blasphemous because the authors of them would not indulge in blasphemy, but they were expressing opinions about what were called indecent and obscene programs produced by the C.B.C. and tele-

vised on a certain night. Then again another dozen or so letters would tell me what a wonderful program it was and what a great thing it was to have me as minister and to see programs on the C.B.C. by independent producers. So there is no way in which you can deal with programming per se.

I think in the area of finance there does need to be a little discipline exercised. Although I am only dealing with small details at the moment, frankly when these estimates come again I intend to spend some little time dealing with the paper which the minister has put before us this afternoon and which I did not anticipate; therefore I am only dealing with the mechanical aspects at the moment.

I think there could perhaps be some criticism of the C.B.C. in some of its expenditures, for example in sending camera parties here, there and everywhere, to places where we have good existing media of communications. I think it is true that there were more cameramen present at the Olympic games in Tokyo than there were medals won. I think that that is a particular area deserving careful examination.

I am also directly concerned—I am mentioning this now because I know the minister will deal with it later on—with one particular item of his expenditures, and that is the loan amounting to $14,500,000 or $14,250,000 to the corporation. Loans have been made in the old days. I am not criticizing any government for this. Possibly they were made under the government of R. B. Bennett, but the point is that they have been built up, built up and built up until the minister concerned had millions of dollars under loan, all of which was impossible of repayment. To make a loan to the C.B.C. is the same as giving a snowball to a fireman in a furnace room and expecting him to return it tomorrow morning. The snowball of course will have evaporated just in the same way as this money is spent. To call it a loan is a euphemistic statement of the most extreme kind. In addition to the money listed in the public account we also have this $14,250,000 loan, which as I said is a euphemistic expression which I think is used to cover additional expenditures.

I notice the hour is five o'clock, Mr. Chairman, but as I said I am only touching on a few of the mechanical aspects at the moment. The minister has brought forward a very interesting document this afternoon and I am sure he would be very disappointed if we did not spend two or three days or even longer some time next week or the week after in order to discuss the matters he has put before us. Therefore, may I call it five o'clock?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, may I just say the house leader, who is detained elsewhere, asked me whether I would come down to the house and see, since the house has been so agreeable these last few days, whether there is a general disposition to go right on until six o'clock with these estimates? Perhaps the hon. gentleman himself wants to make a speech, as well as others, and this would provide a wonderful hour for making them.

Mr. Nowlan: No. I think the minister's remarks were of such a wide ranging nature and so different from what is usually entertained on estimates on a Friday afternoon that as a tribute to the minister—because he deserves this tribute—we should adjourn this matter now and go ahead with private members' hour.

Mr. Pickersgill: Well, could we take some of the other items—

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Pickersgill: —stood over from other parts of the minister's department.

The Chairman: Order, please. May I suggest this discussion is out of order and that this proposal should be made with the Speaker in the chair.

In order to allow the house to proceed with 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?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Resolutions adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I think it is usual on Friday afternoon before commencing private members hour for the acting house leader to inform us what business we will be dealing with on Monday and Tuesday of the following week.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I am not in my right place, but if the house will suffer me to speak I might say that the house leader is at this time consulting with the Prime Minister about that matter, and I do not think he will be in a position to say anything about it until six o'clock.

Mr. Nowlan: He will be in at six o'clock.

CANADA GRAIN ACT

AMENDMENT TO REVISE DEFINITION OF "ELEVATOR"

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-70, to amend the Canada Grain Act (Off-track elevator licensing).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the intent of Bill C-70 is very simple. It is to amend the Canada Grain Act by dropping the words in the second line "directly from or into railway cars or vessels". Under the definition of an elevator in the Canada Grain Act it is specified that no licence can be granted to an elevator unless the elevator is in a position where western grain may be received, or out of which it may be discharged, directly from or into railway cars or vessels. There are some further provisions.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that this definition of "an elevator" needs to be changed, particularly in view of the proposed railway abandonment or rationalization program which may come into being as a result of the passage of Bill No. C-120. I am not sure whether it is well known to hon. members of this house that there was a period of time when it was possible for the board of grain commissioners to license an elevator whether it was located along a railroad track or not, but since the adoption of the amendment to the act inserting the words "directly from or into railway cars or vessels," it has been impossible and unlawful to license an elevator unless it is located alongside a railway line.

There is a very useful purpose to be served by an elevator in this day and age, 1964, whether or not it is located beside a railway line. As an example of this I could refer to many small towns where all, or almost all, of the grain is delivered to the elevator and taken out of the elevator by motor truck transport. While there are railway lines located in these towns, very little use is made of them for the movement of grain. If the provisions contained in the Canada Grain Act were enforced, unless those elevators were standing alongside a railway track it would not be possible for the elevator to be licensed.

I am certain that in years to come, particularly if there is a large scale program of railway line abandonment undertaken, motor truck transport is going to play an increasingly important part in the movement of grain. We might as well recognize this fact now so that it will be possible for an elevator to be licensed, whether or not it is located adjacent to a railway line.

Perhaps there would not be a great amount of grain moved from these elevators by motor truck transport for export, yet when one considers the economics and the cost of maintaining some of these branch lines solely for the purpose of carrying grain in boxcars as opposed to short movements by motor transport and then into railway cars, it becomes fairly obvious that some substantial savings can be effected by the use of motor truck transport.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to spend a great amount of time advocating the acceptance of this bill because it is completely obvious that it needs to be amended for the reasons I have suggested, but I hope if the government is not prepared to accept this amendment today it will at least be prepared to refer the subject matter to the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines, so that it can be considered at the same time as that portion of Bill C-120 which relates to railway line abandonment.

I could spend some considerable time outlining the history of this licensing practice, and give many examples of the beneficial results of off-track storage, particularly in the early 1950's, but I am not as interested in what has happened regarding these elevators in the past as I am in what may happen in the future. I know that the three western wheat pools and some of the line elevator companies have advanced as one of their arguments against the abandonment of any branch lines this particular section of the act which would in fact mean the revoking of their licences if the lines were abandoned. However, I am one of those who believe that while we cannot have wholesale abandonment of railway lines we must face up to the fact that some of them are not being used for any other purpose than to haul a very small amount of grain. If we want to be practical and realistic we have to recognize that some of these lines are going to be abandoned because they are not being used for hauling l.c.l. or local freight any more, or for passenger service or for carrying the mail. Therefore it just does not make common sense to maintain them for the hauling of a very small amount of grain.

Before anyone misunderstands me let me say that this applies to a very few railway lines, and the argument I am trying to make is that even though those railway lines are rolled up and abandoned the elevators now situated in some of these small towns could serve a very useful purpose if the board of grain commissioners would license them. The

grain could then be transported by motor truck to the nearest railway line where it could then be moved to an export position or in some cases to flour mills or places where other types of processing of grain are carried on.

That is all I want to say about the matter. The bill is very simple and is almost self-explanatory. Its passage would serve a very useful purpose from the point of view of some of our communities in western Canada.

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, Bill No. C-70, an act to amend the Canada Grain Act, off-track elevator licensing, has been introduced by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) and I believe it received first reading last February. I think it deserves a certain amount of commendation and has a certain amount of merit, but there are some facts I should like to put on the record.

The bill concerns the definition of a grain elevator which, according to the board of grain commissioners' interpretation of the Canada Grain Act must, for the purposes of the act, be a structure situated on a live railway line where it can be serviced by rail cars, or a structure situated on the waterfront where it can be serviced by vessels. The bill would change the act so that there would not be a restriction to servicing by railway cars or vessels. In other words, grain could be shipped out by truck without a special permit from the board.

However, the definition envisaged in Bill No. C-70 is much too loose and would permit the unrestricted licensing of any storage space at all, from curling rinks or churches to farm storage bins, with a consequent loss of control by the board of grain commissioners and by the Canadian wheat board. Moreover, it is premature in that the effects of the branch line rationalization program cannot be known for some time yet, and indeed it may never be necessary to go as far as amending the Canada Grain Act in order to accommodate the few elevators which it may be expedient to retain on abandoned lines. The situation has not had time to crystallize yet, so that no one really knows whether or not it is an urgent matter. Meanwhile, as long as there is enough flexibility in the Canada Grain Act to permit the continued operation of grain elevators on abandoned railway lines, although restricted to shipping out only, no urgent problem exists.

The board of grain commissioners does continue to license elevators situated on abandoned lines under an agreement with the Canadian wheat board whereby the elevators may stay open for shipping out grain but, as I said earlier, they are not permitted to receive grain once the line is closed. There are currently 29 such licences in force and the quantity of grain involved is approximately one million bushels.

There are two country elevators that are fully licensed despite the fact they have never been situated on a railway line. One is at Olds, Alberta, and the other is at Makwa in northwestern Saskatchewan. The latter was erected and licensed in the expectation that the railway line was to be built, but this never happened. Producers who deliver to that point now pay 5 cents per bushel extra to have their grain trucked to the railhead. However, these are the exceptions. For those elevators not yet closed which are situated on an abandoned rail line the board of grain commissioners continues a restricted licensing but would not, of course, permit the construction of additions to them and does keep these licences under continual review.

By and large the Canadian grain marketing and handling system was well designed for the purpose of facilitating the export movement of grain and there is no reason for it to be altered now. Accordingly grain should not be stored in any facility where it is not readily accessible for shipment when it is required. Furthermore, experience has shown that grain stored at off-rail sites deteriorates more readily than does grain in elevators where it can be turned over more frequently.

This question has been discussed with the grain handling organizations and they are in full agreement that the effect which the passage of Bill No. C-70 would have on our grain collection system would not be in the best interests of western grain growers. There is a school of thought among the grain handling people that our country elevator system has been overexpanded. Some firms are known to be eagerly looking forward to the day when certain branch lines will be closed because they will then have an acceptable reason for closing down elevators where they consistently lose money.

Because of the Crowsnest pass freight rates and our egalitarian delivery quota system, our country elevator set-up will probably continue in its present general pattern rather than move to the type of elevator system that we see in the United States. Nevertheless some improvements can be carried

out that would lead to a more efficient operation and so allow Canadian grain to remain competitive in world markets. It seems to me that the dropping off of the high cost elevators along uneconomic branch lines will help us to do that. The implementation of the idea inherent in Bill No. C-70 would effectively prevent the desired improved efficiency. Consequently I cannot support the bill.

The overexpansion of our country elevator system has generated a progressive rise in both direct and indirect operating costs related to this overbuilt position, and has resulted in a total cost of operations which may well be in excess of the level that the Canadian grain system can bear if it is to remain competitive. It has been suggested that the prairie grain collection system now comprises too many, too small elevators at too many delivery points. The system now consists of 5,187 separately licensed elevators located at about 2,000 separate shipping points.

The licensed capacity totals 370 million bushels. These levels are fairly representative of the situation that has prevailed over the past six or seven years. Prior to 1940, the country elevator capacity was stable at about 200 million bushels, distributed amongst 5,600 elevators. During the war the construction of temporary annex structures and enlargements of existing elevators brought the total country capacity to 310 million bushels.

After the war the temporary storage was progressively cut back so that by 1952 the post-war low point of 293 million bushels was reached. The number of elevators totalled 5,430. The high level of crops in 1951 and 1952 reversed the trend and by 1957 a level of 371 million bushels of space was available in country elevators and special annexes, the latter including non-elevator structures such as rinks and airplane hangars. Since then this temporary storage has been progressively eliminated.

Such capacity is not at all desirable for reasons already given, and it would seem that permitting the storage of grain in elevators on abandoned rail lines is in the same category as storing it in these temporary structures.

Another factor to bear in mind is the size of the box car fleet which must, as a matter of course, be related to the size of the country elevator system. With fewer elevators and the same number of box cars, efficiency is automatically increased because the throughput is increased; that is, the ratio of the volume of grain moved to the storage capacity is higher. At the same time, the box cars become available more quickly and the whole grain flow is speeded up. With an adequate box car supply each country elevator can turn over its capacity four or five times per year with little difficulty. Only at that rate, as a minimum, can grain handling through a country elevator be made to pay. Because of the overexpansion, very few elevators have such a turnover and this indicates why some companies eagerly await an opportunity to close down some elevators.

It has been estimated that a country elevator system of 250 million bushels capacity, consisting of modern, properly located plants, is ample to handle marketings of 700 million bushels or more per year. If this is so, then the loss of elevators on abandoned lines will not be felt in the over-all grain movement picture. Indeed, to keep them open and transfer the grain to an elevator on a live line by truck would be a self-defeating act because of the added expense.

Mr. Olson: I wonder if I could ask the hon. member one question?

Mr. Whelan: Yes.

Mr. Olson: Does he not think there are other qualifications and specifications that could be applied in considering whether or not an elevator should have a licence, other than the fact that a railway line runs alongside of it?

Mr. Whelan: I said that I thought the bill sponsored by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) had a certain amount of merit and I think it warrants some definite consideration. The fact that an elevator may not be located on a railroad line deserves some definite consideration when it comes to licensing. However, the potential of the area and the history of it should be considered in connection with licensing. If my words were interpreted in the manner the hon. member suggests, I certainly did not intend to give that impression.

Mr. Olson: Then, why are you opposing the bill?

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I find myself wholly in agreement with the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson), the sponsor of the bill. Actually, Bill No. C-70 will have a direct effect on the grain marketing industry in the years ahead, even if rail line abandonment does not reach the huge

proportions the railways would like to see it reach. Actually, what the bill does is to leave out five or six words that are in the act to the effect that such an elevator must discharge grain directly into railway cars or vessels.

As the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Whelan) pointed out, few off-track elevators are licensed. The hon. member for Essex South showed some ignorance of the grain handling facilities when he said that a 250 million bushel capacity would handle a 700 million bushel crop. Where would the extra grain be stored? It would be stored on the farms. Any farmer will tell you that one only has to go back to the fifties to find that it was obvious that farm stored grain, while it was like money in the bank, did cause many farmers to sell their grain at what one might call depressed prices. If they had only waited, they would have obtained the wheat board price for it. If the amount of storage space available for grain were cut down, this would be a retrograde step. Actually this would happen if rail line abandonment were given effect to the extent the railways want it, and if the grain act were not amended to allow off-track elevators to be licensed.

Some years ago in Winnipeg the chairman of the Canadian National made a speech about grain handling. He suggested that the elevator companies, the railroads and the farmers, the people concerned, should get together and study the grain handling facilities. He felt that 100,000 bushels of grain could be moved 50 miles on either side of the main line easier by truck than it is moved now by rail. Many of these lines could be abandoned and the grain could be moved by truck. He did not go so far as to suggest that the farmers should be moving the grain themselves that extra 50 miles, but he did suggest that the three parties concerned should get together and perhaps a trucking fleet could be devised to move the grain. If this is true, then surely off-track elevators should be licensed.

As I say, the hon. member for Essex South thought there was enough storage capacity and that the elevator grain system was now over-extended. This was not true a few years ago when the box car commission investigated grain handling facilities and grain storage capacity on the prairies. This was not the situation when we had to institute cash advances on farm stored grain. Certainly we must proceed and let experience be our guide. Experience with grain handling facilities does not suggest that grain storage capacity is necessarily overextended. It does not suggest, to me at least, that a 250 million bushel capacity can handle a 700 million bushel crop year in and year out without putting an added burden on the farmers. They are the ones who would have to store the grain.

The present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) well knows the difficulties experienced in the middle fifties with regard to farm stored grain. They tried making payments on it in one form or another in an effort to compensate for what we might call this underdeveloped grain storage system. When we are discussing this bill, we are not saying that we should go back to the middle fifties and license all the community curling rinks, skating rinks or abandoned airplane hangars for the handling of grain. We are saying that an elevator should be able to obtain a licence to handle and store grain on wheat board storage tickets, but it should be an elevator, not a skating rink or a curling rink. An elevator has facilities to move grain and turn it. The only reason grain could not be kept in other storage is that it cannot be turned if it is slightly heated or if mice and termites get into it. Therefore there is no reason why an elevator could not be chosen as a good storage place, no matter whether it is sitting beside a railroad or 15 miles away from one.

As the hon. member for Medicine Hat pointed out so aptly, there are many other specifications to be taken into consideration. This bill may not be passed today but it will certainly be considered when the railway committee studies Bill C-120.

The railroads propose to abandon 4,000 miles of track in the prairie provinces and this might envision the abandonment of 700, 800 or possibly 1,000 elevators. What will happen then if, as Mr. Gordon says, grain can be moved cheaper by truck over short disances? Why shouldn't elevators on abandoned railway lines be allowed to continue in business? As road networks improve trucks will be able to handle the grain.

Although he did not say so, Mr. Gordon may prefer to use a fleet of trucks rather than a diesel locomotive. In fact the railways are fast moving into the trucking field. Perhaps this is what he envisions when he says a whole new grain transportation system should be devised.

Mr. Sharp: I was very interested in the comments the hon. member was making but I wonder is he satisfied that Bill C-70 would achieve what he is speaking of now? Would

not this seem to open the way for the licensing of almost any premises?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I am sure that before any premises is licensed—

Mr. Tardif: Did you read the bill?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I have the grain act before me and I have read it several times during the past six or seven years. I also read the bill. Surely the board of grain commissioners do not license any elevator alongside a railway line. It has to be open for public business. A farmer cannot buy an elevator alongside a railway track and keep it for his own business. It has to be open for public business before it can be licensed. Therefore the reverse is directly true. If an elevator is alongside a railway track it does not automatically receive a licence, and neither does it automatically receive a licence if it is not alongside a railway track.

A curling rink would not qualify under any definition as an elevator. I remember when curling and skating rinks were allowed to store grain but they were not covered by separate licences. It was merely the case of an extension of an elevator company's licence permitting it to store grain in an off-site storage place. When this was done away with I questioned the wheat board on it when its representatives appeared before the agriculture committee the following year, and they pointed out that it was eliminated because there were no turning facilities in such places.

I do not intend to discuss the bill at length but I know provision will have to be made for off-site storage if the railways proceed with the abandonment of 4,000 miles of track in the prairie provinces.

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go on record as being opposed to Bill C-70, but I would like answers to a number of questions. For that reason I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson), that the bill be referred to the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines, is a good one.

If railway abandonment is proceeded with and these off-track elevators are licensed to accept grain I would like to know at whose expense will the grain then be moved to railway elevators? Will it be at the expense of the farmers or of the railways? If it is at the farmers' expense, then many of the benefits they receive under the Crowsnest pass agreement will disappear. Further, if railway abandonment goes through, I would like to know how many of these elevators will be licensed? Will all the elevators that are at present alongside railway tracks be licensed?

If railway abandonment is proceeded with, then instead of licensing many of these elevators I think the government should give serious consideration to having government terminals built on those lines which will not be abandoned, so that if the farmers have to haul 40 or 50 miles to these terminals there will nevertheless be money saved because these terminals will deliver grain to the ports, Vancouver or Hudson bay, but not at the farmers' expense.

I think the minister should give careful consideration to having this bill referred to the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines. I do not believe it should be talked out. Representatives of the board of grain commisioners or of the Canadian wheat board could appear before the committee and give evidence as to the likely effect if off-track elevator storage were licensed. I know this is a matter of great concern to the prairies where thousands of miles of track will be abandoned. Farmers who had to haul their grain only five or ten miles will be obliged to haul it 50 or 60 miles to the elevators, and this will be an expensive business. If these elevators which are on the lines to be abandoned would accept the grain, and if the government, or the crown companies, were to be responsible for moving it to the nearest station where it could be loaded into boxcars, it would be a different story altogether. If there is merit in the bill now before us, I think it is up to the government to allow the farmers to benefit from its provisions by referring the measure to the committee as I have suggested.

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Carleton): The mover of this bill, the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) is to be congratulated on adopting this means of calling attention to a problem. I know that as an experienced parliamentarian he is well aware of what a private member's bill can realistically be expected to do in the hour which is set aside for us here. I think the intention of the bill is to call attention clearly to a problem which has to be thought through, namely what would be the effect of branch line rationalization on the elevators which are bound to be affected and upon our storage program.

I have followed this debate with great interest. I especially enjoyed the brilliant con-

tribution made by my hon. friend from Essex South (Mr. Whelan). I also enjoyed the contribution made by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner) whose talents I have always admired. I must say he was lacking something in fire and volume this afternoon, but I think it was very considerate of him, especially on a Friday afternoon when the house has some difficulty in maintaining its numbers, to choose to assist us. I can well recall his contributions to our debates on previous occasions and I will always remember his speech in this chamber during the flag debate, along with that of the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis).

The difficulty which this bill was designed to cover is the problem which will arise with respect to elevators along railway lines which will be abandoned. My hon. friend from Essex South made a good point when he said we had to think of a desirable volume in a country elevator system in relation to an expected volume of export business. We must realize that the whole purpose is to keep our system of grain marketing competitive, and in order to do this we must see that the storage facilities are situated at points where there are no unnecessary additional trucking or related charges—points where the grain can be turned over properly and where the marketing board can maintain proper control. They must be close to transportation facilities and so on.

It seems to me there is a major line of criticism which could be directed at the bill before us. Basically, as I have suggested, a bill of this nature serves an educational purpose; it calls a problem to our attention and offers a possible solution. The difficulties which may still exist can then be examined in the course of public debate, and possibly some other line of attack on the problem can be found.

The concern I had on reading this bill arises from the definition of "elevator". The definition presently reads as follows:

> "elevator" means any premises into which western grain may be received, or out of which it may be discharged directly from or into railway cars or vessels—

It seems to me by eliminating the phrase "directly from or into railway cars or vessels" one leaves the definition very loose indeed. The possibility of using any type of storage space is opened up, whether it be an abandoned aircraft hangar, an abandoned community skating rink or storage space in general—space which may not be a desirable location for the storage of grain.

I am told, although this is a field with which I am not as familiar as I should like to be, that grain in storage has to be turned over regularly, that we cannot be haphazard about these things and that control over conditions of storage is most important, especially when grain is intended for export. There is no doubt that the elevators system has to be examined. Canada must develop the most effective facilities in order that our export business may be conducted with the minimum delay and the maximum efficiency. Any amendment to the legislation which would have the effect of worsening our storage facilities by creating too loose a definition should not be undertaken lightly by this house, especially if it were likely to remove some of the tools now at the disposal of the marketing board for controlling the quality and nature of our storage facilities.

I think the fate of a measure of this kind should be as follows. The question is a large one and it deserves the attention of more hon. members than are present this afternoon. It should be up for debate again, at which time there might possibly be a correction in the definition which would meet the deficiencies which have been pointed out in the course of this debate.

The hon. member could introduce it again. By the force of compelling public debate which has brought attention to the problem an examination will take place, not only in this house and the press of the land but among those who examine public problems and try to resolve them in the most satisfactory manner. Attention will also be focused upon it within the department. Certainly the problem is there. We are going to undertake a program of abandonment of certain branch lines in the process of the rationalization of our railway system in western Canada. Legislation in this respect has been placed in general form before the house and it will be discussed and debated at great length. The final impact of the program is not yet clear.

When we have taken that step we shall have to look at the elevators program at the same time. I think the hon. member who moved the bill has shown commendable foresight in calling attention to the problem, doing so in a timely way and according to the established procedures of the house. I think it illustrates the proper use of private members' hour. I know the hon. member who moved the bill is a little more sophisticated and knowledgeable than some hon. members

of the house, not of his group but who sit near him, who seem to take a very liberal approach to the problem of private members' bills and who think that every private member's bill should be voted on, except the ones they choose to talk out. These members have chosen to talk out, for example, the Bell Telephone Company bill on a number of occasions. They have asked that other bills be voted on as a principle of reform in this house. I realize the hon. member who moved this bill recognizes the fundamental educational purpose served by debate on a measure of this type. The problem receives proper and careful attention as a result of the kind of debate which this house is undertaking. This is one of the best and the most laudable purposes of the use of this hour, which is set aside from the government business in this house.

I can only conclude, reluctantly, Mr. Speaker, that in its present form this bill does not appear to meet the requirements of the definition of an elevator which would permit the authorities charged with the marketing of grain to have the kind of discrimination they must have to build up a rational and efficient system of grain elevator marketing. If the bill has this serious defect, as I believe it has, I should not like to vote against it, although if compelled to do so I would have to vote against the bill in its present form. But I think the purpose of this bill can be achieved as a result of the debate which has taken place. The hon. member should look at it again, consider a modification in the wording, and then once again bring the matter before the house for reconsideration.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I do not represent an agricultural constituency but I have listened with a great deal of interest to all the statements from both sides of the house made since five o'clock on Bill No. C-70. There has not been one member who has highly commended the hon. member who introduced this bill. There has not been one member who has not pointed out that there is a problem here which should be considered. Some technical objections have been raised but I do not think they are of sufficient importance to override or overbalance the fact that everyone is in agreement with the hon. member, who has introduced a subject which is worthy of further study.

That being so, Mr. Speaker, and because I think all are in agreement that the bill should not be talked out, I would therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That Bill No. C-70, an act to amend the Canada Grain Act (off-track elevator licensing) be not now read a second time but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines for study and report.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, it is unusual for a minister to take part in the debate on a private member's bill of this kind, but in view of the motion which has just been moved I thought I should say a few words.

I, as a member of this house, should like to consider a little more carefully the implications of the motion which has been made to refer the subject matter of this bill to a committee. As several hon. members have said—and I am very happy to join with them this bill does relate to a problem of some importance; at least it can be so construed. I share the doubts of some of the members who have spoken as to whether the bill does in fact deal directly with the problem which is in the mind of the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson).

Mr. Winch: For "study and report", by the committee.

Mr. Sharp: Yes. Perhaps I should say on behalf of the government that the government very well understands the problem, and while the hon. gentleman has brought the matter before the house in the form of this bill it is a problem which is engaging the attention of the government in connection not only with the program of rail line rationalization, which will be proceeding in due course, but also in connection with all the ancillary changes which have to be made in the handling of grain.

Therefore I am a little reluctant to see this motion which has been put before the house decided today. I think we ought to look a little more carefully at the subject. I should like to look carefully at the bill myself before deciding whether it is the most useful way to bring the matter before the committee of this house or to have it decided by the house itself.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hour for the consideration of private members' business has expired.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I did ask at five o'clock about the business but was told that

I could not get an answer until six. Can we now be told what the program will be for Monday, and if possible for as much of next week as possible.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to give the business for the first couple of days of next week in any event. Although I was not in the house earlier today at one o'clock when the committee stage of the redistribution bill was completed, it is my understanding that there were certain amendments to the bill this morning and that third reading of the bill was held over in order to have these amendments printed in the bill. On the assumption that third reading will be only a formality I propose calling third reading of that bill first thing on Monday. If it is not to be merely a formality I expect to be aware of that fact before the house opens on Monday.

I am happy to report that there is agreement among the parties to give second reading to the Canada pension plan bill in order that it may be sent to a committee before the conclusion of the sitting on Wednesday at six o'clock. In order that we have a committee to which we can refer that bill it would be convenient to adopt the motion, which is item No. 17 on today's order paper, for the establishment of that committee on Monday before second reading. When that motion is passed, and I assume it is a mere formality, we will then call second reading of the Canada pension plan bill and continue our consideration in that regard until second reading has been given, with the understanding that that will take place not later than Wednesday.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, the house leader has shown a high degree of optimism in assuming that any motion for third reading, or for the setting up of a committee will be a mere formality. I trust that that may be true, but I do not know who could be sure of that in this house as it is now constituted. Nevertheless, as far as we in the opposition are concerned, we will co-operate with the house leader to make sure that we can proceed with the business of the house.

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]:

SECRETARY OF STATE

Office of the chief electoral officer—

1. Salaries and expenses of office, $106,000.

Civil service commission—

1. Salaries and contingencies of the commission including compensation in accordance with the suggestion award plan of the public service of Canada, $5,516,500.

Privy council—

B—Economic Council of Canada—

35. Administration, $817,920.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, November 16, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

ALASKA HIGHWAY—STUDY RESPECTING RECONSTRUCTION AND PAVING COSTS

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, as the house is already aware, the Department of Public Works is carrying out an engineering study to determine the cost of reconstructing and paving the Canadian section of the Alaska highway, and the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources is conducting an economic study to establish the benefits which would accrue to Canada as a result of this construction if it were undertaken.

Hon. members will be interested to know that the above studies are progressing, and for these it is now necessary to ascertain more precisely the design standards on which estimates of construction costs will be based and to obtain more detailed information about related engineering aspects. For this purpose there will shortly be technical talks between Canadian and United States officials. These talks will be without reference to possible means of financing.

Officials of the government of British Columbia and of the territorial government of the Yukon are being invited to participate in these talks and to have prior discussions with the federal officials. The question of paving the portion of the Alaska highway which lies in Canada, and of any negotiations with the United States government on the matter, remains open. Before any decision can be made it will be necessary to have more information regarding the cost of reconstruction, relocation and paving of the highway and regarding the economic benefits to Canada. A tentative date for talks with British Columbia and the Yukon is December 3, 1964, and with the United States, December 4.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, if I may comment briefly on the minister's statement may I say I am sure that members of the house, particularly those from the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia and, of course, the northern areas will especially welcome the minister's announcement. We have been waiting for some time for this development to occur, and while I for one am disappointed that the talks will not include the subject of cost sharing, nevertheless the talks will no doubt be fruitful.

As the minister is well aware, there are two bills pending before the United States Senate and House of Representatives which suggest that the United States undertake half the cost of reconstructing and paving the Alaska highway. I suggest that perhaps it would be useful to include a discussion of the financial and cost sharing implications of the paving and reconstruction of the highway, particularly since over half of the highway, 657 miles, is in the province of British Columbia. With the energy, ambitions and convictions of the premier of British Columbia I am sure he would be only too happy to enter into any cost sharing arrangement with the federal government and the government of the United States for the paving of the highway. My own suggestion has been for some time that the United States should bear half the cost, British Columbia should bear one third of the cost and the federal government should bear one third of the cost.

An hon. Member: What arithmetic.

Mr. Nielsen: I am sorry; the United States should bear one half of the cost, the federal government one quarter and British Columbia one quarter. I was quoting Social Credit theory, as one member suggests.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: I really do suggest to the minister that these cost sharing talks should be beneficial. I am sure we are all extremely happy to hear that progress is finally being made and that concrete talks are going to be held with regard to paving this very vital artery through the Yukon to Alaska.

Mr. Bert Leboe (Cariboo): We do welcome the report that has been given to us by the minister today. We hope, however, that emphasis will continue to be put on getting those sections of the highway paved that fall within the alignment on the official survey. This, of course, would greatly assist in the time that

is going to elapse between the total paving of the highway and the time some of this work can be accomplished. If the amount of paving that can be done is brought forward immediately, it will be of great help to the Yukon and to Alaska. I hope the minister will continue to study this angle so that as much paving as can be readily done in certain spots will be done. This, I am sure, will meet with the approval of the people of British Columbia and the Yukon.

In so far as Social Credit policies are concerned, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the remarks and the laughter indicate just about how much the people of this country do understand Social Credit.

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources based on his announcement today concerning the talks that will be proceeding with the three governments mentioned. Since there are two other very important matters that can be usefully discussed, I wonder whether the minister would consider suggesting to the governments concerned the inclusion in these talks of the recently discovered Tarr inlet as a tidewater port in the Yukon and the construction of the Skagway road, since they concern all three governments?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, our latest information on the so-called Tarr inlet harbour area is rather discouraging. These other matters may come up when the governments get together. However, the technical discussions to which I referred, will concern themselves essentially with the Alaska highway.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

FREE MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICES TO OLD AGE PENSIONERS AT 65

Question No. 2,001—**Mr. Mather:**

Has the national pensioners and senior citizens federation requested that free medical and hospital services be extended to persons entitled to an old age pension at age 65 and, if so, what consideration is being given to this request?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Reference to this matter was contained in one of a number of resolutions set forth in a copy of a report of a recent meeting of the national pensioners and senior citizens federation addressed to the Prime Minister, the Minister of National Health and Welfare and members of the federal parliament.

Old age assistance is provided at age 65 to persons who fulfil the requirements of the Old Age Assistance Act and regulations. As the provinces administer and share the cost of old age assistance, any supplementary benefits for recipients involving the expenditure of provincial funds would require consideration by provincial authorities.

FEDERAL ROYAL COMMISSIONS

Question No. 2,038—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. How many royal commissions have been set up at the request of the federal government since 1957 and what are they?
2. How many of them have submitted their final report since that time and how much has each of the commissions cost?
3. Which commissions have still to report and when are they expected to do so?

Mr. Jack Davis (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1, 2 and 3. Seventeen royal commissions have been set up since 1957, as follows:

Final report submitted	Cost
Royal commission on Seabird island Indians	$ 2,506.00
Royal commission on railway problems (transportation)	574,090.00
Royal commission on the Great Slave lake railway	46,920.00
Royal commission on treaties 8 and 11 as they apply to Indians of the Mackenzie district	8,245.00
Royal commission on coal	99,166.00
Royal commission on the motor vehicles industries	57,841.00
Royal commission on certain activities of station CHEK-TV, Victoria, B.C.	4,720.00
Royal commission on government organization	2,791,915.00
Royal commission on Canadian magazines and other periodicals (publications)	136,121.00
Royal commission on banking and finance	*726,384.00
Royal commission on irregularities in processing claims under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act	*16,074.03

* As at September 30, 1964—a few outstanding small accounts still to be paid.

Final report not submitted	Expected reporting date
Royal commission on Health services	Volume 1 has been published—volume 2 expected prior to end of March 1965
Royal commission on taxation	Summer of 1965
Royal commission on pilotage	Late in 1965
Royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism	No date as yet has been forecast for the preparation of a final report
Royal commission on the future of the overhaul and maintenance base of T.C.A. at Winnipeg	Unable to determine at this early stage
Royal commission on crash of a T.C.A. aircraft at Ste Thérèse, Quebec	Unable to determine at this early stage

ROYAL COMMISSIONS SET UP AT PROVINCIAL REQUEST

Question No. 2,039—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. How many royal commissions have been set up at the request of the governments of each of the provinces since 1957 and what are they?

2. How many of them already submitted their final report and what was the cost of each of them?

3. Which of these commissions have still to report and when are they expected to do so?

Mr. Jack Davis (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1. Suggestions for the appointment of a commission of inquiry may originate in many ways and often come from a number of sources during consideration of the matter by the federal government. Consequently, while provincial governments have, on occasion, expressed views about the need for various inquiries, it is not possible to say that any royal commission has been established specifically at the request of any particular provincial government since 1957.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

*S.I.U. LICENSED DIVISION CHARTER

Question No. 2,058—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Has the licensed division of the S.I.U. of Canada accepted a charter from division 2 of Atlantic and gulf division of the S.I.U. of North America?

2. Is division 2 of Atlantic and gulf division of the S.I.U. of North America also known as the brotherhood of marine engineers, a constituent part of a union known as the marine engineers beneficial association and, if so, is the marine engineers beneficial association controlled by Paul Hall, president, S.I.U. of North America?

3. Have the maritime union trustees any knowledge to indicate that Hal Banks has been assigned to direct the activities on the great lakes of this union and, if so, will Mr. Banks therefore be in charge of Canadian marine engineers?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): The answer to parts 1, 2 and 3 of this question is no.

*STUDENTS SENT TO U.S. SCHOOL BY CANADIAN S.I.U.

Question No. 2,059—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Have sailors been sent by the S.I.U. of Canada, with the approval of the board of maritime trustees, to learn democratic techniques at the Andrew Furuseth school in New York?

2. Has the board of trustees a copy of the curriculum of the subjects taught at the Furuseth school and the names of the instructors and, if so, what are the subjects taught and the names of the instructors?

3. Has the board of maritime trustees knowledge that Hal Banks has been teaching at the Andrew Furuseth school in New York operated by the S.I.U. and, if so, has the board of maritime trustees given consideration to instructing the S.I.U. of Canada to discontinue the sending of students to that school?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): In reply to parts 1 and 2, this is a matter affecting the internal operations of the union concerning which the trustees have taken no direct action.

The answer to part 3 is no.

RESTRICTED SERVICES TO APARTMENT BUILDINGS, OTTAWA

Question No. 2,087—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. Has the government received representations or information to the effect that in several apartment buildings in Ottawa (a) only one dairy, one bakery, and one cleaning firm are permitted to enter to conduct business (b) that most of such firms provide to the building landlord, owner, or superintendent a kickback in the form of cash, free service, service at a discount, or a portion of profits and (c) that in some cases compulsion to use the services of specified firms has been written into the lease, and that failure to use these services can result in eviction?

2. Has the restrictive trade practices commission undertaken any investigation of this matter and, if so, what are the names of the firms and apartments under investigation?

3. If no investigation has been initiated, is one being considered?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1. Yes. The director of investigation and research under the Combines Investigation Act informs me that information of this nature has come to his attention.

Questions

2 and 3. The general practice is that no information is given out as to whether a particular inquiry has been or is being pursued with respect to a particular group of companies or individuals unless and until a report is published.

TRANSFER OF COAL ADMINISTRATION TO ENERGY BOARD

Question No. 2,093—**Mr. MacEwan:**

Is it the intention of the government to remove coal from the administration of the dominion coal board and transfer it to the administration of the national energy board as suggested recently by the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister?

Hon. W. M. Benidickson (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Such action would be a matter of government policy and, in accord with standard practice, any such change would be formally announced when policy has been decided.

MAILING PRIVILEGES OF CANADIAN NAZI PARTY

Question No. 2,132—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Has the government considered withdrawal of mailing privileges from the Canadian nazi party, under section 7 of the Post Office Act?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Section 7 of the Post Office Act authorizes the Postmaster General to take steps to prohibit the use of the mails to a person who, the Postmaster General believes, on reasonable grounds, is by means of the mails committing or attempting to commit an offence or aiding, counselling or procuring any person to commit an offence, or with intent to commit an offence, is using the mails to accomplish such object. The Canadian nazi party is not known to the Post Office Department but if it is made to appear that any persons so describing themselves, or any other persons, are bringing themselves within section 7, consideration will be given immediately, in accordance with the practice, to prohibiting the use of the mails to such persons.

SURVEY RESPECTING POSSIBLE RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, NORTHERN B.C.

Question No. 2,157—**Mr. Howard:**

During the past two years has Canadian National Railways undertaken, directly or indirectly, any survey of the possibility of building a railway from any point between Prince Rupert, B.C., and Prince George, B.C., northward toward the Yukon Territories or the state of Alaska and, if so (a) what was the result of the survey, and (b) the action contemplated as a result thereof?

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows: No survey has been undertaken, directly or indirectly by Canadian National Railways within the past two years concerning the possibility of building a railway northward from a point between Prince Rupert and Prince George.

HEMISPHERE WATER DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Question No. 2,195—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Has the Canadian government been approached concerning joint participation with the United States in an engineering study of a hemisphere-wide water development plan, if so, what has been their reply?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The Canadian government has not been approached concerning joint participation with the United States in an engineering study of a hemisphere-wide water development plan. However, representatives of the Ralph M. Parsons Engineering Co. of Los Angeles, the firm which has developed the North American water and power alliance or "NAWAPA" project, have informed officials of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources of details relating to this project.

QUEBEC—RESEARCH INTO RAIN PRODUCTION

Question No. 2,197—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. During the past ten years, has the Department of Transport made or ordered to be made (a) in Canada (b) in the province of Quebec, research work or experiments consisting of seeding clouds to produce rainfall, by means of airplanes or land-based generators?

2. If so (a) what amounts have been spent yearly for such research work or experiments (b) what were the results?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. The sole research study in which the Department of Transport conducted cloud seeding experiments during the past ten years was associated with the precipitation physics project and confined to two small areas in northwestern Quebec contiguous to the Quebec-Ontario boundary. This project was restricted to cloud seeding from aeroplanes and no ground-based generators were used.

2. (a) Amounts spent annually by the Department of Transport in support of the precipitation physics project were as follows:

	Capital	Total
1959	$ 4,000.00	$ 51,843.00
1960	15,793.71	82,594.47
1961	13,916.62	94,153.50
1962	10,426.45	110,936.19
1963	138,583.01	240,242.07
*1964	NIL	27,330.00

(* cloud seeding carried out in 1964.)

(b) The data obtained from this project is now under evaluation, however, analysis is not yet complete. Results are therefore not available at this time.

[*Text*]

INVESTIGATION INTO SUGAR PRICES

Question No. 2,208—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. Has an investigation been carried out under the provisions of the Restrictive Trade Practices Act to determine the cause of last year's high sugar prices and, if so, what were the conclusions arrived at following the investigation?

2. If not, why was such an investigation not instituted?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1. No formal inquiry was instituted under the Combines Investigation Act.

2. In his annual report for the year ended March 31, 1964, at pages 36-38, the director of investigation and research under the Combines Investigation Act reported that because of public concern regarding the high level of sugar prices and fluctuations in the price of this commodity, the domestic sugar industry was subjected to very close scrutiny to determine whether there was any cause for inquiry under the act. He stated that his assessment of the situation, based on the information available, was that the price behaviour of the industry and other factors known to the combines branch did not disclose the likelihood that evidence of an offence would be forthcoming and that, therefore, he did not have proper grounds for undertaking a formal inquiry under section 8 of the act. The director also stated the industry would continue to be the subject of close surveillance by the combines branch.

ALLEGED MONOPOLY AMONG PENCIL COMPANIES

Question No. 2,209—**Mr. Marcoux:**

1. Has the restrictive trade practices commission carried out an enquiry concerning the entry into reciprocal agreements to eliminate competition and the establishment of an illegal monopoly by Eagle Pencil Company of Canada Ltd., Dixon Pencil Company Ltd., Eberhard Faber Pencil Co. Canada 1955 Ltd., and Venus Pencil Company Ltd., all of Toronto, Ontario and, if so (a) has the Minister of

Justice received a report thereon from the restrictive trade practices commission (b) what action has the government taken on such report?

2. If no action has been taken when and what action does the government intend to take in this regard?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1. (a) A report of the restrictive trade practices commission in an inquiry under the Combines Investigation Act concerning the manufacture, distribution and sale of pencils which relates to the above companies was received by the Minister of Justice and made public on October 20, 1964. (b) The report and evidence have been referred to council with instructions to institute proceedings unless he comes to the conclusion that the evidence is insufficient.

2. Answered by 1.

HAMILTON, ONT., POST OFFICE—CHRISTMAS HELP

Question No. 2,212—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Will the Hamilton, Ontario, post office hire temporary Christmas help and, if so (a) how many (b) in which positions, and (c) at what wages?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General):

(a)	(b)	(c)
200	Helper on letter carrier work	$1.25
700	Helper on postal clerk work	$1.00
900		

*BILINGUAL CAP AND UNIFORM FLASHES, C.N.R.

Question No. 2,226—**Mr. Pigeon:**

Is the Canadian National Railways considering the possibility of having bilingual wording on cap and uniform flashes for Canadian National Railways employees and, if not, for what reason?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): According to the information we received from the Canadian National Railways the reply is yes.

[*Text*]

REPAIRS TO LAUNCHING RAMP, DYER'S BAY, ONT.

Question No. 2,239—**Mr. Loney:**

Has an inspection been made this fall of the small craft launching ramp at Dyer's Bay, Ontario, and, if so, have repairs and alterations been recommended at that place?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Yes, but no repairs or alterations were recommended.

Questions

LETTER CARRIER SERVICE, WEYBURN, SASK.

Question No. 2,246—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

1. When was the last survey made in the city of Weyburn, Saskatchewan, by the Post Office Department, with a view to implementing letter carrier service?

2. What was the result of that survey?

3. Is it expected that letter carrier service will commence in 1964 and, if not, what is the earliest date this service could be expected?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): 1. The last survey was in September 1964.

2. It indicated that there were 2,528 available calls for letter carrier delivery and as a result this service was approved.

3. Letter carrier service will commence early in 1965 as soon as 80 per cent of the homes have been equipped with the necessary mail receiving facilities.

REQUEST FOR OLD AGE PENSION INCREASE

Question No. 2,248—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Has the government received representations from the senior women's committee for pension increase, requesting an increase in the old age pension to $100, tied to the cost of living, and a reduction of pension age to 65 years and, if so, what has been their reply?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, the Minister of National Health and Welfare had a long discussion with representatives of this committee.

As any change would involve a matter of government policy, an announcement would be made by the government at the appropriate time.

BUTTER AND BUTTER OIL EXPORTS AND STORAGE

Question No. 2,255—**Mr. Doucett:**

1. What was the amount of butter the government had in storage as of October 31, 1964?

2. Was any butter exported during 1964 and, if so, how much, at what price and to whom was the butter exported?

3. What was the amount of butter oil the government had in storage as of October 31, 1964?

4. How much butter oil was sold or disposed of from February 1, 1964 to October 31, 1964?

5. What amount of butter oil, if any, was exported, and at what price and to whom was the butter oil exported?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): 1. 105,557,343 lbs.

2. Yes. 33,470,000 lbs. at 33½ cents and 7,728,000 lbs. at 36 cents per lb. all exported to Great Britain.

3. 12,759,552 lbs.

4. 50,621,949 lbs.

[Mr. Deschatelets.]

5. 49,714,991 lbs. at 27 cents per lb. exported to Great Britain, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, Chile, Cuba, Japan, Turkey, Iran, British Guiana, Formosa, Jamaica, Singapore, Greece and France.

EXTENSION OF COMBINES ACT EXEMPTION FOR B.C. FISHERMEN

Question No. 2,258—**Mr. Howard:**

With reference to the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act that nothing in the Combines Investigation Act or in section 411 of the Criminal Code shall be construed to apply to any contract, agreement or arrangement between fishermen or associations of fishermen in British Columbia, and persons or associations of persons engaged in the buying or processing of fish in British Columbia, relating to the prices, remuneration or other conditions under which fish will be caught and supplied to such persons by fishermen, which will expire on December 31, 1964, are any steps being taken to extend the said provisions beyond that date and what are those steps?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): The matter of extension of this legislation as contained in chapter 4 of the 1962-63 statutes of Canada is receiving careful study and any decision to amend the legislation will be made known in due course in the proper way.

STUDENT LOAN APPLICATIONS

Question No. 2,262—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many applications for student loans have been received to date?

2. Of the total number of applications, how many have been approved to date, how many rejected, and how many are still under consideration?

3. What is the breakdown from a provincial point of view as to the total number of applications received, rejected and still under consideration?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1. Not available.

2. As at October 10, 1964, 22,278 applications for certificates of eligibility had been approved. The number of such applications rejected and the number still under consideration is not available.

3. Not available.

COIN WITHOUT LIKENESS OF QUEEN

Question No. 2,264—**Mr. Coates:**

Is any action being taken by the Royal Canadian Mint to strike a coin which does not have upon it a likeness of Queen Elizabeth II?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): No.

CONSTRUCTION OF PENAL INSTITUTION, SPRINGHILL, N.S.

Question No. 2,265—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What are the names of the subcontractors who will be associated with Foundation Maritime Limited in the construction of the young offenders penal institution at Springhill, N.S.?

2. What is the target date for the initiation of construction of this institution?

3. Is there a completion date included in the contract with Foundation Maritime Limited and, if so, what is the date?

4. Is there a specification with regard to the use of local labour by the contractor and subcontractors in the construction of this institution, and what method will be used in the employment of individuals in the constructon of the institution?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. The subcontractors listed in the tender form are: Precast and prestressed concrete, Schokbeton Quebec Inc., Montreal; architectural and precast concrete, Schokbeton Quebec Inc., Montreal; aluminum windows, Robert Mitchell Co., Montreal; security hardware and metalwork, Chubb-Mosler-Taylor, Brampton, Ont.; kitchen equipment, Rideau Aluminum, Ottawa; laundry equipment, Canadian Laundry Ltd., Montreal; roofing, Tosco Co., Halifax; structural steel, Canada Iron, Dartmouth; water storage tank, Steen, Halifax; plumbing, Steen Mechanical Contractors, Halifax; heating and ventilation, Steen Mechanical Contractors, Halifax; electrical, Canadian Comstock, Dartmouth.

2. The award of the contract was confirmed to Foundation Maritime Limited by letter dated November 9, 1964, in which they were instructed to have the work commenced immediately.

3. May 9, 1966.

4. The general conditions of the contract require the contractor to employ labour from the locality of the work to the extent to which it is available and consistent with proper economy and expeditious carrying out of the work. The contractor is to use the offices of the national employment service in the recruitment of workers wherever practicable.

WHARF CONSTRUCTION, TIDNISH, N.S.

Question No. 2,266—**Mr. Coates:**

Is consideration being given by the Department of Public Works to the construction of wharfage facilities at Tidnish, N.S.?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): No.

IRISH MOSS PLANT, MIMINEGASH, P.E.I.

Question No. 2,280—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. When is it intended to commence development of an Irish moss plant at Miminegash, P.E.I.?

2. Has the government received representations against locating this plant at Miminegash and, if so, from whom?

3. What reasons prompted the transfer of this project from the Atlantic development board to the Department of Fisheries?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): 1. Plans for the development are already well advanced.

2. No.

3. The scale and nature of the proposed operation has been broadened from its original conception. The control and operation of the type of experimental plant now planned is regarded as properly the concern of the Department of Fisheries.

AIR CANADA FLIGHT CHANGES

Question No. 2,282—**Mr. Martin (Timmins):**

1. Has Air Canada flight 653 been rescheduled 45 minutes later and, if so, for what reasons?

2. Has Air Canada flight 275 (Ottawa to Toronto) been rescheduled 20 minutes earlier and, if so, for what reasons?

3. Has Air Canada flight 657 been rescheduled 10 minutes earlier and, if so, for what reasons?

4. Has Air Canada flight 241 (Ottawa to Toronto) been rescheduled 30 minutes later and, if so, for what reasons?

5. Has Air Canada flight 237 (Ottawa to Toronto) been cancelled and, if so, for what reasons?

6. Has Air Canada flight 253 been rescheduled 35 minutes earlier and, if so, for what reasons?

7. Has Air Canada flight 259 been rescheduled 40 minutes earlier and, if so, for what reasons?

8. Has Air Canada flight 262 been rescheduled 35 minutes earlier and, if so, for what reasons?

9. Have Air Canada flights 354 and 356 been cancelled and, if so, for what reasons?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Trans-Canada Air Lines advise as follows:

Parts 1 to 9—Air traffic volume in the winter months is traditionally less than the preceding summer, necessitating cut-back in schedules on certain routes.

The various flights mentioned were rescheduled when winter schedules became effective October 25. The reason for minor changes in time was to maintain connections with other flights, or due to economical utilization of aircraft or ramp staff at the terminals Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto.

To improve passenger service between Toronto and Ottawa, Viscount flights 354 and 356 were replaced by Vanguard flight 672. From Ottawa to Toronto, Viscount flights 237 and 307 were replaced by Vanguard flight 671.

AIR CANADA AIRCRAFT

Question No. 2,288—**Mr. MacRae:**

1. What is the number of aircraft now owned by Air Canada?

2. What are the different types and what is the value of these aircraft?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Trans-Canada Air Lines advise as follows:

1. Eighty aircraft.

2. Forty one Viscounts; 23 Vanguards; 16 DC-8's.

Aggregate cost, $217,411,000; depreciated value as at October 31, 1964, $145,329,000.

STUDENT LOANS FUND, P.E.I.

Question No. 2,290—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. What was the amount made available to the province of Prince Edward Island under the student loans fund?

2. Have representations been received from the government of Prince Edward Island for an increase in this amount and, if so, what response did they elicit?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): The provincial allocation of Prince Edward Island under the Canada Student Loans Act for the loan year ending June 30, 1965, is $232,000.

2. There has been liaison on this and other matters between federal and provincial officials. No representations, however, have been received from the government of Prince Edward Island.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

INFANT MORTALITY, AVERAGE INCOME, ETC., VARIOUS CANADIAN CITIES

Question No. 2,249—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

What is (a) the infant mortality rate (b) the total death rate (c) the average income, and (d) the rate of unemployment in: Corner Brook, Newfoundland; New Glasgow, Sydney, Sydney Mines, Amherst, Springhill, Inverness, and Liverpool, Nova Scotia; Campbellton, Minto, St. Stephen, Sussex and Woodstock, New Brunswick; Rouyn, Shawinigan, Mont Laurier, La Tuque, St. John, Dolbeau, Jonquière, Port Alfred, Louiseville, Causapscal, Matane, La Malbaie and Val d'Or, Quebec; Brantford, Cornwall, Windsor, Pembroke, Timmins, Wallaceburg, Elliot Lake and Chatham, Ontario and Blairmore, Alberta—British Columbia?

Return tabled.

INFANT MORTALITY, AVERAGE INCOME, ETC., VARIOUS CANADIAN CITIES

Question No. 2,250—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

What is (a) the infant mortality rate (b) the total death rate (c) the average income (d) the rate of unemployment in: Halifax, Nova Scotia; Montreal and Quebec city, Quebec; Hamilton, Toronto and London, Ontario; Winnipeg, Manitoba; Regina and Saskatoon, Saskatchewan; Edmonton and Calgary, Alberta; Vancouver and Victoria, B.C.?

Return tabled.

UNITED NATIONS

CANADIAN ATTITUDE TOWARD SO-CALLED RESCUE FUND

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think this question should be directed to the Prime Minister as it covers the activities of a number of departments. Considering the impending crisis in the United Nations, is the Prime Minister in a position to say whether Canada is one of the four nations which are engaged in an endeavour to bring about the collection of a rescue fund made up of contributions from the 112 members of the United Nations? As the Prime Minister knows, this initiative was launched by the former president of the United Nations in 1963.

Is Canada participating in this, and what is our country's attitude in relation to this matter and its possible acceptance as a solution for the serious results that would follow should the U.S.S.R. fail to pay the sum of $53 million that it is in default?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the four members of the United Nations which held these talks were non-permanent members of the security council and, as my right hon. friend knows, Canada was not one of them. However, we have been kept informed of these talks through a discussion we had with the foreign minister of Norway, who was here last week and who represents one of the four. We have also been kept informed in other ways, and we are doing what we can to assist in working out an arrangement by which the charter will be observed. We are endeavouring to avoid a direct confrontation on this matter, but in a form which will insist on charter observance.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Does that form comprehend the acceptance of a rescue fund, as it has been described, to be provided by the various members of the United Nations through voluntary contributions? Also, when the Prime Minister is replying would he tell us the four non-permanent members of the security council which belong to this group?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the so-called rescue fund was one element put forward in the negotiations as a way out of this difficulty,

but it was only one element. Other proposals have been made, but it is difficult for me to go into them in detail because the negotiations are continuing. I am not aware of the identity of the four non-permanent members involved in the discussions. I know Norway was one, and the Secretary of State for External Affairs might brief me as to the other three. I think Nigeria was one, and if the Secretary of State for External Affairs would speak a little louder I could give the other two.

DISARMAMENT—PROPOSAL RESPECTING ARCTIC AREA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has his attention been drawn to the suggestion made by the United States and Russian scientists, Drs. Rich and Vinogradov, regarding a three step disarmament proposal for the Arctic area modelled on the Antarctic treaty? In view of the fact that this will eventually affect Alaska, Siberia, Greenland, Canada and areas of Norway and Sweden, has the Canadian government any statement to make regarding its reaction to this proposal?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the proposal to which my hon. friend draws my attention was put forward privately by a Soviet and a United States scientist in the current issue of a United States scientific journal. We are interested in this proposal and are studying it. Disarmament proposals embracing the Arctic region, mainly in the context of aerial inspection and other measures aimed at inhibiting surprise attack, have a long history dating back to the post-war disarmament discussions. My hon. friend will remember that Canada was a very active participant in those discussions.

Mr. Douglas: After the Canadian government has had an opportunity of studying these proposals, is it its intention to make recommendations or advances either to the government of the United States or the government of the Soviet union with a view to bringing them together for a discussion of these proposals?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): If these proposals commend themselves to us we will take the opportunity to bring them to the attention of all interested parties.

Inquiries of the Ministry

LABOUR RELATIONS

WINNIPEG—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN LABOUR DISPUTE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question either to the Minister of National Defence or to the Minister of Industry. My question relates to a labour dispute between Canadian Aviation Electronics, Winnipeg, and the united automobile workers. I recognize that the labour dispute itself comes under provincial jurisdiction, but in view of the fact that the Royal Canadian Air Force has been a principal customer of this firm, and in view of the co-operation which the R.C.A.F. itself has given, would the government use its good offices to try to persuade the firm to sit down with labour and discuss the matter?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): I was not aware of this, but I will consult with my colleague the Minister of Labour and see what can be done.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gene Rhéaume (Northwest Territories): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, in view of reports which are circulating in Ottawa, I am wondering whether Your Honour has any information to give other members of this house to the effect that the members of the Créditiste party are boycotting the debate on the Canadian pension plan by not appearing at all at this sitting.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

PUBLIC HEARINGS OF COMMISSION ON RUN-THROUGHS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. O. Cooper (Rosetown-Biggar): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport regarding the railway run-through in Saskatchewan. Does the minister intend to hold hearings in towns which are affected by this run-through when the commission is set up?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I think that question would be more properly directed to my colleague the Minister of Labour, but I did read in the press, as no doubt the hon. gentleman did, that there were to be hearings in certain of these places.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Cooper: A supplementary question. Could I have an assurance that since Biggar is more affected than almost any town between Saskatoon and Edmonton, there will be a hearing held in Biggar, Saskatchewan?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): The question of the location of hearings is in the hands of Mr. Justice Freedman, who I am sure would listen to any representations made to him from these communities with regard to the hearings.

SHIPPING

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—WINTER USE BY RUSSIAN SHIPS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. Lloyd (Halifax): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Press reports indicate that the fleet of icebreaker-ice reinforced cargo ships scheduled for winter service on the St. Lawrence river to Montreal will be augmented this winter by Russian cargo carriers. Will the minister inform the house whether the government is considering any measures to maintain and equalize the competitive position of the ports of Halifax and Saint John in view of the increasing use of Montreal as a winter port?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I have heard reports that these Soviet ships are to attempt to come up the St. Lawrence during the winter time, but no exceptional steps will be taken as far as icebreaking is concerned.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Will the minister give every assurance that there will be no assistance whatever to these Russian ships?

Mr. Pickersgill: It is possible, of course, that a ship might be in distress. Recalling some of the interventions of the hon. gentleman on previous occasions I would be very hesitant about giving any blanket undertaking of that sort. But, as I told the hon. member for Halifax, no measures which would not be taken in the ordinary normal course will be taken as a result of this attempted passage.

Mr. Lloyd: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that Canada has a substantial investment in port facilities in Halifax and Saint John, will the impact of these developments on the revenues and investments of Canada be considered by the government?

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

Mr. Pickersgill: They certainly will be, Mr. Speaker; and, as the hon. member knows, we are conducting a very intensive study at the present moment of means of developing further the use of the ports of Halifax and Saint John.

Mr. Fisher: And Montreal.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

HAL BANKS—DISPOSITION OF BAIL FORFEITED

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rémi Paul (Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice.

Can he tell us whether an agreement took place between the department of the attorney general of the province of Quebec and his own department as to the appropriation of Hal Banks' $25,000 bail? If so, what was that agreement?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to answer that question today, but I will inquire from my officials and I will answer it tomorrow.

[*Text*]

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the national press stories in connection with Hal Banks, the S.I.U. and Liberal members, particularly a story not related to the S.I.U. but one appearing in the Toronto *Star* of November 13 in connection with the administration of the R.C.M.P. in Quebec, would the minister not assure the house that he will cause his estimates to be brought before us at the earliest possible moment so that all these matters can be carefully looked into by the committee?

Mr. Favreau: Of course, Mr. Speaker, my estimates will be brought in as soon as possible, but this is a matter of the business to be called by the government.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the Minister of Justice said that as soon as he found out where Mr. Banks was he would let the house know, as I recall it. Has he any information yet that he is in the United States?

Mr. Pearson: He may have left.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No official information.

AGRICULTURE

AID TO FARMERS SELLING CATTLE BECAUSE OF DROUGHT CONDITIONS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should have liked to ask the Minister of Agriculture a question but, in his absence I shall put it to the Minister of Forestry who is responsible for eastern agriculture.

Could the minister tell us what steps the government intends to take to assist Ottawa valley farmers who are now forced to get rid of their cattle owing to the shortage of water and fodder?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, that matter comes under the Quebec minister of agriculture. If the province wishes to call upon Ottawa, we shall be glad to help.

Mr. Martineau: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Can the minister tell us whether or not such a call has been made and if he is aware of the present crisis?

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, since none were made in previous cases, I doubt that there was a call this time.

[*Text*]

[*Later:*]

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Battle River-Camrose): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister in view of the fact the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue did not obtain a satisfactory reply from the Minister of Agriculture.

I am referring to the drought which is forcing farmers to sell their cattle, as reported in today's newspaper, and I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he will look into this very serious situation; because if these farmers are forced to sell their cattle at this time it will force the cattle market across Canada to an even lower level with a resulting adverse effect on the economy of this country.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to look into this matter.

BRIDGES

JACQUES CARTIER BRIDGE, MONTREAL—AGREEMENT RESPECTING SALE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport?

I should like to ask him whether the government of the province of Quebec has entered into an agreement with the federal government for the purpose of acquiring the Jacques Cartier bridge in Montreal?

[*Text*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, an agreement in principle was made between the previous administration and the government of Quebec, but the details have not all been settled yet and the matter is still under discussion.

CROWN ASSETS

SASKATOON, SASK.—DISPOSAL OF LAND AND HOUSING UNITS AT R.C.A.F. BASE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry. It has to do with the advertisement inserted in the press by Crown Assets Disposal Corporation regarding the disposal of 48 acres of land and 162 housing units in the former air force base at Saskatoon. The call for bids, or offers, expires today. I want to ask the minister whether there have been any negotiations with the city of Saskatoon for the disposal of these buildings, particularly in view of the fact that the municipal services for this area are supplied by the city of Saskatoon even though it is not located within the boundaries of that city.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, in disposing of surplus assets of the crown, Crown Assets Disposal Corporation acts as trustee of the assets for the government and the taxpayers of Canada, and with regard to any disposal is obviously required to get as fair a price as it can.

In pursuit of this aim it will offer the right of first refusal at the fair market price to the government of the province in which the assets are located. If the provincial government has no interest, then the right of first refusal will go to the municipality in which the assets are situated. If the municipality has no interest, then the assets will be offered at public auction.

In the present case the housing project is located entirely within the municipality of Cory. The municipality of Cory does not wish to purchase these assets at the fair market price, consequently they are to be put up for sale at public auction. If the city of Saskatoon has an interest in these assets it will be free to bid, like any other bidder.

Mr. Douglas: I have a supplementary question. May I ask the minister what will happen if private interests are the highest bidders and consequently acquire this property; because the municipality of Cory within which these assets are located could not possibly service this area, and the city of Saskatoon may refuse to do so? That is the position in which the government has put the entire housing unit.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, presumably a private purchaser, before making a bid and entering into ownership, would make sure that whoever is concerned, either the officials of the municipality of Cory or of Saskatoon, will provide services.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask whether any such arrangement has been entered into with the city of Saskatoon?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, we have not got the names of the bidders as yet, so I am unable to answer as to whether any arrangements have been made.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

QUEBEC—DISCUSSIONS RESPECTING DESIGNATED AREAS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I would also like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. Did he receive, from the minister of revenue of the province of Quebec, Mr. Kierans, suggestions or information concerning the districts in the province of Quebec which the latter would like to be designated for economic assistance, and when will those districts be announced publicly?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, discussions were held between officials of my department and officials of Mr. Kierans' department, during which information was exchanged, but no agreement has yet been reached.

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to the Minister of Industry, which question is related to the one I asked him a while ago. He said discussions have taken place between members of his department and those of the department of revenue for the province of Quebec and that they failed to reach an agreement. Will there be other discussions between the same parties with regard to designated areas?

Mr. Drury: Information has been exchanged, Mr. Speaker, and these exchanges will continue.

[*Text*]

WATER RESOURCES

GRAND CANAL—INQUIRY AS TO FEASIBILITY STUDY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. Has the minister received a report of the meeting that was held in North Bay on Friday night in regard to the Grand canal proposal, and is he disposed to recommend that a feasibility survey be made of this important project, especially in view of the critical conditions existing in the great lakes and the St. Lawrence river?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, the government is fully aware of all the consequences of the low water levels of the great lakes. It is also aware of the number of cures that have been offered and, without indicating any agreement on the part of the government that the introduction of new water from outside would be satisfactory, we think that it is imperative that we make a complete study of the proposals which have been made. To that end we have approached the governments of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, suggesting to them that we should like to make studies as to feasibility of such a program. We have received a letter from the province of Ontario indicating that it would be glad to work with us in connection with the Ontario water resources division, and we have also received a tentative reply from the province of Quebec.

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate the nature of the tentative reply that has been received from the province of Quebec?

Mr. Laing: Mr. Speaker, I can say that I think we will now be able to approach the

province of Quebec with a more definitive statement as to what our proposals might be, and I look forward to receiving their co-operation. I hope that will be the case.

ELLIOT LAKE, ONT.—REPORTED RADIOACTIVE POLLUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister if he is yet prepared to make a statement regarding the pollution of certain lakes by the waste from uranium processing. Since this matter was first raised in the house there have been press reports indicating that other lakes have also been contaminated. Is the Prime Minister ready to make a statement?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have been as active as possible over the week end trying to get all the information available both on the provincial level where the primary responsibility and jurisdiction lie, and on the federal level, and I hope to be able to make a full statement in respect of the particular matter at Elliot Lake and vicinity and also in more general application either tomorrow or the next day.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): In that connection will the Prime Minister say whether any reports were received by the government regarding the waters in the Elliot Lake area from the atomic energy control board at any time in the last three months, pointing out that there was danger as a result of the pollution of these waters?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I will be dealing with this matter in detail in my statement, and I hope to make that statement tomorrow.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is the Prime Minister not in a position to say whether he had any reports from the atomic energy control board? Surely that is a matter upon which he should be able to give an immediate answer. If he had reports, it is strange that nothing was done.

Mr. Pearson: I am in a position to say that I have not received any reports, but I wish to go into the matter in further detail.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

RETENTION OF MILITIA UNITS RECOMMENDED FOR DISBANDMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to ask the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys. Will the minister tell me what steps are necessary to have a unit of the militia retained on the order of battle in spite of the fact the Suttie commission recommended that it be transferred to a supplementary order? I notice that the minister has had success in having the 40th medium artillery regiment, R.C.A., retained on the order of battle under the recommendation of the Department of National Defence. I should like to have the same information as to his method so I can relate it to the Toronto members on behalf of the Irish regiment and the Vancouver members on behalf of the Irish Fusiliers?

Hon. W. M. Benidickson (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, the former minister of defence has made a speech, but I will make inquiries and suggest that his answer will be forthcoming in due course.

Mr. Nielsen: In whose riding is it located?

Mr. Churchill: I did not make a speech, Mr. Speaker; I asked a question. The artillery unit is located in Kenora.

May I ask the Minister of National Defence what he meant on Thursday when I asked him a question, as recorded at page 9994 of *Hansard*, as to why the department failed to accept the recommendations of the Suttie commission, which reported favourably with regard to the maintenance on the active list of some of these regiments. The minister's answer to this question, as recorded on that same page, was as follows:

> —the reason that some of the recommendations were not upheld was very carefully explained in the committee on defence—

May I ask the minister whether the explanation contained in four lines of the report of the proceedings of the committee on defence is a full and very careful explanation as to why the department did not accept the recommendations of the Suttie commission?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): I do not know to which four lines the hon. member is referring, Mr. Speaker, but I think the explanation I gave was fair and reasonable.

Mr. Churchill: Now that the minister is in a fair and reasonable mood, Mr. Speaker, may I ask him whether he considers this to be a careful explanation of a departmental decision; and I quote his words as they are recorded at page 806 of the report of the special committee on defence, in its minutes of pro-

ceedings and evidence No. 19 for Thursday, November 5, 1964, as follows—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is not the hon. member beginning to argue the case rather than ask a question?

Mr. Churchill: On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I am not presenting an argument, unless you wish me to base my statement on a question of privilege, in that the minister has misled the house. I hope, sir, that you will permit me to read the four lines to which I have referred, which are representative of—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Churchill: —the so-called careful explanation, which the minister used—

An hon. Member: Put it on the order paper.

Mr. Churchill: —to brush aside my question on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member would indicate the great urgency of this question, because I am unable to see the degree of urgency that would require a general statement from the minister at this time. Perhaps if the hon. member put his question on the order paper he would obtain the necessary details.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, questions can stay on the order paper for months at a time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I point out to you that there is still a question on the order paper dated June 3, several others under dates in July and some under dates in August. Therefore, sir, I regretfully have to submit, on a question of privilege, that the Minister of National Defence misled the House of Commons on Thursday when he gave the answer which is to be found in *Hansard* at page 9994, in which he said that a careful explanation of the alterations to the Suttie commission recommendations was made by himself to the defence committee. I base my charge on the fact that the careful explanation amounted to only these words:

> —in the interests of what we felt to be an even greater uniformity in the application of the standards across the country, some of the decisions had to be reversed and some were reversed in each direction. It was the application of our review that resulted in some different recommendations from those that had originally been put forward.

I submit that is not a careful explanation of why these changes were made, and that the minister was misleading the house on Thursday in the answer he gave me on that occasion.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, in addition to the very brief statement just read there were a number of factors which had been listed as forming the judgments which were made in respect of various units, and most members of the committee on defence found them adequate to their comprehension.

Mr. Churchill: That, Mr. Speaker, is another misleading statement, because these units are not mentioned by name with the exception of two, the Irish of Toronto and the Irish Fusiliers.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

THE SENATE

INQUIRY AS TO REFORM MEASURES PROPOSED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a non-contentious question of the Prime Minister which is prompted by two things; first, the wide reaction to his latest appointment to the other place, which I am sure he has noticed; and second, item No. 40 on the order paper regarding reform of the other place. I want to ask the Prime Minister when he intends to proceed with this reform and whether this is the limit of Senate reform at present intended by the government?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): We will proceed with that motion just as quickly as possible, Mr. Speaker.

IMMIGRATION

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT ON CHANGES IN ACT AND REGULATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Has the minister yet received a report from Mr. Joseph Sedgwick in regard to some matters affecting the department and the proposed changes in the regulations and the Immigration Act? If not, does he expect it soon?

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received this report from Mr. Sedgwick but, as I indicated, I hope to have it before the end of this month.

[*Text*]

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is there any truth in the story circulating in Toronto that a number of people who were incarcerated by the department were deported without Mr. Sedgwick first having the opportunity to interview them and get their stories?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to say that no deportation order has been signed in the case of the persons who were to be investigated by Mr. Sedgwick, before Mr. Sedgwick had been informed of the action contemplated. Therefore, no action has been taken without his consent and, indeed, in several cases the decision was taken on his advice.

[*Text*]

Mr. Orlikow: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister has not answered my question. I am not concerned whether Mr. Sedgwick approved it. I should like to know whether any of the people involved were deported without first seeing Mr. Sedgwick and telling him their stories.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member put his question on the order paper.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

ROYAL COMMISSION REPORT—INQUIRY AS TO CONFERENCE WITH PROVINCES

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 National Health and Welfare. Is she now in a position to answer the question I put to her parliamentary secretary on Friday, which was in these words:

> Now that the government has decided to meet with the medical representatives regarding the Hall commission report, will they announce a date for a conference with the provinces?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, we met with representatives of the Canadian medical association and affiliated associations from 11.30 a.m. until 1 p.m. today, but this did not put us any closer to selecting a date for discussions with the provinces.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

INTERFERENCE WITH SHOWING OF EXCERPTS FROM FILM "MR. PEARSON"

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Battle River-Camrose): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. Is it true that government interference prohibited the showing of excerpts from the film "Mr. Pearson" last night on the C.B.C. program "This Hour Has Seven Days"?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, there was no interference whatsoever.

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister say if there was any interference with the producers by the top management of the C.B.C.?

Mr. Lamontagne: I am not aware that there was interference or that any action was taken by top management.

FISHERIES

NORTH PACIFIC COMMISSION—DISCUSSION OF TERMS OF OPERATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Can the minister tell the house whether any discussions will take place at the meeting of the international north Pacific fisheries commission which may serve to clarify the possible terms of operation of the commission in the future?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, the commission is now meeting in Tokyo, and I have to await a report from the meeting before I can say anything further about what is taking place.

Mr. Barnett: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell us whether he anticipates that any significant information will be provided by the commission as a result of any program of research in the technical and scientific fields arising out of this meeting of the commission which may serve to help set a pattern for a fruitful future for the north Pacific treaty?

Mr. Robichaud: I am not in a position to determine at this stage exactly what discussions will take place in Tokyo, but I can

point out that the discussions which are taking place are in the interests of the north Pacific fisheries.

REDISTRIBUTION

PROVISION FOR BOUNDARIES COMMISSIONS AND READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister) moved the third reading of Bill No. C-72, to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions to report upon the readjustment of the representation of the provinces in the House of Commons and to provide for the readjustment of such representation in accordance therewith.

Mr. W. H. A. Thomas (Middlesex West): I should like to make a few brief comments on the third reading of this bill. During the course of the debate it has been suggested by various speakers that when the provincial commissions begin their work they are likely to search the *Hansard* record to help clear up any matters of interpretation that they might find it necessary to deal with, and that the *Hansard* record would assist them in this regard by making clear to them what were the wishes and intentions of the members of parliament.

I am going to confine my remarks to the interpretation that might be applied to section 13, subsection (c) which reads as follows:

(c) the commission may depart from the strict application of rules (a) and (b) in any case where

(i) special geographic considerations, including in particular the sparsity, density or relative rate of growth of population of various regions of the province, the accessibility of such regions or the size or shape thereof, appear to the commission to render such a departure necessary or desirable, or

(ii) any special community or diversity of interests of the inhabitants of various regions of the province appears to the commission to render such a departure necessary or desirable,—

Then the section goes on to state that a tolerance of 25 per cent may be applied in the case of constituencies in which it is found necessary to vary the strict rule. I should like to say that in the province of Ontario the constituencies have traditionally been based upon county boundaries. This does not apply in some other parts of Canada, but in the province of Ontario it is of great importance. I should like to make a plea today that when the commission for Ontario comes to the interpretation of the provisions of this bill they respect this traditional practice of basing the constituencies on county boundaries.

There are two concepts that such a commission might use in approaching the problem. The first is to apply a rigid, mathematical formula based on the fact that urban constituencies should have the maximum population, rural constituencies should have the minimum population, and constituencies which are part urban and part rural should come between these two limits. Now, if such a concept were applied rigidly it would probably have the effect of completely wiping out or completely distorting the present constituency boundaries in the province of Ontario.

I believe this is unnecessary if the commission, rather than adopting such a rigid, mathematical approach, would adopt a practical, non-disruptive approach and deal with the constituency boundaries in Ontario with as little distortion as possible. I believe this procedure would be found much more satisfactory for the people in the Ontario constituencies.

I should like to indicate briefly what may happen in western Ontario in this regard. Down in the southeast corner of Ontario is Essex county, containing the city of Windsor. There are three constituencies in Essex county, including the city of Windsor, namely Essex East, Essex West and Essex South. If the population of these three constituencies is divided by three, that is the population of Essex county including the population of the city of Windsor, we come up with a quotient of 85,258. Now, assuming that the average population of a constituency in Ontario will be about 70,000—and preliminary calculations indicate that this will be the case—then in these Ontario constituencies we can go from a low of about 53,000 to a high of 87,000 or 88,000. The figure for the three constituencies in Essex county, including the city of Windsor, would work out at 85,258, which is quite within those limits. I submit, therefore, that Essex county and the city of Windsor, with some slight adjustment in the boundaries to even up the three constituencies in that area, could be left alone.

Then we go a little farther north to the county of Middlesex, including the city of London. If we divide the population of the county of Middlesex including the city of London by three and make a similar adjustment by putting certain municipalities from one constituency into another but still maintaining the traditional county boundaries, we get an average of 73,000 per constituency. I suggest that this is just about right. Elgin county, which is down in that corner, is just

about right at present with 62,000. Kent and Lambton counties at the present time have been adjusted so that the constituency crosses the Lambton-Kent boundary line. However, with some slight adjustment, that is by moving municipalities from one constituency to the other, these two constituencies could be left alone with an average population of 57,000. This comes within the maximum and minimum limits.

Going a little farther north we come to Huron, with a population of 48,000, which is slightly under the minimum. However, by taking a municipality off the north end of Lambton West or whatever is necessary off the north end of Lambton West, which includes the city of Sarnia a well populated area, the average for Lambton West and Huron works out at 63,418, again well within the limits.

Then going north again we run into a problem in the Bruce peninsula. Bruce has 29,000; Grey-Bruce has 36,000; Grey North has 38,000 and Wellington-Huron has 32,000. It is difficult to see how these areas could be adjusted. The only place one finds more population in an adjacent territory is Waterloo North, where that one constituency has a population of 115,579 according to the 1961 census.

I am giving this information to indicate that sweeping changes across these Ontario constituencies are unnecessary if the commission is willing to adopt a practical, non-disruptive program. With the 25 per cent tolerance allowed, these constituencies can be left alone except for very minor adjustments.

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, the only point I wish to raise relates to the dual constituency matter. I left the chamber before the vote was taken on it in committee the other day, and so did not get a chance to express my objections to it. Now having read the observations of the minister who sponsored the bill I am even more put out about it. Could we have a clearer expression from the minister of what he was talking about? As recorded at page 10064 of *Hansard* for Friday last he said:

> Mr. Chairman, obviously I do not want to prolong this debate, but may I say I do not feel I could propose such an amendment. On the other hand, I have one drafted here that is slightly different from the one shown me by the hon. member for Queens, who was good enough to send me the one about which he was thinking. I would think that the one I have here would be preferable if this is going to be done, because the only real difference between the two is that in the one case it just says that the commission "may" and in the other case it says "may if it sees fit to do so".

In view of the queer interpretations sometimes placed on the word "may", if that additional phrase was not included I think there might be a suggestion that parliament's inclination was to have it done. My own inclination is not to have it done.

We are getting very clear here.

> I say that quite frankly. I really feel about this matter, and it is going to be very difficult for me to vote. I have been thinking I might do something that I thought only members of the N.D.P. did, sit on my hands, if there is a vote.

The minister has a very short memory if he does not remember the session of 1957-58, when a lot of Liberals sat on their hands until one brave day in January a lion came into the house and then we did get a vote. To continue with the quotation:

> I have not made up my mind yet—

Here is the minister who sponsored the bill, and right in the final stage of this very debatable issue he says he has not made up his mind yet.

> —but I certainly do not want to influence the judgment of any other member of the committee. Particularly because of the objection reiterated by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre I do not feel it is fair to impose upon the commission the making of another decision which in my bones I feel we ought to make ourselves if it is to be made at all. I think it would be very hard for me to vote for this. On the other hand I am rather impressed—

This is about the fifth "on the other hand."

> —by the argument put forward. I want to reiterate—

This is about the fourth reiteration.

> I want to reiterate, however, that these historic constituencies will not survive anyway.

What is the point of all this? If they are not going to survive, why bother?

> Halifax county is far too big to be one constituency, so we will not be preserving the historical situation there and probably not in Queens either. However, if the hon. gentleman wishes to do so I think the simplest way would be for him to move his amendment in order to test the committee on it and get the agony over with.

Here is a minister with largeness of spirit. First he is on one side and then he is on the other. He feels things in his bones and is a bit worried about the agony. I want to ask him what he means by saying it is not going to help Halifax anyway, that Halifax cannot survive anyway. Why did he go ahead and let the amendment come to a vote without putting it much more clearly that this was a nonsense amendment in so far as it affects Halifax? Or is it a nonsense amendment in so far as it affects Halifax? How does the minister see it?

The thing which bothers me is that throughout this whole debate on redistribution which, with intervals, has stretched for many months, we never heard anything about this problem of dual constituencies. I happen to represent the twin cities of Port Arthur and Fort William and I am sure if there are arguments —aside from historical ones—for dual representation they are even better for Port Arthur and Fort William than they are for these two constituencies down east, because there is almost an equal balance in the size of my constituency.

If we are having a really clean slate to start with, then we should never have had this amendment. I am not going to raise any objections to the bill as it stands, but I would like a fuller explanation from the minister than this sort of tortuous path he walked on Friday between his own feelings and the feelings of other people.

Having said this critically I think I should go on to compliment the minister. I think we should thank somebody that he managed to get back here from his bed of pain, because this is the first measure of any scope which we have got through this place for a long time; and despite criticisms I and others may make I think he deserves some recognition for the fact that he got it this far. But surely it was not just to get it this far that he made that rather equivocal speech on dual constituencies?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I think there is only one point involved here, and if the hon. gentleman had read my earlier observations he would have seen that it was explained. The historic constituency of Halifax is in fact Halifax county, which has far too big a population to be merely two seats. If I understand correctly what we did on Friday, and I think I do, if the commission so desires it will be possible to make a dual seat constituency out of part of Halifax county, the greater part population-wise, but this will not preserve the historic riding of Halifax, which was the whole county, because of the rule that the population cannot exceed a certain figure.

I know both hon. members for Queens who proposed this matter understood that perfectly, and I think the same would be true in P.E.I. where, because of the 25 per cent rule, it would not be possible to have Queens county retained as Queens county, or where it would be very difficult to do so. However, that does not mean that the greater part of Queens county could not be a dual constituency. Therefore this has some meaning, but I think I am right in saying this would not preserve the historic ridings we have known because the commission will have to carry out the mandatory part with regard to limits of population.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I have three points to raise on third reading. The whole purpose of this bill is to provide more realistic boundaries for our constituencies, and I would like to bring to the attention of the house that in my own district of Athabasca it is at present necessary for the hon. member for Jasper-Edson to travel 100 miles through my territory on the only road available to get to the northeast corner of his own district. This is a waste of his time, and it is a waste of public money when he tries to cover isolated communities up near my headquarters.

This brings me to my second point. I am afraid that these commissions, when they are set up, will be operating in the dark. In every constituency there is a man who for possibly ten or 12 years has had a close relationship with everything that goes on in that constituency. He knows its problems, and it would be a tremendous waste of his experience if the commissions could not consult him.

I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to the sitting member. I do not say sitting members should be appointed to the commissions. In any case, this would probably require an amendment to the bill itself. But I think it should be placed on record now, for the guidance of the commissions, that use should be made of the services of the sitting member, or possibly of those who have sat in this house over the past ten or 15 years. The commission should ask them what they think should be done in connection with the redrawing of the maps, for the welfare of the country as a whole.

Cynics may say this would amount to political interference but I think most if not all members of the house are public spirited in these matters, and surely it would be a waste of experience if they were not consulted.

There is another matter I wish to raise, and I ask permission of the house it bring it up at this time because it is difficult to discuss it in connection with any other piece of legislation I know of. A great many of our constituencies are far too large to allow any member to get around them adequately in the absence of some further assistance from the government. As the most important example

I will quote the Northwest Territories, which cover an area of some 1,342,000 square miles. The sitting member is expected to serve this vast region on the basis of exactly the same expense account as is available to, let us say, the hon. member for Carleton or the hon. member for Ottawa East, which is patently ridiculous.

I suppose that in the absence of government legislation this is a matter which no private member could seek to remedy; it would be called a money bill. Therefore, while we are talking about redistribution, I think the present is an appropriate time at which to bring the subject forward. I do not suggest we should cut down the size of the enormous riding to which I have referred, but I think we should certainly take a realistic view of the situation and make sure that no undue financial strain is placed on a private member because he seeks to do a job for his people, which cannot be done unless some change is made in the provision allotted to him.

It may be of interest to the house to know that the most easterly point in the Northwest Territories Cape Dyer on Baffin island, a point which is east of Halifax. This constituency runs west to a point west of Queen Charlotte islands off the coast of British Columbia and to Aklavik in the far northwest corner. And we, as representatives of the people, try to pretend that a man can cover this immense territory with the same ease as those who represent, say, Ottawa East and Carleton county.

I know all members of the house recall the contribution which was made by the former member for the Northwest Territories. There is no one here who does not know what a strain this imposed on him, both physically and financially. We cannot undo the harm we did to this man, but we can certainly make sure it does not happen to another. The least we can do is to be realistic and make sure that some consideration is given to placing public transportation at the disposal of members who represent these vast outlying districts.

I represent one of these large districts myself. I am not complaining particularly about that, but even in my district it is very hard to get around an area of some 65,000 square miles. So I have great sympathy with those who have to cover a territory such as the Yukon, for example, on exactly the same basis as is made available to other members, and I think it is time we did something about it. If I am out of order in discussing the subject, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to enlarge on my remarks on some other occasion, but since this is a question of some urgency I hope my words will not go unheeded at this time.

Mr. J. E. Pascoe (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre): I am glad the hon. member for Middlesex West has put his views on record calling for special consideration to be given to particular areas affected by this redistribution measure. I too wish to make a few remarks on Bill No. C-72 before the house completes its consideration on third reading. I wish to protest very strongly, as I did on Friday night, against the threatened loss of four seats in Saskatchewan. I do not think any province should suffer such a loss in its representation as four seats in the course of one redistribution.

I draw to the attention of the house what happened during the redistribution of 1952. At that time the Liberal government of the day took action to see that the reduction of seats in Saskatchewan was minimized. Of course at that time there were Liberal representatives from Saskatchewan in the house, and this probably had some effect on the thinking of the government of the day. I drew attention on Friday to the statement of policy just released by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, that factors other than population should be used in determining equitable representation. What I am suggesting is that action should be taken to see that the west has equitable representation in this house in accordance with its position in the country's economy. I believe, too, that discussions of changes in our country's constitution will be coming up very shortly, and I understand some effort will be made at that time to consult with the provinces in connection with the representation which each province should have.

I do not intend to repeat what I said on Friday, but I wish to point out once more, as forcefully as I can, that the action taken in clause 13 in providing special consideration for certain constituencies should also apply to provinces as a whole. I think the commissions should be instructed by this house to consider the situation in Saskatchewan very carefully. I also believe special consideration should be given to the prairie provinces as a whole so their representation may be kept in fair balance with that of Ontario and Quebec.

As I said on Friday night, I do not wish to become too political. Nevertheless, I believe I should put the situation very clearly once

again. In doing so I will use the words of Robert McKeown, writing in *Weekend Magazine* of November 29, 1963: "The Liberals now draw most of their support from the cities and the Conservatives get theirs from the country." I think I could enlarge on that statement by saying that support for the Conservatives comes to a large extent from the west, and that this might have some influence with regard to the possible loss of four seats there. Mr. McKeown also said a member of parliament had told him that the next election might be won or lost as a result of what happens in this redistribution measure. I wish to point out once again that special consideration should be given to Saskatchewan with regard to this matter of seats in the House of Commons.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, the few remarks forcefully made a while ago by my hon. friend from Middlesex West (Mr. Thomas) have given rise in my mind to some suspicion.

I think that his remarks are extremely to the point and that the commission which will be responsible for considering the matter will have to give special attention to the boundaries of the constituencies in the province of Quebec as well as in Ontario.

For instance, if I take my own riding I come to the conclusion that the people are satisfied with the proposed requirements for the redistribution. But on the other hand, if my information is accurate, there is no doubt that in the event of a redistribution, my riding would be seriously dislocated.

In my opinion, this would be an error, because the citizens of St. Hyacinthe-Bagot have been used to it for many years, and if the difference between the number of the population and the 25, 20 or 30 per cent to be provided for in the act is observed, then I believe that more would be done to respect the aspirations of my electors and those of electors in the other ridings, and to adjust the situation from top to bottom and from bottom to top in order to have the number of electors required to form an electoral riding. There must be a more equitable way than the one suggested; otherwise, many counties which have existed since confederation could disappear, and this would be against common sense.

I make these remarks so that those points will be taken into consideration by the commissions which will be studying this matter, because I know that a great deal of attention is being paid to it in our ridings by the electors and the citizens in general.

[*Text*]

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

PENSIONS

MOTION TO SET UP JOINT COMMITTEE ON CANADA PLAN

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved:

That a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons be appointed to consider Bill C-136, to establish a comprehensive program of old age pensions and supplementary benefits in Canada payable to and in respect of contributors;

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; and 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 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.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, on item No. 17, in connection with the setting up of the joint committee may I ask the house leader this question. I realize the importance of getting the committee set up, but I do not quite see the urgency of it; because as I understand it the other place is not now in session and will not reassemble for some considerable time. Supposing we pass this resolution now and send a message to the Senate; when is that message likely to be dealt with? Is there any likelihood of expedition in promoting the business of parliament?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I was somewhat concerned about the whole procedure as to when the committee should be set up, either before or after second reading of the bill. On reading the cases I came to the conclusion that it is desirable and the usual practice, although not always followed, to have a committee in existence so that when second reading is given you can immediately refer the bill. But I found in that connection, somewhat to my amazement, that a bill had been referred to a joint committee even although the message had not come back from

the other place saying that they had concurred. In other words, a bill had been referred to a committee that had not been perfected.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, would the minister refer to specific examples, if he has them there?

Mr. McIlraith: I do not have them with me at the moment. I did a lot of work on this on Friday and I regret that my right hon. friend was not here, because it troubled me a great deal. The difficulty about leaving it until after second reading is that then you have to have unanimous consent to bring it on. I went further than that; I consulted with the leader of the other place to see when that place would reassemble. The motion on the order paper is that they have adjourned, I think it is, until next Tuesday or an earlier date. I am not sure whether the motion reads "at the call of the Speaker" or "the leader", but in any event it can be reconvened at an earlier date and I would anticipate that this course may be followed, although I cannot say, in fairness, that it will.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, we are not raising any objection to the proposed resolution to set up a joint committee, but I want to make some reservation about the minister's suggestion that after second reading the motion to refer to the committee should be adopted by this house, until we have heard from the other place. I would prefer to reserve judgment on that suggestion, because unless there is an established procedure whereby following second reading a bill can be referred to a committee which is only partially set up, we would be rather reluctant to adopt that procedure now.

Mr. McIlraith: I have no objection whatever to the hon. member reserving his position on that point. I must admit that the point did cause me some concern on Friday when I was trying to look up the authorities to decide just what procedure should be followed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, could not the minister give us a general outline—he has a very good memory—and give us examples of this procedure being followed; because it seems most unusual.

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There is a good example in the 1960 *Journals,* when the right hon. gentleman had a motion, I think it was on the bill of rights resolution. It went to a special committee. In that case the right hon. gentleman, at the conclusion of second reading, asked for the unanimous consent of the house to set up the committee.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is quite different.

Mr. McIlraith: When he obtained unanimous consent he then proceeded immediately to refer the bill to the imperfect committee. That is one example that I can recall.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is the very reverse.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell us what happened back in 1950 at the time a joint committee was set up on the same subject.

Mr. McIlraith: There was no bill. It was a different point altogether. That is not applicable to this situation. The one precedent which seems to have a bearing on this point is the one in 1960 to which I referred. I will get the exact reference and give it to the hon. member. In that case the unanimous consent of the house was required, and with unanimous consent the bill was referred to the, if I may so describe it, unperfected committee.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if that is not the antithesis. In this case you are placing the matter before a committee before second reading has been given.

Mr. McIlraith: No, there is no motion to refer the bill to a committee at this stage. This motion is to create a committee to which the bill can be referred when it receives second reading. This motion merely creates the House of Commons part of that committee. I think this is the usual procedure. As a matter of fact, the right hon. gentleman will recall that earlier this session there was some objection taken in the house because standing committees were not perfected, although they were already in existence and bills were referred to them. There could be objection taken if this committee was not in existence when second reading was given to a motion for referral.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, do I gather from what the minister has said that he is arguing that there must be a committee of some sort before the bill can be referred?

Mr. McIlraith: That is the whole point.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to the next item may I ask the house leader whether the government is in a position

to present a motion containing the names of the members of this committee?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the list of names has not been completed as yet, but I hope it will be, immediately second reading is given. I asked for them on Friday, and I hope to have them very quickly.

PROVISIONS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTRIBUTORY PROGRAM

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved second reading of Bill No. C-136, to establish a comprehensive program of old age pensions and supplementary benefits in Canada payable to and in respect of contributors.

She said: Mr. Speaker, members of the house have now had an opportunity, even though a short one, to examine the Canada pension plan set out in Bill C-136. One can appreciate from its length and complexity the difficulty I face in endeavouring to cover adequately the provisions of the measure in my statement on second reading. I propose to deal with a number of the more important aspects. A number of other areas of special interest and importance will be discussed by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson), whose department will be responsible for the administration of coverage and contributions, and by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) who is concerned with the financial and economic implications of the plan.

We are concerned at this second reading stage with the principles of the bill. It is apparent that there will be many detailed points which will need more explanation than can be given in these statements. The parliamentary committee will provide the opportunity for this, after approval in principle is given and the bill referred to it.

When speaking last week on the resolution preceding this bill, I emphasized that our objective was to have as comprehensive coverage as possible under this plan. Therefore I should like to make a few remarks about the question of coverage.

Only a few groups have been excluded from coverage, and these have been for constitutional, legal or administrative reasons. The crown in the right of Canada has not the power to require employer contributions from the crown in the right of any province: for this reason provincial government employees and provincial crown agency employees cannot be covered unless the province concerned wishes to enter into an agreement with Canada to have its employees covered and to pay the employer's contribution. Similarly, employees of foreign governments or international agencies will only be covered if their employer enters into an agreement to pay the employer's contribution. As I mentioned last week, members of the armed forces and the R.C.M. Police will be excluded from the plan because of the special provisions for relatively early retirement that are already made for them.

Because of the administrative difficulties involved in reaching them, certain groups of migratory workers have also been excluded from the plan. In agriculture, horticulture, fishing, forestry, logging and lumbering, a worker who does not spend at least 25 working days a year with the same employer, or one who does not earn at least $250 a year from the same employer, will not be covered under the plan. Most migratory workers in this country have other employment for much of the year, and spend less than 25 days on one job in these primary industries. The $250 a year represents an income of $10 a day for 25 days; it is also the amount of income a married woman can earn without affecting her husband's taxation status. It may be of interest to compare these provisions with the provisions of the United States program where farm workers are excluded from coverage unless they work for one employer for at least 20 days a year and earn at least $150.

I am often asked about the baby sitter or about the man who cuts your grass or shovels your snow or paints your fence, or about the woman who comes in to help with the spring cleaning or to help your wife make curtains. The answer is, this is not pensionable employment, though in fact what you pay may become part of the person's self-employed earnings.

I should like now to outline contribution rates. The contribution rate proposed for the Canada pension plan is 1.8 per cent each from employer and employee, making a combined rate of 3.6 per cent. This contribution will be paid on earnings between lower and upper limits which are initially $600 and $5,000 a year, respectively.

The effect of the lower limit is progressive, in the sense that the man with low earnings will contribute a smaller proportion of them than will the man with average earnings. On earnings of $300 a month—about the present average level—the employee's contribution will be equivalent to 1.5 per cent of his total earnings.

Both lower and upper limits will rise during the ten year transition period if the cost of living rises, and thereafter in ratio to an eight year moving average of earnings.

The combined contribution rate of 3.6 per cent on earnings between these limits, is proposed as a rate that can be expected to finance the plan for at least 20 years, without liquidating any of the investment reserve that will be built up meantime. After that, the estimates necessarily become less precise. There are too many uncertainties for us to predict what the contribution rate should be more than 20 to 25 years, that is, more than a generation from now.

There is, of course, a good reason why the cost of pensions may increase over the years. We can expect to live longer. All the estimates prepared by the chief actuary of the Department of Insurance are based on the assumption of a considerable continuing improvement in mortality rates; that is to say, more people will enjoy their pensions longer.

This, of course, will increase the total cost of pensions. What it does to the contribution rate, however, depends on what happens meantime to the total amount of earnings to which the contribution rate is applied. This, in turn, depends on a variety of factors—the rate of increase of the population of working age, the proportion of this population actually at work, the rate of increase in their productivity, and what happens to prices. I therefore propose to refer briefly to each of these.

As those who studied the actuarial report made public last fall will recall, the actuarial work for the Canada pension plan has been based on two different sets of assumptions about population growth. These were deliberately chosen by the chief actuary as extremes. That is to say, one is the slowest rate of population growth which seems at all reasonable and the other is the fastest which seems reasonable. On the first set of assumptions, that is, the slow population growth rate, the number of Canadians in the year 2050 would be 46 million; on the second set, the fast growth rate assumptions, it would be 156 million, or a difference of 110 million.

Even in the course of a generation the divergence between the two estimates is considerable. In 1990 the population of Canada would be 30 million on the first set of slow assumptions and on the second or fast set of assumptions it would be 37.2 million. That is to say, the difference between the two projections is, within 25 years, equal to the present population of Ontario and Manitoba combined.

These alternative population projections produce very different ratios for the future number of pensioners compared with the number of contributors. On the first set of assumptions, that is, with a slow growth of population, the pensioners will increase much more than the contributors, and the contribution rate therefore has to increase. On the second set of assumptions, that is, fast growth, the ratio would not change much, even if the projections are carried as far into the future as the year 2050. That is to say, if our population increases fast the contribution rate required in the 2050's may well be no higher, and indeed could be lower, than the rate required in the 1990's.

The possible wide variations in population are the greatest of the uncertainties which affect the long term cost of the plan. Economic factors, however, are also of great importance. The actuarial estimates depend on, for example, assumptions about the proportion of people of working age who in fact will be at work. They assume that for the first ten years of the plan unemployment will average 5 per cent of the labour force and thereafter it will average 4 per cent.

Before hon. members jump to any conclusions I should like to emphasize that these assumptions, like others in the actuarial report, cannot in any way be taken to reflect what the government actually expects to happen. They are the independent assumptions of the chief actuary who has worked on the principle that he should choose, to use his words, "assumptions that would not underestimate the cost" in this as in other doubtful areas. In other words, he is being deliberately on the pessimistic side or, if my hon. friends opposite will permit me, he is being somewhat conservative.

The cost of the plan will also depend on the future development of prices and earnings and especially on the relation between the two, that is, on productivity or real earnings per person.

Many different projections could be made. In order to avoid so many that they would be confusing, the chief actuary has made two assumptions about prices. Pensions will cost more, of course, the more prices rise. For the long term estimates based on a slow rate of population growth a rapid increase in prices, by 2 per cent a year, is also assumed. Thus this is deliberately a "high cost" estimate on both counts. For the estimates based on fast population growth, and therefore "low cost"

on that account, a slower but still considerable rate of price increase, 1½ per cent a year, is assumed.

Again I point out that these assumptions of the chief actuary in no way should be taken as an indication of any government expectation. The chief actuary chose them because he is seeking to guard against the danger of underestimating the possible cost of the plan.

Between these high cost and low cost estimates, the actuarial report, which I will be tabling, develops projections which are described as "intermediate cost"; that is to say, they represent costs with an intermediate rate of population growth and with price increases equivalent to 1¾ per cent a year. Each of these projections is developed on two different assumptions about earnings, a rate of increase of 3 per cent a year or a rate of increase of 4 per cent a year. The first, 3 per cent, applied to the high cost estimates with a 2 per cent rate of price increase, would imply that productivity rises by only 1 per cent a year. This is the highest cost estimate of all. This is what will happen only if there should unfortunately be a dramatic reduction in the rate of technological progress.

Such progress has led in the past to long term productivity increases at an average rate of 2 per cent to 2½ per cent a year. A 2½ per cent increase is the rate implied on the lowest cost projections, where a rapid rate of population growth is combined with earnings increases of 4 per cent a year and price increases of 1½ per cent a year. A moderate rate of productivity increase is provided for in the projection which combines the intermediate population assumptions with a 4 per cent rate of increase in earnings, which is equivalent, given the assumed 1¾ per cent price increase, to a 2¼ per cent rate for productivity.

These various estimates cover a wide range of possibilities. Consequently, they have very different implications for the costs of the plan on a very long term basis. But for 20 years at least the stories they tell are not too divergent. On anything from the lowest cost to the highest cost assumptions, the proposed contribution rate will result in building up an investment fund which is substantial but not, in relation to our economy, unduly large. The actuary's estimates apply to the fund which the plan will generate in Canada, excluding Quebec. These estimates, at the end of 20 years, range between $6.7 billion and $8.4 billion.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

I should point out that these figures are based on the chief actuary's assumption that the rate of interest will remain at about the current level, roughly 5 per cent, for ten years but will thereafter be 4 per cent. About this I would enter the same reservation as I have made about others of the actuarial assumptions. The actuary's estimates must not be taken to imply a government view that interest rates are going to decline. From many points of view, of course, a decline in interest rates would be welcome. But if the developing nations of the world are to achieve the progress that is probably essential not only to them but to the security and prosperity of all of us, this may well remain a capital hungry world for many years to come. I understand that for this and other reasons many economists would say that interest rates are no more likely to go down than they are to go up.

If the actuarial projections were made on the basis of unchanged interest rates, that is, 5 per cent throughout, the estimates of the investment fund at the end of 20 years would be higher. On the various assumptions about population and earnings, they would range between $7.4 billion and $9.3 billion.

It is, however, common to all the actuarial estimates that by 1985 income of the plan from contributions, at the 3.6 per cent rate, will no longer equal the full cost of the pensions being paid. On some of the projections, the interest on investments will for a time more than fill the gap, so that the fund will continue to increase for part at least of the plan's third decade. The highest of the chief actuary's range of estimates for the fund in 1990 is at $8.6 billion, slightly higher than for 1985. On the least favourable estimate, on the other hand, the fund would decline to $5 billion by 1990. These again are the figures with the assumption of a 4 per cent interest rate. If the interest rate remained at 5 per cent on the average, the highest figure would become $10.1 billion and the lowest $6.3 billion.

All the actuary's estimates indicate, however, that some time after the plan is 20 years old there will be a need to reassess its finances. By that time, experience of the plan will have made possible considerably more precise estimates of its costs. The range of population and economic projections is too wide for it to be realistic to try to anticipate now what should be decided more than a generation hence. The timing of any change will, of course, depend in part on the views

that are then taken about the desirability of continued partial funding and about many other points of economic policy. The most that can now be said is that if the current range of predictions is sustained, and if it is desired to preserve the funding of the plan, some increase in the contribution rate probably will be required some time in the later 1980's or the 1990's.

If I may pass now to the question of benefits, it may be helpful for hon. members if I list the benefits provided under clause 44 of this bill. They are as follows:

1. The retirement pension, available on retirement at 65 or unconditionally at age 70.

2. A disability pension.

3. An orphan's benefit.

4. A pension for widows of any age if they have dependant children.

5. A pension for all widows over 65.

6. A pension for women widowed after age 35.

7. A pension for disabled widows and widowers.

8. A death benefit.

Now, in order to receive a survivors pension or death benefit contributions must have been made for at least three calendar years and one third of the total number of years possible for the contributor.

This rule, while a reasonable one in general, could operate unfairly for people who are unable to join the plan until late in life. I am thinking, for instance, of members of the armed forces who cannot join a plan until they leave the service and are employed in some sort of pensionable employment. I am thinking also of older immigrants who do not come to the country early enough to be able to contribute. For the sake of these people, it is provided that they can achieve permanently insured status after ten years of contributions.

Because of the nature of the benefits provided the eligibility period for the disability benefit has an added requirement which could be called currently insured status. Contributions must have been made for at least five of the last ten years before the benefit is claimed.

The adjustment of benefits in payment to changes in the cost of living is an important feature of this bill. It will apply to all the benefits provided by the bill. The adjustment will be made whether the pension is being paid for the first time or whether it has been paid for many years.

This feature of the bill means that for the first time Canadians will be able to be sure of their pensions being kept up to date in value. I do not think there is any serious dispute about its desirability, but it does necessitate some rather complex sections in the bill, which I am sure hon. members have run into already. It is not desirable to adjust pensions annually if there have been only minor changes in the cost of living. Nor is it desirable to provide either for large jumps from year to year or reductions of pensions should the cost of living fall. The formula provided in the bill will therefore have the effect of keeping the pension adustment closely in line with the cost of living, and without making increases from year to year of less than 1 per cent or more than 2 per cent.

Benefits will be paid under this bill for the first time in 1967, and therefore the first adjustment to any cost of living cannot be made until 1968.

The pension is to be a fixed portion of the average earnings upon which a person has contributed. But in calculating this average, his past earnings will be revalued to their current equivalent; that is, in proportion to the changes that have taken place in the meantime in the general level of wages. In this way, the pension he has earned will be in step with improvements in productivity and in wage rates.

As in the case of the cost of living adjustment, it is desirable to find a way of smoothing out these changes. The formula in this bill, therefore, establishes an earnings index based on employees' actual average earnings throughout Canada in the most recent eight year period for which information is available, as related to the employees' actual average earnings in the first eight years of the plan.

The retirement pension is to be 25 per cent of average monthly pensionable earnings. A man who has earned $200 a month will have a pension of $50 a month; a man who has earned $400 a month will have a pension of $100 a month. A member of parliament who has contributed to the plan on the first $5,000 a year of his indemnity, will have a pension under the plan of $104.17 a month. I have to warn you, however, Mr. Speaker, and all hon. members, that the average monthly pensionable earnings are your total lifetime earnings after the plan starts and up to the earnings ceiling, averaged over your working life and expressed on monthly basis. During your working career, you may have had

months or even years of sickness or unemployment, or just low earnings before you were a member of parliament. Some people will have been attending university or taking other types of education beyond age 18. There is therefore a provision in the bill for a dropout of years of low earnings or no earnings amounting to 10 per cent of the number of months in which you may have contributed.

If you continue to work and contribute beyond age 65 up to age 69, you may substitute any months of earnings during those years for less favourable months of earnings before age 65, as long as this does not reduce your contributory period below 120 months.

The disability pension consists of two parts, a flat rate benefit and an amount equal to 75 per cent of the retirement pension the contributor might have claimed had he been age 65. The flat rate portion will be $25 adjusted in line with increases in the cost of living. The total disability pension will be at least as large as the retirement pension at any given level of earnings. The actuaries have estimates that in the year 1975 about $63 million will be paid out in disability pensions. This will represent about 17 per cent of the estimated total benefit payments.

A widow of 65 or over will be entitled to a pension at 60 per cent of her husband's retirement pension. She will be able to draw this in addition to the flat rate old age security benefit that is to be available from age 65 in the future. For widows under 65, and therefore not entitled to old age security, the widow's pension will itself contain a flat rate component as well as an earnings related component. The flat rate component is the same amount, $25, adjusted in line with the cost of living, as that provided for orphans and disabled people. The earnings-related component will be 37½ per cent of her husband's retirement pension.

The philosophy on which pensions are paid to widows under 65 is that a full pension should be available to those who cannot easily obtain employment. That is, a full pension will be paid to all widows who have dependant children, and to all widows who are disabled, no matter how young they may be. Other widows will receive a full pension if they are age 46 or over when they are widowed. For those who are widowed before age 45, the pension available will be reduced on a sliding scale so that those who are aged under 35 will not receive a pension. Young widows in their twenties and early thirties usually have little difficulty in finding employment, and of course many of them remarry.

When a widow reaches 65, or when a woman of 65 or more becomes a widow, the widow's pension is calculated at 60 per cent of her husband's retirement pension. She may, however, be entitled to a retirement pension in her own right. In that case she receives the larger of 60 per cent of her own pension plus 60 per cent of her husband's, or 100 per cent of her own pension plus 37½ per cent of her husband's, up to a ceiling equal to the maximum pension payable to a retired contributor.

The pension for the disabled widower is calculated in the same way as that for the disabled widow. The actuaries estimates indicate that in 1967 widows benefits will amount to $89 million.

If the father dies, what happens to children under the Canada pension plan? The orphans benefit will be paid to all dependant children up to the age of 18, and to age 25 if they continue their full-time education.

The benefit will be paid on the death of the father or if the mother dies in cases when she has been the main support of the family. The benefit for each child will be $25, increased in line with the cost of living. However, the total amount paid to the children of one contributor cannot exceed the maximum retirement pension payable in the year the parent died. It is estimated by the actuaries that in 1975 the payment of orphan's benefit will be about $37 million.

The death benefit is a lump sum payment which amounts to six times the monthly retirement pension, or 10 per cent of the earnings ceiling for the year of death, whichever is less. Initially the maximum would be $500 but it will increase as the earnings ceiling rises. The actuaries estimates indicate that in 1975 death benefit payments will amount to $20 million.

At ages 65 to 69 many people continue full time employment. Indeed, while many of us can hardly wait to be 65 to retire it is noticeable that as we get closer to that age, and this is especially true of men, there is a desire not to leave the labour force. But the purpose of this bill is to provide pensions for those who do retire voluntary or involuntarily. However, a person who does retire may still make modest earnings from part time or casual employment without any effect on his pension benefits under the Canada pension plan.

At the outset, when the plan's earnings ceiling is $5,000, a pensioner will be entitled

to earn 1.5 per cent of that ceiling each month, without pension reduction. That means, to begin with, that he could earn up to $75 per month without reduction in his pension, that is, $900 annually. Beyond that, up to $1,500 extra income per year his pension will be reduced by 50 cents for each extra dollar he earns, and if he earns more than $1,500 it will be reduced by $1 for every dollar he earns over that $1,500.

In considering the level of earnings at which the retirement test applies we should remember that old age security pensions will also be available from age 65. Exempt earnings of $75 a month, or $900 a year, combined with an old age security payment of $51 a month, or $612 a year, mean that a single person could have an income of $126 a month, or $1,512 a year, with no reduction in his retirement pension. A married couple both eligible for old age security could have a combined income of $177 a month, or $2,124 a year, with no reduction in the husband's retirement pension.

So far as administration of the plan is concerned I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, that a number of departments of government have been involved in drawing up the plan and will be involved in the administration of the program. We intend to avoid expensive separate facilities for collecting contributions by taking advantage of existing machinery. The contributions will be collected by the Department of National Revenue in the same way and at the same time as taxes are collected. The administration of benefits will be integrated with our existing old age security, family allowances and youth allowances administration.

The federal administration will be coordinated with that of any province having a comparable plan. In the case of Quebec these arrangements have already been worked out. If a contributor to the one plan becomes a contributor to the other plan, through a change in job or a move in residence, the earnings records of what we might call these dual contributors will be merged and only one combined pension will be paid. The act will determine which of the two jurisdictions will pay the pension and there will, of course, be financial reimbursement from the other. Arrangements of this sort are essential for the complete integration of the two plans.

The chief actuary has assumed that expenses of administration will be 0.1 per cent of contributory earnings. That is the same percentage used by the chief actuary of the old age, survivors and disability insurance program in the United States, based upon their quarter century experience in the field. This amounts to about $12 million a year, rising slowly to about $18 million in 1975. In addition to this general assessment of the magnitude of these costs, more detailed cost studies by the different departments concerned with the administration indicate that expenditures will be well within the actuaries estimates. Of course, as has been stated many times before, the administrative expenses will be a charge against the revenues of the Canada pension plan.

The bill provides a right of appeal to contributors and beneficiaries who disagree with administrative decisions. We have made an effort to establish an inexpensive and convenient review procedure. In cases where appeals from this review are desired, final determination will be made by a pensions appeals board. That board will consist of a chairman who will be a judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada or a superior court of a province, and not less than two or more than five other persons, each of whom shall be judges. Provision is made for a province administering a comparable pension plan to be able to refer cases to the same appeal board. By this means there will be not only the common benefit and contribution rate which have already been provided for, but also common interpretation of federal and provincial legislation.

The bill also contains a requirement that at least once in every five years the chief actuary of the Department of Insurance shall prepare a report based on an actuarial examination of the operation of the legislation and the state of the Canada pension plan account. This report will include estimated revenues and payments for each year in the immediately succeeding ten years, as well as other pertinent financial projections each fifth year for a period of not less than 30 years. It also directs that whenever any bill is introduced or presented to the House of Commons to amend this legislation in the future, the chief actuary must undertake an actuarial study of the effects of the proposed changes on any estimates contained in the most recent actuarial report. This information must be placed before parliament so that it can be studied in relation to the proposed amendment.

The periodic scrutiny and the suggestions and advice of a representative advisory committee are very much needed in this type of legislation as it will directly affect almost every Canadian, as a contributor or as a

beneficiary. The bill provides for the establishment of a 16-member Canada pension plan advisory committee. The committee, which will provide for representation of employees and employers and the self-employed, will meet at least once a year. In giving advice to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, it will be the responsibility of this committee to review and report on the operation of the legislation, the state of the Canada pension plan investment fund and the adequacy of coverage and benefits. Each year a report of the activities of the advisory committee will be included in the annual report of the minister to parliament.

The legislation provides within this nationwide pension plan for a province to legislate and operate comparable pension provisions. This situation applies if a provincial government, within 30 days after this act receives the royal assent, signifies its intention to enact provincial legislation providing a comparable provincial plan beginning at the same time. The province of Quebec has indicated that it proposes to do this.

This choice remains open to the provinces for the years ahead. However, once the federal legislation becomes operative a transfer to a provincial plan is involved, and therefore a notice period is required. The province would have to signify its intention to implement its plan commencing with the third year after the year in which notice was given. The benefits would have to be comparable to those under the federal legislation or any other provincial pension plan. The province would have to assume all obligations and liabilities with respect to benefits accrued under the federal legislation.

It must again be emphasized that in this bill we are dealing with a subject which has a very special status in our constitution. Under section 94A of the British North America Act, which parliament approved in 1951 and this house again approved earlier this year, there is federal jurisdiction for pensions and supplementary benefits but the federal legislation must not interfere with the operation of any present or future provincial legislation.

This unique constitutional position means that we can achieve a comprehensive Canada-wide system of pensions only by means of legislative provisions which ensure continuing consultation and co-operation with the provinces. For this reason, the bill provides that amendments of substance will require the consent of two thirds of the provinces having two thirds of the population. Amendments altering the general level of benefits and contribution rates require a notice period of at least two years.

While future parliaments cannot be committed—they can amend the legislation as they see fit—it is difficult to imagine any future parliament disregarding the requirements of this legislation, because these requirements give meaning to the special nature of the federal and provincial jurisdiction provided for pensions under section 94A.

I should like to thank hon. members for the attention they have shown in listening without interruption to this statement. As I indicated earlier, it is really not possible to anticipate all the questions which may arise in the minds of members regarding the provisions of the bill, but I have tried to deal in the course of my remarks with the salient points. My colleagues the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) and the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) will, during the course of the debate go into further detail on some of the other provisions and on the financial and economic implications in general. I propose to place before the house at this time the report of the government actuaries. I regret it is in English only, and I apologize for this to the house; the French copy is not yet ready. I regret too, that the six appendices are not yet attached to it; they are not quite completed but they will be completed in time to be made available to the special committee when it is set up.

Mr. Churchill: Will they be handed to the house?

Miss LaMarsh: Yes, I will be happy to hand them round to everybody.

Mr. Monteith: But not before second reading is complete.

Miss LaMarsh: I do not expect they will be ready before second reading is completed. However, I have the actuarial report, which is complete, and it deals with some of these appendices. Perhaps it might be of assistance to the house if I were to read the titles of the appendices. Hon. members will know what it is I am not at this time producing. They are as follows: (1) The development of population projections; (2) the development of rates of participation in covered employment; (3) the development of average earnings; (4) the development of contributions and age retirement benefits; (5) the development of death and survivor benefits and (6) the development of disability benefits. This information will be available to the members of the committee and to members of the house at the same time.

I hope the bill will, by Wednesday evening of this week, have received approval in principle so that it may be referred to the special committee we have just set up. The committee can then get on with its work of calling expert testimony and hearing representations from many interested groups as it proceeds with a clause by clause examination of Bill No. C-136.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask whether copies of the actuarial report are available for each member?

Miss LaMarsh: Yes, they will be available for all. They will now be placed in members' boxes.

By leave, I wish to table two copies of the actuarial report on the Canada pension plan dated November 6, 1964.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the minister have the unanimous consent of the house to table the document referred to?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): One of the questions I had intended to ask the minister later on in the course of my remarks was: What about the actuaries' report, and who are these actuaries? I have heard the hon. lady mention the chief actuary of the Department of Insurance and I hope she will tell us whether or not this report was drawn up by the chief actuary of the Department of Insurance alone or whether there were outside actuaries, or others, involved. The hon. lady shakes her head—no. So this is completely within the Department of Insurance.

I am shocked at the way this house has been treated in this respect. Last Monday we had the resolution. It was passed on Monday evening, but the bill was not ready. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill)—

Miss LaMarsh: On a question of privilege.

Mr. Monteith: Only 100 copies in English—

Miss LaMarsh: On a question of privilege, the bill was ready in both English and French and it was only because of the fact that it could not be reprinted in large numbers because it had to have the number of the bill put on it—

Mr. Monteith: For goodness sake, when is the government going to take some responsibility in these things?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Monteith: The bill was not ready last Tuesday in English and in French for all members of the House of Commons. I inquired of the Minister of National Health and Welfare what the circumstances were, and she made an explanation. She said there had been about 100 copies printed. I thought she said at that time they were available in English only. There may have been some French copies; the translation may not have been completed, or sufficient copies printed. But she also said they would not be available to members of the house until Thursday of last week.

Now, several days have passed. One question I had intended to ask the minister was: Where is the actuarial report; would it be presented only to the joint committee when set up? Now I ask the minister this: Why are not the members of the House of Commons taken into her confidence? We should have had this report before the second reading of this bill came up. I think this represents a complete abdication of responsibility. I am referring to the appendices. I made a note of the minister's remarks in the last few moments of her statement. Apparently they are still not complete. I do not know what kind of discharge of responsibility this represents in the opinion of the government, but in my opinion it is most inept.

Mr. Byrne: Sour grapes.

Mr. Monteith: Sour grapes my eye. The hon. member from, wherever you are from—Kootenay East—

Mr. Byrne: I know where I am from.

Mr. Monteith: You do, but nobody else does. All we hear from this member is when he chirps up and interrupts. Get up and talk on the pension plan.

Mr. Byrne: If I did, I would make more sense than you.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, we have just agreed to set up a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons, of which 24 members are to be from the House of Commons. We are requesting the Senate to consider appointing some members to this special committee. I go back to the joint committee of 1950. That committee, if you recall, sir, did reach unanimity; all parties and members of both the Senate and the House of Commons were unanimous. I do not know whether this was the first time in the history of our parliament, but it was probably about the first time in the memory of a great many of us that actual unanimity was reached in a matter such as this. I can only say that

I trust when this committee begins its proceedings and sittings it will do its best to reach unanimity. I have to admit that I doubt this. I have had some experience recently in a committee of the House of Commons. I had hoped then for unanimity, because I felt it would have meant so much to Canada as a whole. This was not to be achieved, however.

I would like to ask the minister this question, Mr. Speaker. I believe I asked her the question during the resolution stage. She did not reply then. I know we were anxious to get the motion through a week ago today, and I am not criticizing her for not replying then; but I hope she replies when she closes the debate. I am wondering how long she is going to allow for study of the bill. Let us face it, Mr. Speaker, some members of the House of Commons have only had a copy of the bill since last Thursday, as I understand it.

Mr. Churchill: That is right.

Mr. Monteith: I certainly think the bill should be available to those interested citizens of Canada, also, so they can examine it in detail. How long is the committee going to be given, or how long are the people of Canada going to be given to study the bill, prepare briefs and present them to the committee? We were in such a big hurry today to authorize the setting up of the committee. When are we going to give the people of Canada an opportunity to study this bill?

Mr. Lloyd: When you send it to the committee.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Lloyd) need not interject, either. He can get up and make his speech, just like the member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne). I was asking a question of the minister, and I think I asked it during the resolution stage. How long will the public of Canada be given to study this bill before the committee forces a deadline on it? How long are they going to be given to prepare briefs? When I asked the minister this question previously, she smiled rather benignly. I asked whether the committee was going to be in operation before Christmas. I ask this question again. Some preliminary work of the committee could be done before Christmas, and surely to goodness the people of Canada are going to be given an opportunity to study this most complex piece of legislation. I do not suppose there has been for a long time any piece of legislation that has meant so much, not only to the recipients of pensions, those who are going to benefit under the bill, but to the whole citizenry of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Monteith: All right. I further ask, Mr. Speaker, when the people of Canada are to be given the chance to study this 85-page, 125-sections bill. Are they not to be given this opportunity?

Mr. Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has asked whether we are going to give the people of Canada an opportunity to study this bill. The hon. member was in his place today when the committee was established, and surely its function is clear.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, I have no idea what the hon. member for Halifax is talking about. It sounded to me like a program I saw on television last night, which was called "Candid Camera". It was a bunch of gobbledygook, or whatever it is called. The hon. member's remarks could not have meant any more than that. The minister, in her introduction on second reading, sounded good, I admit; but really it was so technical. I am not blaming her for that; it would have to be technical, on a bill of 125 sections and 85 pages. How could it be other than technical? I would mention in passing that this is a bill of four parts. Part I has divisions A to E; part II has divisions A to G; part III is administration, and part IV amendments to the Old Age Security Act. I am not a lawyer, but I doubt very much whether there is an expert lawyer in Canada today who could have analysed this bill between last Thursday, when it was received by most hon. members, and today. I think this is another illustration of the deplorable handling of house business by the government. I insist that this bill needs a great deal of detailed study.

I am very pleased that the minister is going to be buttressed by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) and the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson). I see the Minister of National Revenue in the offing. No doubt they are going to make very worthy speeches, one as to how he is going to collect the money and the other as to how it is going to be possible to spend the money. This is the sort of thing they will be speaking about. It will all make a pretty good argument, I am not denying that; and I am really very pleased that the minister should have this assistance. The minister did mention that the

employees of foreign governments in Canada —she may correct me if I am wrong about this —may be covered if the employer agrees to pay their contributions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Monteith: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) applauds.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but the hon. member did not realize that we were applauding the appearance in the house of the Créditiste party. It has just arrived.

Mr. Monteith: At last. I am certainly very pleased to join in the welcome.

Mr. Churchill: I don't.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, to answer this welcome from the hon. member I would like to say that the Créditiste members were attending about 40 public meetings during the week end, were continuing to organize throughout all the provinces, and were saying—

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member has any right to be on his feet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) has the floor.

Mr. Monteith: What they were doing had nothing to do with pensions, unless they are looking for one in some other sphere.

I would, in all seriousness, like to ask the minister another question. I will take an example. If a Canadian citizen were a chauffeur or worked at a foreign embassy in Canada, and the foreign embassy did not choose to enter into an agreement, that person could not be covered, could he? Am I right in my thinking in this regard The minister nods, indicating "yes". I think this is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, but I will not argue the point at the moment.

This will undoubtedly come up during the course of the study by the joint committee. The minister's statement contained reference to baby sitters, snow shovellers, individuals who make curtains, and individuals in other categories. I do not intend to go into this subject, because various categories of eligible workers will undoubtedly be studied by that committee.

One certainly could not hope to digest all of the detail contained in the minister's opening remarks in the time available, but I should like to refer to several specific points. She made two assumptions about rates, but she would not accept the responsibility for either. These were actuarial assumptions. Sooner or later the minister is going to have to accept some responsibility in this regard. She pointed out that the thinking of one group was such and such, while the thinking of another group was different, and she did not appear to know exactly where she herself stood. In my humble estimation she is going to have to accept responsibility in this regard and make some declaration.

I was amazed by her suggestion concerning the thinking of some people that 5 per cent of our labour force being unemployed is not a bad situation, whereas the thinking of another group was that 4 per cent of the labour force being unemployed was not too bad. I am wondering what the minister herself thinks in this regard. In this connection I recall the considerable amount of conjecture expressed by the Minister of Finance in his book.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the minister has manifested a certain amount of what I should call waffling. She has stated that some economists have said that interest rates will go up, whereas others feel interest rates will go down. It certainly appears to me that she was waffling, in that she did not declare her position or thinking in this regard.

One other comment by the minister in her opening remarks I found intriguing. I hope she will correct me if I am wrong, but I thought she was referring to the members of this house. She did say that the lifetime earnings of members of parliament were going to be averaged out. I should like at this time to ask the minister how she thinks this averaging out process is going to be worked out. I hope she will answer that question in due course. Is the Department of National Health and Welfare going to have access to the records of the Department of National Revenue? These records have been considered somewhat sacrosanct in the past, and I do not think departments should collaborate for the purpose of exchanging this kind of information. I am not complaining seriously at the moment in this regard, but I should like the minister to tell us whether these lifetime earnings are to be averaged out on the basis of that kind of exchange of information.

The minister made one other remark which struck me as facetious. Surely she was not being serious when she suggested that many of us could hardly wait until we reached the age of 65 to retire. I look forward with happiness to every year before I reach age 65, as I am not in a hurry to attain that precarious age. Perhaps one could sense a slight

innuendo in her remark, and I admit that the minister is much younger than I, but is she looking forward to the time I reach 65 and retire?

Last Tuesday I asked her whether the bill, a copy of which was apparently available to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), was to be made available to other members of the house. Within 20 minutes of the time I asked that question two copies were made available, so the question was worth while. Having studied this bill since it has been available, I have concluded that it has taken a great many months to prepare. One need only examine it to see how intricate and complex it is. Perhaps one could suggest that it has been in preparation almost since April 8, 1963. There have been many revisions, and this bill is the final draft.

In spite of the fact that there may be agreement between house leaders as to the length of debate at this stage, I should like to complain vociferously, as an individual member, about that limitation on the time we have to study this very complex bill. I do not believe the greatest legal mind in Canada could come up with answers, within such a limited period of time, to the many apparent questions arising from a consideration of this bill. I hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that we are not going to oppose second reading. That has been our position in respect of a Canada pension plan throughout the various phases of every presentation of the government's pension scheme. We favour a Canada pension plan.

There are one or two general questions I should like to ask the minister. A week ago today, when the resolution was before the house, I asked the hon. lady several questions and I do not criticize her for not replying to them on that occasion. At that time we had reached the end of our evening's work and we allowed the resolution stage to pass. I do hope the hon. lady will see fit to give us at least some of the answers to those questions. During her earlier remarks she said she would attempt to answer some of the questions, but that she may not be able to answer them all. I can understand that situation because the bill is to be referred to a joint committee immediately following second reading, or as soon thereafter as the joint committee has been established. We as a committee of the whole will be studying the bill when it comes back from the joint committee, so at that time we will have the hon. lady with her officials in front of her to answer questions in detail.

I am sure hon. members who speak on this subject during the next two or three days will refrain from asking unnecessarily detailed questions, but rather will confine their questions in depth to the pertinent realities of the plan. We will, however, want to know about some of the things the minister as yet has not explained. It may be that she will be in a position to give some detail, but at least for my part I will not expect her to give this detail, unless she does so following consultation with her officials during adjournments between sittings. That is the position I intend to take, but perhaps other members will feel differently.

During the resolution stage I asked the minister whether she had given any consideration to possible priority requirements recommended by the Hall health commission. What is she going to do about the report and recommendations of that commission? Are those recommendations to be left in abeyance or forgotten? I should like to receive a reply to that question.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I have a general question I should like the minister to answer. Has there been any indication of how many provinces are going to join with the federal government in the Canada pension plan or how many are going to operate their own plans? The minister mentioned today that Quebec is going to proceed on its own, and I am not quarrelling with that. The legislation provides for it. But is this the only province which, according to the minister, has indicated it is going to do this? Are other provinces going to do the same thing? Has there been any indication as to the number of provinces that are actually joining in the Canada pension plan with federal administration only? I should like to know about Ontario. Has there been any indication yet? Surely the minister can give us some enlightenment on this matter.

There is another matter about which old age security recipients in Canada are going to be very disturbed. It is obvious that when the minister spoke at the resolution stage she intended to build up great hopes for the elder citizens of Canada. These hopes have proved to be completely unfounded. She mentioned at that time that all future old age security pensions would be pegged to the cost of living index and would increase automatically if living costs increased. The minister said she hoped that this would not only develop a sense of security among our older citizens but

would protect the real value of the pension dollar for Canada's million-odd pensioners.

I cannot help but say that, deliberately or otherwise, Mr. Speaker, this was a complete distortion of the real facts. It sounded noble until some of us received copies of the bill on Tuesday, and other members on Thursday. The bill provides that the Canada pension act shall come into force on January 1, 1966 and that payments under the act will commence on January 1, 1967. The shocking provision so far as present old age pensioners are concerned is that payments based on the cost of living index will not be made until January 1, 1968. They will then be based on experience in the year 1967 only and the increase will not be less than 1 per cent or more than 2 per cent.

Mr. Knowles: It might be zero.

Mr. Monteith: As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre says, it might well be zero. What this means in effect is that old age pensioners cannot expect any increases until January 1, 1968. They might then receive an increase of 75 cents a month if the cost of living index has gone up by 1 per cent in the year 1967. If the cost of living has increased more than 1 per cent old age pensioners can expect an increase of up to $1.50 per month. If the cost of living does not increase during the year 1967 then, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said, the old age pensioners will not receive an increase. This is a terrible blow to the old age pensioners, Mr. Speaker. These older people have to wait three years and possibly they will then receive an increase of 75 cents a month.

I said earlier that it would be impossible for the greatest legal mind in the world to digest this bill since last Thursday. I admit I have had it since last Tuesday afternoon. I have tried to peruse the bill in the meantime but it has been impossible to digest it. It is an affront to parliament to bring it forward when we have not had an opportunity to study it. However, I would go so far as to say that the officials of the department deserve a great deal of credit. I refer not only to the officials of the Department of National Health and Welfare but also to the officials of finance, justice and maybe national revenue because the bill is so comprehensive.

So far as references and cross-references are concerned, I do not know whether the idea came from the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson), but as he well knows the Income Tax Act is the most complicated piece of legislation on the statute books of Canada today. He made his living out of it, and so did I for a while. But I must say that one would have to sit down for weeks in order to look into the cross-references having to do with this particular legislation. I am not fooling when I say that.

The minister did clear up one matter for me earlier by nodding her head in agreement that the only actuaries who have worked on the actuarial report are government actuaries. Am I correct in that?

Miss LaMarsh: Yes.

Mr. Monteith: And the chief actuary of the Department of Insurance is accepting all responsibility for the figures which will be found in the actuarial report?

Miss LaMarsh: No responsibility?

Mr. Monteith: All responsibility.

Miss LaMarsh: Yes.

Mr. Monteith: That is fine. I accept that. In her remarks the minister referred to the fact that any province, within one month after the act is assented to, may signify its intention to operate its own plan. The minister referred to this in her remarks and I have a question for her. It may be I am at fault here because there were so many details in her statement that I could not quite follow them all and get them all down in writing. However, I believe she did say that a province can opt out at any time after three years if notice is given in writing. Am I correct in that?

Miss LaMarsh: Yes.

Mr. Monteith: I am wondering why the period of three years was chosen. There may be very good reasons. I should like to refer to subclause 2 of clause 4 where I find these words:

> Subject to subsection 3, all of the provisions of this act to
>
> (a) employment by Her Majesty in right of Canada or by an agent of Her Majesty in right of Canada in a province providing a comprehensive pension plan.

Perhaps the minister would tell me just how employees of the C.B.C. and the C.N.R. who reside in Quebec will be affected by the plan. I am also interested in clause 6 (1) (i) which reads as follows:

> 6. (1) Pensionable employment is—
>
> (i) employment by Her Majesty in right of a province or by an agent of Her Majesty in right of a province.

Does this mean provincial employees or just what does it mean? There are so many questions that arise but I am not going to pursue them today.

I should like to impress upon the people of Canada, Mr. Speaker, as I did at the resolution stage, that there is a great discrepancy between people who are hired by somebody and the self-employed person. I gather that we, as members of parliament, will have a deduction made of 1.8 per cent of our pay up to $5,000. Is this correct? The minister nods, yes. Some person who is running a corner grocery store is going to have to pay 3.6 per cent of his earnings. The farmer is going to have to do the same. I do not believe this provision is going to be acceptable to many of the self-employed people in Canada. In other words, I believe one might say that the self-employed are going to pay exactly 100 per cent more towards a pension than those who are employed at the present time.

In so far as reciprocal agreements with other countries are concerned, I am not against them. I think this is a wise provision. I ask again, how many provinces have indicated a desire to enter into the scheme? I should like to ask one more question. If a province requests the federal government to enter into a reciprocal agreement with another country, must the federal government do so? I will put it this way. The minister, thus far, has only mentioned the province of Quebec so I will refer to Quebec. If the province of Quebec asks the minister to enter into a reciprocal arrangement with Italy or any country in South America, must the federal government enter into such a reciprocal arrangement? I ask her that question.

There are other items, Mr. Speaker, about which I am not going to comment in detail this afternoon. We want to get this bill into committee, and I know there are many other speakers to be heard. There are one or two things under part IV upon which I should like to comment. I notice the minister has retained one feature, and I must admit I am probably responsible for this to some degree. I notice that clause 120 of part IV is being amended, but this part is being retained:

> Subject to the provisions of this act and the regulations,
>
> (a) a monthly flat rate pension may be paid to every person who has attained 70 years of age and has applied to receive such a pension,—

Then, we go down to paragraph (d):

> (d) has resided in Canada for at least one year immediately preceding the day on which his application is approved.

[Mr. Monteith.]

I notice this provision is being retained. I know also from my experience in the post the hon. lady now holds that great hardship is caused in certain cases. Frankly, I do not know the answer, but if a wife of lesser age may be living with a husband in California or in a warmer climate in the south, this provision means she must come back to Canada to reside for at least a year before she attains the age of 70 to be eligible to receive her pension. I am only pointing this out in the hope that possibly in the last year and a half or so, additional experience has been gained which would permit some cure of this inequity which often develops.

There is one provision upon which I must congratulate the minister. I refer to clause 122 of the bill. It is very rarely that I ever congratulate a minister of the government because frankly, I do not believe they deserve it too often. This particular provision indicates that where a person has applied for old age security and it is found subsequently he is older than was thought, the date of eligibility for the pension may be made retroactive one year. I have known this to happen during my tenure of office, and I feel this is a good move. In fact, I was planning such action myself when circumstances suggested otherwise. I do believe this is a good move in the right direction. When a person reaches this age, quite often the family Bible has been lost and the person might not be as mentally alert as previously. I have known four people in one town to have this happen to them within the course of a few months. These four people all applied for their pension when they were actually 71, but it was impossible to do anything for them. Now it is going to be possible to make the pension retroactive one year.

I am going to close my remarks by saying that the government has shown complete ineptitude in handling this whole question of pensions. At last, at long last, we have reached the second reading stage of the Canada pension plan bill. We want to get on with the job, and we want the government to get on with the job.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) would hardly expect me to share completely her enthusiasm for this bill, as though it were the last word in pension legislation. I must say also that I cannot join in the ranting and complaining that we have had from the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith).

He seemed to spend most of his time complaining that we should not proceed with this complicated bill today because we have not had time to study it. I do not claim to be as smart as the imaginary lawyer to whom he referred, but I would point out that we had a bill very much like this, Bill No. C-75, which was given first reading and presented to us on March 17. This Bill No. C-136 is based very largely on that bill. There are very few changes in the retirement benefits set out in the bill. Bill No. C-136, in the main, adds the widows, disability and survivor benefits.

I point out also that since August 10 we have had a white paper that explains the provisions of this bill. All told, I do not believe we have any complaint at being asked to proceed with it today, even if some members did not get their copies of the bill until last Thursday. Personally, I found no difficulty on Monday night, just out of my own interest, in ascertaining that there were copies of the bill, after it had been tabled, and if any member really wanted one he could get it quite easily. My concern, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Churchill: That is not the way to run a government.

Mr. Knowles: —is not so much with the fact that the government has brought on second reading, but is rather with the long delay we have had in connection with the Canada pension plan since this government first came into office, and the fact that we might yet fail to get it on the statute books at this session. I hope that is not the case but I express that fear as a way of indicating my desire that this house and the government take the steps that are necessary to complete this legislation at this session.

I believe we are all satisfied that a bill of such complexity is better studied in committee. Therefore it is not inappropriate that there has been general agreement among the parties that the debate on second reading be limited to three days. I think it is well understood also that when the bill goes to a special joint committee that committee will be granted all the time it wishes to examine and discuss it. However, I would like to suggest to the government that if the time taken by the special committee is such that we get beyond Christmas, or beyond some point at which the business of the house requires the house to continue in session, technically speaking the house be continued in session, even if it is given some kind of recess, so that the special joint committee can make its report back after that recess to a resumed portion of this same session.

I am sure hon. members realize that if the house is prorogued while this matter is being discussed by the joint committee that would kill the bill for the session, and we would have to start all over again at the next session of the house. I remind the minister of the commitment made by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) on July 6 when he was house leader, that the government would take all the steps necessary to complete the legislative process with respect to this bill at this session. I trust that commitment will be kept.

On several occasions we have said that we welcome this bill and we have indicated the aspects of it that are good. Therefore it is hardly necessary to spend any time repeating that welcome or to go into greater detail with respect to the value of this legislation. However, I would like to say that we feel security for our people in their older years, security for our people on the advent of widowhood or disability, or on the occasion of children being orphaned, is one of the most important marks of a decent civilization.

We think the time has come to make an adequate pension plan an integral part of our economy. As I have already said to the minister, we do not regard this bill as the last word in this kind of legislation but it is certainly a forward step. We have moved from the first positions that we took in this field when we provided pensions that merely kept starving people alive. We have moved into universality with respect to pensions. We have moved into a fairly broad range of pensions, and now we are considering the proposition that one of the things that should be an integral part of our economy is a plan whereby pensions as of right are available upon retirement, are available to persons who are disabled, are available to persons who become widows, or in certain instances widowers, and are available to orphans.

A great deal has yet to be done to raise the levels provided by this bill and make them really adequate, but this bill starts in that direction and for that reason we are glad that at last we have it. Nevertheless I wish to say again that we feel this legislation is too modest in its beginnings.

I know there are those in the house who think we should be grateful for the extent to which the bill goes, but I suggest that this concept of starting things in a modest way is one that has been with us far too long. I may have occasion to quote this

sentence again with respect to something else, but I would now like to quote what the minister said in reply to the point of privilege I raised last Tuesday when I complained about the cost of living bonus of 75 cents that is to be paid in 1968. As recorded at page 9938 of *Hansard* for that day the minister said:

> I would ask my hon. friend and all members of the house to bear in mind that in the usual spirit of Canadian fiscal responsibility we are beginning this experiment in a relatively modest manner.

That was well put, Mr. Speaker. That is the way we have begun most of our social security programs in Canada. We began them in the usual spirit of Canadian fiscal responsibility, in a relatively modest manner.

We know there are certain things that happen which make it possible for huge sums of money to be made available overnight, and so we feel that in the whole area of social security the time has gone for talking about modest beginnings. The time has come to take the kind of steps that will let our economy provide the full measure of security that it can for all our people.

Another comment I would like to make about this bill is that the relations between the federal government and the provinces which are spelled out in it, seem to be too much of a one way street. I am thinking in particular of the provision whereby any province which informs the federal government within 30 days after royal assent to this bill that it has a plan of its own, is automatically out. This is a provision which was in Bill C-75, or at least there was language to that effect, and we know this covers the case of Quebec. But in addition to that there is a new provision in this bill which makes it possible for other provinces in the future to decide to opt out of the Canada pension plan. In fact the bill sets out the steps that can be taken by certain other provinces to opt out, but I do not see anywhere in the bill the street that runs the other way.

There does not seem to be any way in which Quebec, or some other province, having opted out of the plan can later come back in, and this is a one way street arrangement in federal-provincial arrangements which is not good.

I also believe that the arrangements as to whether an employee belongs to a province or to the federal government for purposes of this legislation are loaded in favour of the provinces. Again this is a one way street. I recognize what the minister said about legislation of this kind succeeding only if there is co-operation between the federal and the provincial governments, but I suggest that co-operation and mutual arrangements work best on a two way rather than a one way street.

As I stated in committee on the resolution a week ago, I believe the government will have to do a great deal more in the field of public relations with respect to this legislation. I suppose we have to forgive the government for its lack of action in this respect, or understand why it has not taken adequate action up to this point. The government no doubt takes the view that it cannot use public money to publicize something which has not yet become law. But in the meantime many misunderstandings have arisen, particularly as to the relationship between this plan and private plans—the kind of misunderstanding which has led organizations such as the teachers to think this is something they must oppose. There is the misunderstanding created in the minds of employees of some large corporations because the notion has gone abroad that somehow or other the federal government intends to take over existing schemes as a result of which retirement conditions will be less favourable than they are now.

Once this legislation has been passed, however, it becomes the law of the land. Then I think the time will have come for a great deal to be done by the government to help the Canadian people realize what it really involves; the government will be free to help them realize its benefits and at the same time to help them realize its real shortcomings so that the people can work together to have those shortcomings remedied.

I have commented previously on the funding aspect of this legislation and one or two of my colleagues may have something more to say on this aspect of the subject than I intend to say now. But I wish to repeat what I said last Monday: It strikes me that this plan is neither a funded plan nor a pay as you go plan; it is in between the two. But it is a little closer to being a funded plan than it is to being a pay as you go plan, and to the extent it is in that direction I do not like it. The reason is simple. We are using a pension plan based on the need and desire of people for pensions, and the fact that they have to pay for them, as a means of taxing people in the lower income groups for the building up of investment and development funds. We in this party believe there should be funds available for investment and development. We wanted to see and have a

chance to vote for the Canada development corporation which the government was talking about a year or so ago, but it seems to have been forgotten since then. But we believe funds for these purposes should be obtained on a voluntary basis and on the basis of ability to pay; they should not be built up by taxing people in the lower income brackets. I also believe that when we are building up a fund for investment in the development of the country on the basis of the peoples' savings there should be much greater control of such a fund from the centre than is envisaged in this present plan under which, as I understand it, control and direction of investment is given to the provinces in proportion to the amount of contribution made in each of the provinces.

I trust I have made it clear that though the plan itself is one which we welcome—indeed, it is similar to the plan we have been advocating in this party for a long time—there are many shortcomings attached to it and we hope these can be eliminated while the bill is in committee, or if not as the years come and go.

Thus far I have been talking mainly about that part of the bill which concerns the Canada pension plan proper. I now wish to say a few words about that part of the bill which deals with a related subject, but which in effect amends the Old Age Security Act. We welcome some of the proposed amendments to the Old Age Security Act which are contained in this part of the bill. We suggest, however, that if this is a time when the Old Age Security Act is being opened up there are many other changes which ought to be made. For example at the present time—and the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) has referred to this—no matter how many years of residence a person may have here he cannot qualify for the pension unless he has spent the last full year before going on the pension in Canada. I understand the reason for putting this requirement into the act but I suggest it has produced some strange anomalies. We now have a situation where some people can live in this country for ten or 15 years, reach the age of 70 and live on the old age security pension in full for the rest of their lives. Other people who may have lived here for 30, 40 or 50 years, but who have had to leave for health or family reasons before the age of 70, find it difficult or financially impossible to come back and spend a year here. So they are not able to qualify for the pension. I have records of a number of such cases in my files upstairs, letters from the United Kingdom or the United States where people are waiting hopefully for a message to the effect that there has been a change in this legislation of advantage to them. Such a change does not appear in the bill now before us but I hope we can bring about an alteration of this kind while the bill is under examination in committee. I remind the minister that either she or the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) told us that these changes which we now see in the Old Age Security Act were made at the instance of the federal government without consultation with the provinces. Therefore, although there might be some difficulty about getting changes in the Canada pension plan part of this bill because of agreements, almost treaties, arrived at with the provinces, we can surely get changes in the old age security part of this measure.

But the part of the bill which concerns or annoys me most in relation to the Old Age Security Act is the part about which I rose on a question of privilege on Tuesday of last week, namely this cruel hoax of telling our old age pensioners that things are going to be fixed up for them, their pension dollar protected, and so on, because pensions are to be pegged to the cost of living index. First, may I say to the minister that it is inaccurate to use the word "pegged", giving the impression that the pension will go up to the same extent that the cost of living index rises, because she knows that under the provisions of the legislation the pension cannot increase by more than 2 per cent in any one year. Therefore if we had a situation—and it could quite conceivably occur—where the cost of living index rose by 3 percentage points in each of ten years, at the end of ten years the cost of living index would have gone up by 30 percentage points but the old age security pension would have gone up by only 20 per cent.

But apart from this—and my colleagues in my party know this is something I have been talking about for many years—I complain about this device because I think it is a snare and a delusion to tell old age pensioners that things are fixed up for them once their pensions are tied to the cost of living index. The cost of living index is not the only element in our economic life; it is not the only element which has a part to play in the standard of living of our people. More important elements are the gross national product, the level of productivity and, to use language out of the Canada pension plan itself, the earnings index. I congratulate the minister and the

government on what they have done in devising the formula on the basis of which the retirement pension is worked out. The scheme, a complicated one, but one not beyond comprehension, is a formula whereby the rate of pension at which a person will retire on reaching 65, or between 65 and 70, is related not to the actual number of dollars he was getting at that point but to his earnings throughout his working lifetime, adjusted according to the changes which have taken place in the earnings index. That is good.

It recognizes that there is something else besides a rise in the cost of living, and that this something else is better measured by changes in the earnings levels than it is by changes in the cost of living index. I think there are other factors, the general productivity and the gross national product of the country. But at any rate the government has accepted the proposition that in arriving at a rate of pension up to or at the point of retirement something else than the cost of living index is taken into consideration. However, once a person goes on pension, whether it is the Canada pension plan amount of $104.17 a month, to use the initial maximum figure, or the $75 under old age security, once that point has been reached the government says, "From here on you senior citizens, you great Canadians, the only adjustment you are going to get in either of these pensions is based upon the cost of living index. The gross national product may go up, earnings may go up, the standard of living in Canada may go up, we may have a society infinitely more affluent in ten or 20 years time than was the case when you retired, but the only basis on which there is to be any change in your Canada pension plan retirement benefit, or any guaranteed change in your old age security benefit, is on the basis of a rise in the cost of living index."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the rise in the cost of living index must be compensated for when we ask for pension increases. It has to cover that, but that is not the only item. What I do not like about tying the old age security pension to the cost of living index is that it ties it to only one element and denies to our senior citizens the other benefits of a society that is growing more affluent and is producing more wealth. These are benefits in which our senior citizens should have the opportunity to share. I recognize what the minister said the other day, and one of the reasons I am glad I raised my question of privilege was that it got one admission out of her that had been very difficult to get; that is, that the $75 figure is not necessarily fixed for all time. In all previous discussions on this matter I had not been able to get a word out of her, but when I complained about this increase of only 75 cents in 1968 the other day she did say:

> Nor is anything in this bill intended to exclude any future action by any parliament with respect to that base.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is good to know. One of the Liberal members the other day said it is fine to get this cost of living index change; it means from here on there will be no more politicking about old age pensions and the increase will be automatic. If it is left to the automatic increase it will take ten or 15 years to get a few dollars increase. It will be only because of the genuine political interest in the well being of the Canadian people that we will get an increase in that $75 a month. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the government should even now realize that there have been increases in the cost of living since the $75 was set, increases in the wage levels and general productivity, and it should set for parliament as a goal that the flat rate of pension should be raised to $100 a month by the time we reach our 100th birthday in 1967. I submit that it would be a mark of good faith on the part of the government toward our old age security pensioners if they were to set out a schedule of $5 increases every few months which would bring it up to that figure of $100 a month by 1967. If we do not do this, we are really leaving them out of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want this principle of still being concerned about the people who are retired to extend not only to the old age security pension but also to the Canada pension plan retirement benefit; I want it to extend to superannuated civil servants, to Canadian National employees and all people on pensions. I think one of the tragedies of the viewpoint the government has taken with respect to pensions is that it does pretty well up to a point, it keeps improving the various pension plans and the public service superannuation plan; but it says to people once they get on pension, "Well, you are off our hands now". Up to this point that has been absolute—there has been nothing more. Once this bill gets through there will be a slight improvement; we will get the benefit of the increase in the cost of living index. But this is the only benefit our pensioners will receive, and it is very small. That is only one element in the standard of living of our people. We do not deny to members of a family the increased benefits that the family can enjoy; and I submit we should

be taking the same attitude toward our senior citizens, to those who are retired, and they should get the full benefit of the increase in productivity and the general increase in wages and earnings and all the other things that go to improve our standard of living.

I see that it is almost six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to take my full 40 minutes; that would mean rising to speak for only a few minutes after eight o'clock tonight. I hope I have made the point that we welcome this legislation. We regret that it has taken so long to even get this far. We hope that once it gets to the committee there will be abundant opportunity to examine and study it. We think that the reports of the actuaries will have to be studied in full and all these 125 clauses will have to be examined and questioned. I hope, also, that the sittings of the committee will do a good public relations job for this legislation. As a matter of fact, I hope there is something to the rumour that the house may recess for a period while that committee is sitting and dealing with this bill, so that it can be the main thing that is happening in parliament. As I say, I hope that if the rest of the business of the house is more or less completed, the house will not be prorogued but that instead there will be a recess so that the committee can deal with the bill and come back to the house with it, in order that we may get it through before the end of this session.

There is just one comment I wanted to make on an unrelated matter, but it is something to which the minister referred. I suppose we non-lawyers, every time we get into a legal matter, point out that we are not lawyers. I do not know whether that strengthens our case or weakens it.

Mr. Monteith: Even the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill).

Mr. Knowles: However, Mr. Speaker, I really am puzzled about the provision in the bill that virtually says the act cannot be amended in certain respects in the future unless such amendment is assented to by two thirds of the included provinces representing two thirds of the population of those provinces. Mr. Speaker, this is not the constitution of Canada; this is just an act, a statute passed in this 1964 session of parliament. Nothing could prevent the next session of parliament from amending this statute. Nothing could prevent any future parliament from amending this statute. This is the kind of language that I would think a law student who had not got very far would write into a bill. As a statement of intention on the part of the government, perhaps I can understand it; but it seems to me that in legal terms it does not stand up at all. If this government is giving a commitment to the provinces that it will not do anything like that, that is something for the government to do by way of commitment to the provinces and to stand or fall on it; but to ask parliament to tie itself in an annual statute to something that is constitutional in character is, I suggest, bordering on the ridiculous. However, Mr. Speaker, rather than rising at eight o'clock in order to conclude my remarks, I would say in conclusion now that we welcome the bill; we are pleased with the things in it that are good, but we hope that the weaknesses we have pointed out will be improved before the bill is finally passed at this session.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTION TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is my duty pursuant to provisional standing order 39A to inform the house that the question to be raised at ten o'clock this evening is as follows: The hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher); the Senate, inquiry as to reform measures proposed.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

PENSIONS

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTRIBUTORY PROGRAM

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Miss LaMarsh for the second reading of Bill No. C-136, to establish a comprehensive program of old age pensions and supplementary benefits in Canada payable to and in respect of contributors.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of my party I should like to say a few words about Bill C-136 now before us.

As has been stated by a number of members of this house about both Bills C-136 and C-75, the predecessor of this bill, it is a very long and complex bill which requires a great deal of study and explanation before it is completely understood by all members of this house. I should like to say at the outset that I do not intend to get caught in the trap in which the hon. member for Perth (Mr.

Monteith) found himself. I might say that was a trap of his own making, because he admitted that he did not understand or comprehend this bill and then proceeded vigorously to criticize what he did not understand.

Mr. Monteith: So you understand it all?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the members of this house were completely familiar with all the ramifications which may develop during the operation of the provisions of this bill, there would be no apparent reason for sending it to a joint committee for study. I do not pretend to understand all of the sections of the bill, nor do I pretend to comprehend fully how all the provisions of the bill are going to be handled in its practical application. Perhaps I should go further than that and state that I doubt whether the minister and her advisers have fully anticipated all of the problems with which they will be faced in the application of the 125 sections of this bill.

In spite of the intended insult, if I may call it that, on the part of the hon. member for Perth, I think this bill is being sent to a joint committee for further study because members cannot be expected independently to study it and understand all of the implications of it, nor answer all the questions which are apparent to one who reads the bill.

There are some questions, quite apart from the provisions of this bill, which should be answered by the minister, particularly when we are being asked to accept the principles of a Canada pension plan. These questions do not necessarily arise from the contents of any section of the bill now before us for consideration, although I believe they are very germane to the successful operation of the pension plan when it comes into being.

One question which has been asked on many occasions by a number of members, and we have yet to have an answer, relates to the number of provinces which have indicated to the minister a willingness to participate. We know for example that under the provisions of certain sections of this bill the province of Ontario can choose not to participate, by opting out within 30 days from the date of its proclamation. That being the case, 12 million people, representing the populations of Quebec and Ontario, of the 19 million people in this country, would not be partaking in the plan. The explanation the minister has given this afternoon, to the effect that provinces can opt out only after positively stating an intention to set up a plan similar in operation with reciprocal arrangements, is not a sufficient explanation, because with two thirds of our population not participating surely this cannot be referred to as a pension plan national in scope. I am not sure that the federal government should be involved at all in a pension plan under those circumstances, with this large part of our population not included.

One other question which has been asked repeatedly, particularly during the resolution stage, and at other times when other bills preceding Bill C-136 were before us, had to do with whether any arrangements had been made for the reconciliation of this plan with other pension plans, particularly of public service organizations, and administered by the government. We are led to believe, by certain articles appearing in various newspapers, that there are some 11,000 private pension plans in existence in Canada. Perhaps some of them cannot or should not be reconciled with this plan. Some of those plans may have been in existence for a long period of time and set up in such a way that the differences are so great it would be at least difficult if not impossible to reconcile them with this plan. I believe the minister will have to face this situation fairly soon and indicate what position will be adopted by the federal government when some of the long established private pension plans are adjusted in such a way as to take into consideration the provisions of the proposed Canada pension plan.

What will be the attitude of the government about these adjustments, particularly if and when it is decided by the administrators of a long established pension plan, in cooperation with the employees covered to reduce the contributions and perhaps the benefits to the extent of the amounts collected and the benefits inherent to this Canada pension plan? It will indeed be a difficult and complex matter to decide what will be fair reductions in potential benefits, at reduced costs.

This situation is not entirely hypothetical, because I have learned from reliable sources that some of the larger companies in Canada are giving serious consideration to this very thing.

So I think we should at least have some indication whether the minister and her officials have considered what their attitude is going to be.

But what is even more important is the question of public service pension plans. For a number of years the province of Alberta has administered a civil service pension plan for the civil servants of Alberta, and I think the same situation exists in every other prov-

ince across Canada. Whether or not these plans can be reconciled is one thing, but just recently the province of Alberta has undertaken an extension of this type of administration to cover other public service pension schemes involving such people as municipal employees, hospital employees and a number of other categories, all falling within the ambit of what can be called public service. If there is no provision in the Canada pension plan for reconciling these public service pension plans so that the administration can be carried out by the same organization, and if the provinces are going to be required to continue to operate and administer pension plans covering quite a large number of people, when you take into account the civil servants and all other public service employees, then there is some opinion to the effect that, if they are going to have to be in the pension administration business, in any event they might as well set up their own plan and expand it to include all those people who would normally come under the Canada pension plan.

I do not think this is a problem that cannot be solved. I do not think it is an insurmountable difficulty; but in spite of the discourse of the minister this afternoon there has been complete silence up to this hour with regard to what the federal government and the Department of National Health and Welfare are willing to do to take into account these very serious matters. So I think that, without getting into the 125 sections of the bill, there should be some kind of explanation from the minister with regard to this matter.

There is another question I should like to ask the minister, since she is apparently so reluctant to tell us how many provinces have indicated they are willing to participate in the plan. Have some of the provinces asked for explanations along the lines I have been discussing but which have not been given by the minister? In other words, have queries come forward from the province of Ontario and the province of Alberta that have not been satisfactorily answered by the minister and her officials? Are the provinces asking questions that the minister and her officials are unable to answer? It seems to me one can reach no other conclusion but that the provinces are asking for explanations and details with regard to the application of this plan which the department is apparently not prepared to give, at least at this stage. I think we have reached the point in processing this bill through the House of Commons where we deserve to be given the answers now.

We are pleased to hear that the administration of the plan may not be as expensive as it might have been if it had involved the setting up of a completely new department of pensions. From the minister's statement today we understand that collections under the pension plan will probably be made through the Department of National Revenue and that payments or disbursements will probably be made through the Department of National Health and Welfare by utilizing the same channels now being used for the distribution of old age security cheques, family allowances, youth allowances and so on. It seems to me there is a great deal of machinery set up in both of these departments, on the one side for collections and on the other side for disbursements, that could be satisfactorily used at substantially less cost than would be involved in setting up a completely new and separate collection and payment agency.

I might also say we are very interested in the amount that it is anticipated will be built up in the fund, particularly in the first ten years of the plan. We would like to know what the anticipated amount of money will be that will be available to the provinces for investment and other purposes. We are told that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) and the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) will be making contributions to this debate later. Perhaps they intend to deal with this matter, as well as giving us an outline of the anticipated effect on the whole economy. I hope there will be considerably more explanation as to what is going to be done with this fund. There has been speculation in the newspapers from time to time by a variety of people that a fund of several billion dollars will be built up in the initial stages of the plan, but so far I do not believe we have had any straightforward statement by any minister in the government as to what the anticipated size of the fund will be and how much will be available to the various provinces for investment purposes.

Generally speaking we in this party are prepared to have the bill referred now to the special joint committee. We think that is the place where we can go into some of the additional details we have been requesting. Therefore we are satisfied to let the bill go now to the committee.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, we often have pieces of legislation which, though good in themselves, are somewhat less so in their application.

The people in charge have managed to come out with a rather thick volume for this

new Canada pension plan. I think the governments, be it the present one or its predecessors, would gain by calling upon popularizers of legal documents, that is, specialists who could write the legislation we have to pass in words everybody could understand. Do not forget that, when passed, the bill will have to be applied by employees of the Department of National Health and Welfare or the Department of National Revenue, who will not have the legal training required to interpret its provisions correctly, which will result in complications both for the staff of those departments and for the people who, some day, should benefit from the measure.

Therefore, what is missing—and I am speaking not only about the bill which is now before us, but about every bill which is passed by this house—is popularizers of texts who will offer to the understanding of all a simple and easily accessible draft which, subsequently, will not give rise to a misinterpretation of the law.

Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to speak at length on this bill because it is another federal act which will not affect Quebec. And it is not the first one either, because during this session we have passed many bills which will concern nine provinces, but not Quebec. We only have to look at legislation passed this year to see that this has happened in several other cases.

In most cases, the bills passed will not apply to the province of Quebec. For instance the legislation concerning student loans will not apply to the province of Quebec; the legislation concerning the Canada pension plan will apply in nine provinces, but not in the province of Quebec; the legislation concerning the $10 allowance to children 16 to 17 years of age applies to nine provinces but will not apply to the province of Quebec.

In the final analysis, during this session we will only have passed legislation concerning nine provinces, and I was forgetting the Crop Insurance Act which does not apply to the province of Quebec.

This will be a session where members of parliament representing ten provinces will have passed legislation applying to nine provinces only.

Therefore, why not sanction officially facts which are becoming increasingly numerous by radical changes in our constitution? That is a question which arises.

I think we are following the British mentality, that is we are proceeding by way of precedents. We are passing legislation which is not applicable to the province of Quebec,

[Mr. Grégoire.]

and by always proceeding by way of precedents and jurisprudence, we finally decide that it is best for everybody and the facts are sanctioned by precedents.

The facts are there. The Ottawa government legislates for nine provinces in some fields and it takes 20 years to set up a jurisprudence around these cases which are sanctioned at a given time. But the situation being as it is in the province of Quebec, it is impossible to wait 15 or 20 years, because the kettle is boiling over.

The present legislation, especially the measure introduced today, should serve as an example to hasten the sanction of facts, namely that the Ottawa parliament exists for nine provinces, but not for ours. Let the tenth province, Quebec, organize its own programs and act on its own. It is on that one condition that in many areas an understanding will be possible which will strengthen the structure of an altogether changed confederation.

Our intention is not to delay the debate, of course. This legislation does not apply to our province but as we want to co-operate with the other provinces, we intend to see to it that it is passed as soon as possible, since the other provinces want it. We do not want to stretch out such a debate. On the contrary, we want to prove that we are ready to co-operate with the other provinces in order to enable them to take advantage of this pension plan as soon as possible.

But one thing is certain; this pension plan constitutes a new tax for Canadians on whom the tax burden weighs so heavily already. It will be a tax which will serve to accumulate funds, and finally, when the time comes to receive a pension under this plan, it will be our children who will pay for the amounts we will receive in 25, 30 or 35 years.

However, there are two points I would like to deal with for a few minutes.

One of them, which may be of interest to the province of Quebec, is that there are at this time, pension plans in operation in various plants and industries. The contributions paid those trade unions by their members have to a great extent been transferred to international unions. The amounts thus contributed to international unions under those pension plans are now largely in the United States. Now—and this applies to contributions paid into international union funds with regard to pension plans in the province of Quebec as well as in the other provinces—is the federal government ready to take the means to bring home those funds and contributions which were paid into pension funds and are now in the United States?

I suggest that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) should take that into consideration and make sure that the amounts paid in the past will be added to those to be paid in the future, so that the worker who will retire in five or six years will benefit from what he has paid in the past, in short, that this will be added to the pension plan.

Then, the province of Quebec will probably be pleased to count on the co-operation of the federal government, since the latter can use its influence in this field to bring back to Canada the dues paid to unions now established outside this country.

Before ending my remarks, I have a word of advice for the members from the other nine provinces who want this pension plan to be adopted as quickly as possible. It has been suggested that this bill be referred to a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons. Well, the experience I acquired while sitting on two committees only leads me to tell you that referring something to a joint committee on which senators sit is practically a waste of time, a needless delay. Since senators are always on holiday, how can you expect them to undertake the study of that pension plan and finish their work before Christmas? That is why I advise you to refer it to a committee of the House of Commons. If some minor bills have been pending for six months in the other place because they have not found time yet to complete their study of them, how can they complete in time the study of a bill as important as the one now before us? You will give them heart trouble, or else make them sick with work, I am not sure which, for the study of this bill will just be too much for them.

So, if you want action, if you want things to get going or to keep going, let us amend the motion in such a way as to refer the bill to a committee of the house where work stands a chance of getting done more expeditiously.

A joint committee, in my opinion, is one where the work is done far too slowly, where ideas are put forward which are two centuries behind times, where there are representatives of finance companies and banks who are more concerned with their own interests or the interests of their firms than those of the people, for their own interests have priority over those of the nation. The bill would run the risk of being consigned to oblivion. So, here is a bit of advice: let us try to send this bill to a committee of the house.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I am happy to see that nine provinces in Canada will take advantage of a pension plan established according to their wishes, since they are on the way to centralization. On the other hand, we are glad to see that the province of Quebec will have its own plan, since it is its desire to administer its own scheme and that its pension plan meet its own aspirations and characteristics.

Let us keep on passing such pieces of legislation applying to nine provinces, with Quebec adopting its own legislation. But in return let us give to the province of Quebec the sources of revenue which are imperative; let us give back to Quebec the revenue from direct and indirect taxation, so that this province will not be a hindrance to the development of the nine other provinces and so that it might develop properly. When this is achieved, when the federal parliament will legislate for nine provinces and the Quebec parliament for the other, then we will all agree, there will be no more quarrels and we will no longer hear the fanatics which are heard now. And everybody will be happy in Canada.

I hope that this year a precedent will be repeated in the years to come and that before long—in the shortest possible delay—the constitution will be drastically changed so that two associate states will co-operate and show good will in a number of fields, while each goes its own way in others.

[*Text*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) stated this afternoon that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) and I were to back up the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh), but I would like to commence by stating that after the knowledge she displayed this afternoon my colleague needs no backing from either of us. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the hon. member for Perth who needs the backing of informed members of his party.

For one who claims paternity for the Canada pension plan and who has had in addition access to Bill No. C-75 for several months, to the white paper preceding Bill C-136 since August, and to the bill itself for six days, he displays—

Mr. Monteith: There are no actuarial figures at all.

Mr. Benson: —either a surprising lack of knowledge of the plan or else he can find little in it to criticize.

Mr. Monteith: It has taken you all dinner hour to figure out that one.

Mr. Benson: Indeed I am sure that the hon. member for Perth as a practising chartered accountant has previously had far less time to analyse far more complicated financial statements.

I would like to contrast his knowledge of the bill with that of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who also claims paternity of a sort.

Mr. Baldwin: Who is going to support the child?

Mr. Monteith: Judy.

Mr. Benson: Before proceeding I would like to make a few comments on a few of the questions that were raised by the hon. member for Perth, and first I would like to comment on his charge of government ineptitude in respect of this measure. In this connection I would point out that in my opinion ineptitude is far less of a crime than the inaction of the previous government on the matter of national contributory pensions.

Second, I would like to refer to his question of priorities concerning this legislation and a national health plan. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if he was suggesting that this legislation be held up pending the consideration of a national health plan. I hope that this is not the case for, if it is, we have further evidence that the official opposition intends to stifle this parliament and prevent the passage of legislation urgently desired by most Canadians.

The only other point to which I would like to direct attention is his comment on the varying estimates of the chief actuary, which were referred to by the minister. The hon. member for Perth, as a fellow chartered accountant, knows as well as I do that when one deals in the field of expected increases in the gross national product, population growth, wage rates, and changes in interest rates in the future, no precise figures can be quoted. Rather, one must make maximum and minimum estimates, especially when he tries to predict beyond a very short period of time; and this is exactly what the chief actuary has done.

The security provided by Bill C-136 is a basic level of protection, especially important to people of low and moderate incomes. It is sure protection, with 100 per cent portability, valid wherever they move, assured in real value if the cost of living rises, and automatically kept in step with improvements in earnings. This protection extends not only to one's own retirement but to one's wife and children if one should die, and to the contributor himself if he becomes disabled.

For many Canadians this will be an addition to provisions they are already making for their old age by individual savings or through company pension plans. If such a private plan is on a modest scale it will probably continue unchanged.

If the private pension plan is one providing pensions on a fairly high scale, people will not lose any contractual rights secured by their contributions to date, but they may expect some adjustments for the future. The contribution rate will probably be reduced, with a corresponding scale down of the benefits that would otherwise have been provided. The net result of the Canada pension plan, plus the old age security pension attached to the pension index, and the continuing private plan, will still represent a considerable gain in security both for older workers, who will be assured of larger retirement pensions in total, and for younger workers who can be confident that their pension contributions will protect them against changing economic circumstances in a way which has never before been possible.

If, on the other hand, a person is one of the majority of Canadians who do not have the benefit of a substantial pension plan, it is likely that the new plan will not only provide a basic level of security but will also encourage the spread of supplementary provision for retirement through additional private plans.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Bill C-136 is the most far reaching piece of social legislation which has been proposed in many years. It is legislation which will affect all of us, both now and in the future. When the ideas contained in this bill are incorporated into law and the Canada pension plan reaches maturity, all Canadians will have security in the knowledge that after a lifetime of work at least their minimum requirements for a decent living in their twilight years will be provided by the combined benefits of the Canada pension plan and the old age security pension.

It is not my intention to deal with the economic aspects of the Canada pension plan or, further with the question of integration with existing pension plans, as both these matters will be dealt with by the Minister of Finance. Suffice it to say that integration with private pension plans can and will be achieved, and indeed has been worked out for the largest single pension plan in the country, namely the federal government's civil service pension plan.

It is the unpleasant task of the Minister of National Revenue to collect the funds which

his colleagues require in order to carry out the objects of government. Thus, under the present bill it will be the responsibility of my department to see that all those who are required to contribute to the Canada pension plan do so, in order that the benefits referred to so glowingly by my colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, may be paid when the individual becomes entitled to them.

I think it might be useful if, after a brief reference to benefits provided by this bill, I were then to turn to the method of financing these benefits, the integration of the Canada pension plan with that of a province providing a parallel comprehensive pension plan, and the method provided for the handling of the funds which will accumulate in the early years of the Canada pension plan in excess of those required to pay benefits and cover administration costs.

There are three main differences in this bill with regard to benefits as compared with Bill No. C-75. These are the extension of widows' benefits, the introduction of orphans' benefits and the inclusion of disability and death benefits and the attachment of the present old age security pension, whether taken at age 65 or age 70, to the pension index which is in turn dependant on the cost of living index in Canada. I need not elaborate further on the first two of these changes, which were made possible by agreement with the provinces for a constitutional amendment. Indeed, they have been ably and fully described by the Minister of National Health and Welfare. However, I should like to say a few words about the third major change, which is that of attaching the old age security pension to the cost of living index because this in the long run will, I believe, prove most beneficial to all Canadians.

Some hon. members have made disparaging remarks concerning this move since this course was indicated during debate at the resolution stage of the bill—remarks which, I believe, were altogether unjustified and which took into consideration only one year, rather than accumulative effects over a longer period of time. I think the argument which has been put forward by various speakers including the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) this afternoon as to the adequacy of the basic $75 raises an altogether different consideration from the attaching of all benefits to a pension index. I believe one should not argue that because he has attached a cost of living index or a pension index based on the cost of living index to benefits presently paid, future parliaments or even this parliament may not see fit to adjust the base itself.

An hon. Member: Just before each election.

Mr. Benson: Yes, we might copy the Conservatives in that regard.

I have made some calculations which show that if we assume after the first two years a 2 per cent annual increase in salaries and wages as well as in the pension index, at the end of five years during which this legislation has been in effect a man earning $100 a month as of January 1, 1966 will be able to retire at the age of 65 with a combined pension of $68.45 or 64.5 per cent of his income at date of retirement. Similarly if he were to continue to work until retiring at the age of 70 he would receive a combined pension of $118.72, or 101.3 per cent of his wages at date of retirement. Of course if he were married the combination of his wife's old age security pension with his own combined pension at either date would cause his pension income to further exceed his own income at date of retirement. However, I do not believe it is fair to presume that a man can presently support himself and his wife on a total of $100 a month, and if he can I believe he has earned any bonus he may receive on retirement.

Let us now consider the case of a person who is earning $250 a month when the plan comes into force. On the same assumptions, such a man, if he attains the age of 65 years after the plan comes into force, may receive a pension of $88.33 or 33.3 per cent of his income at that age. If he were to continue to work until the age of 70 he would receive $162.35 representing 55.4 per cent of his income on retirement. In this case I think we might assume that the man in question is married to a wife of similar age and in these circumstances the combined pension would amount to $143.53 at age 65 or $251.98 at age 70. Based on the assumptions made, the pension would amount to 54.1 per cent of retirement wages at age 65 or 86 per cent of retirement wages at age 70. Of course, as incomes increase the percentage of total benefits to income on retirement decreases. This I believe is defensible on the grounds that persons with higher incomes are better able to provide something toward their retirement income through supplementary pension plans or accumulated savings.

Now I should like to say something about the financing of benefits to be received on retirement. The old age security pension will continue to be financed as at present by 3 per cent of the sales tax, 3 per cent of corporate income tax and 4 per cent of personal income tax to a maximum of $120 per annum. In the long run these contribution rates should be

adequate to provide for all benefits including attachment of the pension index to old age security benefits and the payment of reduced benefits at age 65.

Turning now to the Canada pension plan benefits, these are to be financed by employer and employee contributions of 1.8 per cent each as indicated in clauses 8 and 9 of Bill C-136. In the initial stages the first $600 of earnings will be exempt and the maximum contributory level will be $5,000 so, that the maximum possible contributions will be $79.20 each for employer and employee. It is, I believe, worth noting that an earnings index is provided in the bill itself so that both the exemption and maximum contributory earnings can be adjusted as the general wage level rises.

Contributions by self-employed persons are exactly equal to the combined contribution of employer and employee, with the difference that no contribution need be made unless earnings are $800 per annum or more.

I should point out that on an income of $5,000 the self-employed will contribute exactly the same amount as the combined contribution in the case of an employed person.

The responsibility for the collection of contributions to the Canada pension plan which, as I mentioned, is the responsibility of the Department of National Revenue, will be assigned to the taxation division where integration with present operations will provide maximum efficiency at a minimal cost. Divisions "C" and "D" of part I of Bill C-136 provide strict rules, rules which we believe are essential to assure that deductions from employees, employers' contributions and required payments by the self-employed are made in order that they may be credited to the person who will ultimately benefit.

One of the features of Bill C-136 is that it provides for a pension plan which will be uniform with respect to contributions and benefits across the whole of Canada. In order to accomplish this it will be necessary to have close co-operation with all provinces, especially a province which provides a parallel comprehensive pension plan. It is hoped this will be accomplished by first of all having essentially similar legislation, that is, legislation providing for the same benefits and obligations in respect of individuals who change their places of residence; second, by having a reasonable exchange of information concerning pensions and, next, by providing for agency arrangements under which one jurisdiction can make payments of benefits on behalf of both jurisdictions and be reimbursed for its share by the other party involved. A similar arrangement whereby a person need only apply to one or the other jurisdiction for refund of an overpayment of contributions is provided. Finally, Mr. Speaker, we must have a common set of rules concerning pension administration across the whole of Canada.

In order to achieve these ends it is assumed that Quebec, the only province which has indicated its intention to establish such a plan, will pass a bill similar in all essentials to Bill No. C-136 as finally enacted by this parliament. Clause 103 of Bill No. C-136 provides for the establishment of country-wide social insurance numbers; clause 108 of the bill provides for the exchange of information concerning contributions credited to individuals in the two jurisdictions; clauses 82(3) and 40(3) provide for the transfer of funds between the government of Canada and a province having a comprehensive pension plan; and clause 87 provides for the pension appeal board hearing, if the provincial law provides for it, appeals made under a provincial pension plan so that a common jurisprudence may be developed.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal with the handling of the excess funds which will accumulate in the early years of the Canada pension plan. Clauses 110 to 114 of Bill No. C-136 deal with the handling of moneys received under the Canada pension plan and briefly they provide as follows: First of all, all funds received will be credited to the Canada pension plan account, including contributions and interest on securities. Second, out of this account will be paid the benefits payable under the plan and the costs of administration of the plan, and no other payments. Third, where an excess of funds is available beyond estimated payments required in the following three months, such funds will be available for purchases of securities of participating provinces or of the federal government. The proportion available for investment in the securities of any particular province is the proportion that amounts received from contributors of that province for the previous period up to 120 months is to the total of contributions received. The balance of such amounts not required for investment in provincial securities is to be invested in government of Canada securities.

Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure liquidity the Minister of Finance is authorized by this bill, on advice of the chief actuary, to specify the term of any provincial securities. The rate of interest to be charged on such pro-

vincial securities is to be the rate on similar securities of the government of Canada, which of course will vary according to the term of the securities which are purchased.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister would allow a question?

Mr. Benson: I will be finished in just a moment, and then I will answer the question. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw hon. members' attention to clause 116 of Bill No. C-136, which requires a report by the chief actuary at least once every five years on the Canada pension plan account and a report whenever any bill is introduced into the House of Commons to amend this act as it is finally passed.

All hon. members know that this is legislation with far reaching effects. It is legislation which is needed in Canada in order to provide a sense of security for those of our citizens who are no longer able to work. It is, because of its very nature, complicated legislation and I urge its early approval in principle so that it may be referred to the special committee for more detailed examination.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, if the minister would permit this question: Just who does determine the amount that has to be transferred to the provinces?

Mr. Benson: This is clearly stated in the bill, and it is the Minister of Finance. And, Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of transfer to the provinces, as my hon. friend will find on a further perusal of the bill, but is a matter of investment of the excess funds beyond those required to make all payments and to cover administration for the ensuing three months.

Mr. Monteith: Then the Minister of Finance, I gather, is the one who determines the amount, without any checking or auditing by the provinces?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend knows better than this.

Mr. Monteith: Don't be disgusted; just answer the question.

Mr. Benson: The Minister of Finance has the right to determine the amount that is required to meet payments out of the pension fund and administration for the ensuing three months. These funds are then set aside. The excess funds beyond these are then available for investment in provincial securities or in securities of the government of Canada. The provinces will be entitled to have invested in their securities out of this amount of money an amount based on the proportion that their contributions during a previous period up to 120 months is to all contributions to the Canada pension plan fund. The Minister of Finance is required by the bill to inform the provinces what amount is available for investment in a particular province and the province may then bring forward the securities.

Mr. Monteith: So there will be nothing left for the federal government to invest in any way whatsoever and the province has the complete determination as to the type of investment in which these funds are placed?

Mr. Benson: The province always has the right of determination as to how it will invest, how it will spend money within its own jurisdiction. There will be some funds in excess of the funds invested in the province, in that we will have contributions from the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. However, the Minister of Finance will make the other funds available for investment by the provinces, and the province must decide how it is going to spend its money.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister would permit one question. Earlier in his remarks he made some reference to the relationship between the pension and the level of earnings of people who become 65 years of age five years after the plan comes into effect. I wonder if he could give us some similar examples for those people who are 65 years of age on the day the plan comes into effect.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, this is a question to which the hon. member obviously knows the answer.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Rhéaume: Do you?

Mr. Benson: If one is 65 years of age when this plan comes into effect and continues to work until age 70 and contribute to the Canada pension plan, he will of course be entitled to 50 per cent of benefits under the Canada pension plan. But if one is retired at age 65 and does not continue to work, or is retired at age 75 when the Canada pension plan comes into effect, he will of course only be entitled to his old age security pension of $75 per month plus any increases which may take place in this pension through either act of parliament or action resulting from the attachment of this pension to the pension index.

Mr. Rhéaume: He gets nothing, you mean.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Revenue, inasmuch as he referred to clause 116, whether the chief actuary will be required to prepare a report every time a private member introduces a public bill to amend this act.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I think the government would have to reserve the right to obtain second reading before the actuarial report is prepared. Indeed if a private member proposed a bill to amend the Canada pension plan it would take the actuary that amount of time between the introduction of the bill and second reading to prepare such a report.

Mr. Olson: May I point out that the section says the chief actuary shall, whenever any bill is introduced in or presented to the House of Commons to introduce this kind of measure, prepare this report. I suggest we will have to amend this act to take care of what the minister has suggested.

Mr. Benson: I think if it were amended with the effect of changing the contributions or benefits, it would be improper. It would certainly be improper for a private member to introduce such a bill. However, the question raised by my hon. friend is one which could very well be considered by the special committee when it considers the bill in detail.

Mr. D. R. Gundlock (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I had prepared a speech this afternoon which I felt was short and to the point, and of interest to the members of this house and to the public generally. However, after listening to the debate this afternoon, and particularly to the statement of the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) I feel that some rebuttal to various suggestions should come from this side of this chamber.

I listened with great interest to the speech made by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson), and for several reasons. I listened with interest because today is the first time I have heard him make a speech in this house, and because I have a great deal of respect for him. That hon. minister referred to the white paper, and I should also like to refer to that white paper in a later part of my speech. He also referred to the inaction of the previous government. Since listening to him I have decided that several facts should be brought to the attention of hon. members and the general public.

This parliament can take a great deal of pride in some of the actions which were taken by the previous government, and I intend to refer later to those actions in detail. Since 1957 old age pensions have been increased to the extent of some $29 per month. Admittedly $19 of that increase took place under the previous government, and one must remember that it took place during a period of six years.

[Mr. Olson.]

There has been a great deal said about relating old age assistance to the cost of living index. The Minister of National Health and Welfare during her remarks this afternoon dwelt on the provisions of the Canada pension plan as they relate to adjustments to the cost of living index. At the resolution stage of this legislation the minister announced that benefits to old age pensioners would be related to the cost of living index. She should be commended for her tenacity in bringing this bill before the house, because this is the third time we have commenced our consideration of a bill to establish a Canada pension plan. I commend the minister individually and not the government as a whole. She has shown unusual and sincere devotion to the work of her department, and I give her full credit in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will forgive me for straying for the moment from the bill now being considered, but having listened to one member of the government talk about the inaction of the former government, I feel some rebuttal is warranted.

As I understand the figures that have been given in relation to the increased benefits to old age pensioners, as a result of the adoption of this bill that increase will be between 75 cents and $1.50 per month. That is a shameful increase in relation to the $19 increase which took place during the six year period when the former government was in office. Originally I had not intended to refer to the six buck boys, but having listened to the Minister of National Revenue stoop to such low tactics as he did, I think the actions of this government to increase payments under the Old Age Assistance Act should be compared to actions taken by the previous Conservative government in this regard.

The members of the official opposition have been accused on many occasions of holding up the business of the house by filibustering.

Mr. Byrne: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gundlock: Mr. Speaker, I heard someone say "hear, hear". Perhaps that hon. member would stand in his place and be recognized.

Mr. Pascoe: It was the hon. member for Kootenay East.

Mr. Gundlock: We have been accused of filibustering and holding up the business of this parliament, but what have hon. members opposite done? They have been guilty of taking up the time of this house by making interjections of that kind. Perhaps by straying from the subject now under consideration

I am also taking up the time of this house, but having listened to the debate this afternoon I trust that Your Honour will be lenient and allow me to discuss some of the things which have been said.

I have on my desk several editorials to which I should like to refer during my speech this evening. As I have said, having witnessed a member of the cabinet stoop to very low tactics, I believe we in the opposition have the right to also use this kind of tactic to point out the inadequacies of this government in its actions to increase social assistance. In view of the unjust accusations which have been made by the Minister of National Revenue and a relatively small number of members sitting to my left today I think one should compare those accusations with the facts, keeping in mind always the bragging words of those members about the increased payments to old age pensioners included in this pension plan, and the relationship of those payments to the cost of living index. I will be through very shortly, Mr. Speaker. What did the former government do? How can you condemn the former government? You are bringing about an increase of 75 cents or maybe $1.50 a month when the former government brought about increases of $6 and $10, with an eventual increase amounting to $25 a month. I have great respect for the minister, Mr. Speaker. I am not referring to her. I am referring to the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) who attacked the former government and I am simply trying to point out the difference.

This brings up a point I want to raise in my speech and which is referred to in an editorial I wish to include in my speech. I hesitate to read it all but for the moment I will read part of it. It is from the Ottawa *Journal* of August 12 last and reads as follows:

> On April 1, 1963, Liberal leader Pearson promised that if his party elected a government it would act within "the 60 days of decision" to establish a contributory pension plan. On August 10, 1964, having been in office since April 22, 1963, the Pearson government produced a white paper on its pension plan.

I referred to that a moment ago and I also complimented the minister on her tenacity in bringing such a measure before the house for the third time. Frankly I think she is to be complimented but, Mr. Speaker, not the government.

> One positive statement in the white paper is that the plan will not be effective until January, 1966, at the earliest. Then the collection of contributions will begin. Pension benefits would start a year later but would not reach their full level until 1976. There is also in the white paper a warning to those who wait expectantly that the rate of contribution in certain categories will be higher than had been proposed earlier.
>
> There is not a word about the hopes on the pension raised and then cast down. There is no mention—

These are not my words.

> —of what the pugnacious Miss LaMarsh did in making Ontario co-operation in the plan more difficult because she dragged it into the provincial election last year.

All politicians would naturally do that. These are not my words.

> Costs of the plan, on which many questions have ben raised, will be examined in the course of the parliamentary committee study the government has promised.

If I may deviate for a moment, Mr. Speaker, there are two points I want to make. One of them I referred to a moment ago and it has to do with the old age pensioners and the Old Age Assistance Act. The minister has referred to the fact that in the bill before us their pensions are tied to the cost of living index, but because of certain interjections, particularly by the Minister of National Revenue who asked "what did the former government do", I want to repeat by way of emphasis what the former government did and what kind of comparison we have.

From reading the bill, news releases and the minister's speech at the resolution stage and from listening to the minister's speech today it is my understanding that if the cost of living rises to a certain point the pensions of these people will be increased by 75 cents a month or a maximum increase of $1.50 a month. I repeat again by way of emphasis that the former government increased these pensions much more than that, as a matter of fact up to $25 a month in stages. We only claim credit for part of the last $10 increase, but for all of the $19 before that. Compare that with what the six buck boys did prior to that time. These facts should be made known to the house and to the people of Canada so that they can make a comparison. What is $1.50 a month compared with $10 a month? That is the real point I want to make. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said this afternoon, these people might well be referred to as the forgotten group so far as the government is concerned. They brag about 75 cents or $1.50 a month ten years from now when we have already done ten times as much. I hear a member behind me say that we might change the "six buck boys" to the "six bit boys". Another member says "six bit gal", but actually I have great respect for the minister.

I want to refer to previous speakers, particularly the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) who has a lot to say for a few

moments when he speaks, but is never in the house either before or after. I noticed today and the other day on the resolution stage that the hon. member was not in his place until the time came for him to speak. I have referred to him on several occasions and I am glad to see he is here at the moment. Since he is here I should like to say that in listening to his speech on the resolution stage and earlier today on second reading I can only conclude that he has done nothing but read *Hansard*. In reading his speech in *Hansard* I saw that everything he said had been said previously on the resolution stage and could be found in *Hansard*.

Mr. Grégoire: You do not deserve any answer.

Mr. Gundlock: If you would like to answer I will give you time.

Mr. Grégoire: No, it is not necessary.

Mr. Gundlock: That is what I thought.

Mr. Grégoire: It is not necessary at all.

Mr. Webb: Send him down some peanuts.

Mr. Grégoire: We do not answer to nuts.

Mr. Gundlock: Well, I answer to nuts because some people listen to them and as I listened to your speech today—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order, I suggest the hon. member address the Chair.

Mr. Grégoire: He is not following the rules. He does not know the rules because he is never here. Anyway, you will be out of here next time.

Mr. Gundlock: As I was saying in this regard to the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) through you, Mr. Speaker, I should like to leave these few words with him. I listened to his speech very carefully—

Mr. Grégoire: You cannot do it; it is too difficult for you.

Mr. Gundlock: Mr. Speaker, at least I listened to his speech.

Mr. Grégoire: You listened, but you did not understand; that is the difference.

Mr. Gundlock: I hear some hon. members say I made a mistake in listening to his speech. Probably I did. If I may, I should like to continue with my speech. I should like to go back for a moment to what I call the fifth party.

[Mr. Gundlock.]

Mr. Grégoire: Dispense; it is not necessary.

Mr. Gundlock: The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) told us earlier, and I rather enjoyed this, that it was his unpleasant task to collect revenues from the various parties for the funds of this pension plan. Well, I should like to say that it is not nearly as unpleasant for him as it is for some of the rest of us who have to pay. I refer particularly to the self-employed people and to farmers. I simply wanted to ask a question of the minister, if I may. He explained part of it, but only part of it so far as I am concerned.

Now, the self-employed people pay 3.6 per cent, and employers and employees each pay 1.8 per cent, so that is about equal. The question I have in mind is this. What do self-employed people like farmers do during periods, perhaps short periods, when they employ someone on a part-time basis?

Miss LaMarsh: It was in my speech.

Mr. Gundlock: I am sorry, I could not hear that. I should like this question taken into consideration.

I see the hon. member is still in his seat, so—

Mr. Grégoire: You would prefer it if I were not here, but I am here.

Mr. Gundlock: I am very glad you are here.

I want to refer to an editorial in today's Montreal *Gazette* which carries the headline "The Exhausted Parliament". Some of us may be exhausted, and some of us may not. Some of us have been here and some of us have been here only on occasion. I should like to quote briefly from the editorial:

> This session of the House of Commons should prove in one respect at least to have value. For it has set the precedent of the sort of session that should never be allowed to happen again.

Mr. Grégoire: Whose fault is it?

Mr. Gundlock: I hear questions, Mr. Speaker, that are not addressed to you. I have been called to order and told that I should address you, Mr. Speaker. I should like you to ask any hon. member who has a question to address the Chair, otherwise I should be allowed to make my speech.

Mr. Grégoire: It is not important.

Mr. Gundlock: I think it is very important. As a matter of fact, if you do not want to address the Speaker, then I do not have to do so. If the Speaker is going to call me to order, then he should call you to order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order; the hon. member who is now making his speech has a right, under the rules of this house, to make his speech without being interrupted. I am sure the hon. member for Lapointe would want to accord the hon. member for Lethbridge the ordinary courtesies of the house. The hon. member for Lethbridge.

Mr. Gundlock: In deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing, if the hon. member for Lapointe wishes to ask me a question, to yield the floor to him. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, this is what I wanted to say. As I said earlier the members of the official opposition have been blamed particularly for taking the time of this house.

Mr. Grégoire: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gundlock: I pointed out to hon. members of this house, and I hope to the public of Canada, several reasons why I felt the official opposition was not responsible for taking all this time. I have repeated this statement on several occasions. I think the main reason this session has taken so long and has led to such editorial headlines as the one I have quoted, is the multiplicity of parties. The reference is to this exhausted parliament. I want to say that I do not feel exhausted and I do not feel the minister whose bill we are discussing feels exhausted. Some of the other members of this house may feel exhausted because they are not here. They must have something else to do; perhaps the work has been too much for them.

I wanted to say that the main reason for the length of the session is not the work of this house but results from the fact that there are five parties in the house.

Mr. Grégoire: May I ask a question?

Mr. Gundlock: Yes.

Mr. Grégoire: Does the hon. member not agree that when the Conservatives have disappeared after the next election it will be better in this house?

Mr. Gundlock: In answer to the hon. member I would agree that when this house returns to being a two party house we will have a much better house and much shorter sessions. We will get on with our business. I am not too sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservatives will disappear.

Mr. Grégoire: Yes, they will: You will disappear.

Mr. Gundlock: Perhaps I will, but not the Conservative party. In the light of what I have been reading in the newspapers, I say there will be other parties disappear but not the Conservative party.

Mr. Grégoire: We will be back, anyway.

Mr. Gundlock: You are talking again. You talk about maintaining the rules here, so let us see you do some of it.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that the reason this session is so long and so tedious—do not get the wrong impression, we are still here fighting—is the five parties. I refer particularly to the fifth party.

Mr. Grégoire: You are the fifth.

Mr. Gundlock: What do we see in connection with the fourth party? We see the leader of it operating under government controls. What do we see in connection with the next one?

Mr. Knowles: Order; what has this to do with the bill?

Mr. Gundlock: I hear someone say "what has this to do with the bill?" What do questions which are not addressed to you have to do with the bill, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Knowles: My question was addressed to you, Mr. Speaker. What does this have to do with the bill?

Mr. Gundlock: I am simply answering questions that were addressed to me by an hon. member of this house. Is that good enough?

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Gundlock: I should like, then, to refer to some statements made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Grégoire: You both have nothing to say.

Mr. Gundlock: Since you do so much talking why don't you pay your telephone bill?

Mr. Knowles: To whom was that remark addressed?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I would request members of the house to allow the hon. member for Lethbridge to continue, and I would request him to confine his remarks to the bill.

Mr. Gundlock: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier today I prepared a very mellow speech and I wanted a couple of questions answered.

Mr. Byrne: What speech?

Mr. Gundlock: I have not been able to get to it yet. I listened to the minister, to the

hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and to some interjections, and quite frankly I have not yet got to the notes of my speech.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre expressed a fear that this bill might be killed once it was referred to a committee. We in the opposition do not feel that way. We want it to go to a committee where many of our questions can be answered in detail. The hon. member also said the government should undertake more public relations with respect to the Canada pension plan, and I agree with him on that.

Further, the hon. member said he was a little worried about central control. I would point out that he belongs to a party that believed in central control. In fact it held power in one province for over 20 years, yet now he says he is afraid of central control. I too do not like the idea of central control very much and, as was pointed out by another hon. member on the resolution stage, I believe private enterprise could do a better job of accounting and controlling the fund that will be accumulated.

The thing which surprises me is that an hon. member will say one thing at one time and another at another time when it suits his purpose, particularly regarding the rules and regulations of the house.

Earlier I was quoting from an editorial and I shall continue:

> Costs of the plan, on which many questions have been raised, will be examined in the course of the parliamentary committee study the government has promised.

We in the official opposition endorse the idea of a committee study because we think that when things are ironed out in committee, third reading and final approval will be hastened.

The editorial added:

> If more problems become evident then the government, in the light of its record on pensions in the last year, may be counted on to postpone action again.

I sincerely hope there will not be any more postponement. The editorial continued:

> The faith of those who voted Liberal because they expected to retire in a few years with a good pension to which they had contributed is being sorely tried.

I shall not say anything further. I have listened to many interjections from the left hand corner, incidentally from a seat in which I used to sit myself.

Mr. Rhéaume: You were not as noisy, though.

[Mr. Gundlock.]

Mr. Gundlock: When I sat there I did not say a word.

Mr. Byrne: You haven't yet.

Mr. Gundlock: There are some members opposite who have not spoken yet. You know, Mr. Speaker, having listened to these interjections tonight I recall a speech made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays) in which he referred to the House of Commons as being more like a barn than a debating assembly. If I had the same gift of words as the Minister of Agriculture I might use different words.

Mr. Baldwin: That is not a gift, it is a curse.

Mr. Gundlock: Speaking on the resolution stage, as recorded at page 9915 of *Hansard* for November 9, the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. McCutcheon) said:

> I am also concerned about the very high cost of administration which this plan will necessitate. The career of every citizen from the age of 18 to the age of 70 will have to be followed in the minutest detail.

I agree with that statement, because we have had experience of this many times.

I refer in particular to the experience in this regard of various of the provinces including the provinces of Ontario and Alberta. The plans adopted in these provinces appeared at the outset to be very good. Those responsible were complimented as the government has been complimented today. But there is one fact, which I suggest must be taken seriously into consideration—a fact which justifies my saying a word of warning, or a word of caution. In the last few years, say, in the last 10 years, the cost of most of these schemes has doubled. This is a thought I should like to leave with the minister and with the house. If the plan now under consideration follows the same pattern, if the same trend as to cost is to become apparent, do we not need to look very closely indeed at the legislation we have before us? In these circumstances I am very happy that the government is allowing this measure to go to a committee where the whole matter may be considered in the light of experience with cooperative plans of this kind in the past.

Mr. Grégoire: May I ask the hon. member a question? My question is very simple indeed. What did he say, exactly?

Mr. Gundlock: The question is so simple that it will not take long to answer.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The time allotted to the hon. gentleman has expired.

Mr. Jean-Pierre Côté (Longueuil): The hon. member who has just resumed his seat mentioned several times in the course of his speech that there were a lot of interjections but I think, in all fairness, it should be pointed out that the interventions did not come from this side of the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, since the house did pass a resolution to appoint a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to consider Bill No. C-136, an act to establish a comprehensive program of old age pensions and supplementary benefits in Canada payable to and in respect of contributors, I think it would be pointless to discuss the bill in detail at this stage. I will therefore confine myself to the general principle.

Mr. Speaker, though it is rather difficult now to foresee the repercussions or the impact the operation of the Canadian or Quebec pension plans will have on the Canadian economy, I shall, during the few minutes at my disposal, try to list the advantages which it seems to have in the eyes of this private member, who would by no means pose as an expert.

The economic principle involved with respect to this pension plan is to divert capital that would be used mostly for consumer goods to investments or compulsory savings. Of course, the contributions paid by employees and employers to be entitled to the pension plan benefits would represent huge amounts that will be withdrawn from circulation, therefore, from direct consumption, and which will pile up in a fund.

It may be said that consumption means immediate satisfaction of certain needs, that is, a short term satisfaction: the amounts of money owned or earned are immediately put into circulation, giving the owner an immediate satisfaction.

Therefore, the portion of those revenues which will be transferred to this pension plan and this investment fund will, in the long run, satisfy the persons concerned. In other words, the percentage of the amount which will secure a revenue to the contributor at the age of 65 or 70, will be put back into circulation only when the individual shall attain pensionable age. The other portion of the paid amount will be affected to a capital fund which will increase from year to year.

Naturally, the benefits which the Canadian people may draw individually from this pension plan justify the sacrifices and inconveniences which may be caused over a period of 20 or 30 years when consumption will be affected by the transfer of funds for investment purposes.

The other portion of the revenue which will be used to accumulate funds for the provinces, will be put back into circulation, but to the general advantage of the Canadian people. Consequently, that will benefit each and every Canadian.

A new country like Canada must force itself to save in that way and everyone must do it willingly to ensure his own or his country's economic future.

It is said, with good reason, that the amounts that will accumulate in that pension fund will exceed $10 billion during the next ten years. Do Canadians realize the repercussions that the investment of such a huge amount of money can have on the Canadian economy? Of course, if the provinces use it for capital investments only, such as roads, schools, public utilities, it is obvious that it will not bring many changes in our struggle for our economic independence, except to prevent borrowing on foreign markets. As far as Quebec is concerned, in particular, that fund will exert an influence on the economic future of the province and the situation of the Quebec people with regard to foreign capital which swamps that province. It is sufficient to think of the General Finance Company and the forthcoming implementation of the steel complex to realize for what purpose the province will use these funds.

Didn't Premier Jean Lesage say:

> We have undertaken to free ourselves economically; this cannot be achieved if the people of Quebec have nothing to say about the way their savings are to be invested?

The French Canadians of the province of Quebec realize how important it is to use such permissible means as this one to take over control of their economy. It is probably an advantage for them to be grouped in one area for, if they really want to, they can succeed. This goal will be achieved as soon as they understand that it can be done, not by putting the blame on others, or isolating themselves from the rest of the world or by making speeches on the constitution, but rather by working, studying, saving and facing up to their responsibilities. This is how the Americans became rich, became masters of their economy.

The financial situation of the Canadians of the other provinces is not much better, since the Americans have almost $28 billion invested throughout the country.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the principle of trying to attract foreign capital in our country, because it is thanks to those investments that our country has developed so rapidly, but the desire to reach economic independence is normal for a country, and compulsory savings is the only means to achieve it.

Everyone knows that this objective cannot be reached by sudden changes in the established order of things; this should never be forgotten. It is imperative to apply immediately some measures on a long term basis, in order to regain control of our economy. Besides, the ideas of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) in this respect are very well known.

It is obvious that to set up this investment fund, Canadians will have to accept further sacrifices, because a pay as you go pension fund, as first suggested by the federal government, would have been less expensive for contributors.

Mr. Speaker, even if some people claim otherwise, I am positive that Canadians are willing to accept such sacrifices, if they can in this way regain control over part of their economy. And we should not be afraid to impose such a compulsory savings system. Those who contend that it is a hidden tax levied on the citizens are unworthy to represent the Canadian people, because they do not reflect their aspirations and their love for their country.

Let us follow the example of western Germany, which recovered after the war to become one of the most progressive and industrialized nations in Europe, only 20 years after it had been crushed in that war. How was this feat accomplished? By the sacrifices accepted by the people who entrusted the government with a large part of their revenues so that the state could invest it in profitable ventures for their benefit.

As for us, French Canadians of Quebec, the role of the government must be a positive and active one as far as the economic development of the province and the country is concerned.

It is, therefore, a good thing that the Canada pension plan was amended following fruitful negotiations between the provinces and the federal government, for it was important that the plan be the same all across Canada, whether it was administered by the provinces or the federal government. That is what we mean by co-operative federalism, by a central government which understands the provinces who also have to look after matters coming under their jurisdiction, and it is only through this kind of co-operation between the federal and provincial governments that Canada will be a country composed of 11 happy governments instead of one happy government and ten unhappy ones. Then you have a strong Canada, a united Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this new co-operation between the various provincial governments and the federal government is being used by some people as an excuse for the statement that we are legislating for only nine provinces out of ten.

On the contrary, we are legislating for the entire country but leaving the provinces free to adhere or not to certain measures that might be of provincial jurisdiction. Quebec can no more prevent nine provinces from benefiting from certain measures, through collective action if they so choose, than the nine other provinces can stop Quebec from pulling out of joint projects without giving up any tax benefits.

Remarkably enough, those who are finding fault with this type of legislation are the very ones who wanted the province of Quebec to be free to legislate in those fields, and were accusing the government of centralizing tendencies.

But now that we are getting away from centralization, the government is being accused of never legislating on behalf of the province of Quebec. According to others, the tax burden is falling solely on the small wage earner. But what about the employer who has to pay out as much as all his employees together, and for the sole security of those employees?

Mr. Speaker, it can fairly be said that without the leadership of the federal government in this field, there may never have been any pension plan in the province of Quebec and that without the steps taken by Quebec in that field, the rest of Canada may never have had the benefits of a consolidated fund.

Experts claim that the contributions paid into this fund will have no substantial effects on private economies and this contention is based on the experience gained through the first great social security plans introduced after 1940.

Judging from the experience of other countries where a pension plan has already been established, the white paper that was sub-

mitted to us as a basis for the pension plan gives a rather fair idea of the possible economic repercussions of implementing the pension plan. There does not seem to be any reference to accumulated funds, but rather to the possible effects on the economy of the country of the benefits eventually to be paid to the pensioners under the pension plan. But I sincerely believe that, in addition to providing security for the Canadian workers, the Canada pension plan, or the Quebec pension plan, can really become an instrument in the hands of the provinces attempting to secure their economic freedom.

I believe that the pension plan could be included in the legislation already in force within the framework of fiscal decentralization, such as:

1. The provinces' growing share of the personal income tax, which from 5 per cent in 1954 will reach 24 per cent in 1967; and the provinces' larger share of the estates tax, which has risen from 50 to 75 per cent.

2. The return to the provinces which so desire of the joint programs coming under provincial jurisdiction.

3. The pension plan may also follow the same principle, in the sense that it makes considerable amounts of money available to the provinces.

[*Text*]

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

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the house leader whether the business is unchanged for tomorrow.

Mr. McIlraith: There is no change, Mr. Speaker, and should by any chance this bill be finished before tomorrow night we would call perhaps some of the smaller bills on the order paper; item No. 7, a bill to amend the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act, item No. 58, measure to amend the Coal Production Assistance Act, and item No. 51, second reading of Bill No. C-137, to authorize certain capital expenditures of Canadian National Railways.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

THE SENATE—INQUIRY AS TO REFORM MEASURES PROPOSED

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) a question arising out of the wide and critical comment that has developed over his latest Senate appointment, and particularly as it reflected upon some of his previous appointments to the other place.

I asked the Prime Minister whether it was his intention to proceed with item No. 40 on the order paper, and whether that was the extent of the government's intention for reform of the other place. His reply was almost typically evasive, that the government in due course would go ahead with this piece of legislation.

One of my reasons for raising this question on the adjournment motion, not that it will do much good, is not only to point up the fact that my colleague from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has a bill on the order paper which would abolish the Senate, but also to underline the phonyness of this so-called new politics, about which the Prime Minister talks. This is the party that was coming in with new politics. Well, here is an example of it, Mr. Speaker.

I should just like to read from the Liberal party program for the general election of 1962. This statement is tucked away at page 22, about reform of the Senate. It says:

> A new Liberal government will discuss with the provinces a constitutional reform—

We are not quite sure what that means, but it has something to do with the Senate. The program then states:

> —and will propose, for example, that future Senators be appointed for 15 years or to the age of 75.

I point out that this bill on the order paper only affects senators at age 75. At least if we had this 15 year provision contained in this program we would not have this picture of a young lawyer from Toronto, Mr. Aird, at 41 years of age, with a promising career in front of him, at $15,000 a year until he reaches age 75. Rather, he would be disappearing from the picture at age 56. However, this is another example of the new politics.

One of the efforts often made by young Liberals—and I see one sitting over there from Hamilton East (Mr. Munro), who likes to take this stance of a radical, go ahead party—is to scorn our Conservative friends to my right, because of their reactionary approach to things. I point out to those individuals that here we have an example of our friends to the right of Mr. Speaker coming

forward with an even more drastic reform regarding the Senate.

What are we to take from this situation? Charles Lynch put it very amusingly last Friday in his column in the Ottawa *Citizen* in this way; under the heading "No rocking of the boat":

> A hard-working party bagman is rewarded.
>
> Party politics being what they are, somebody has to raise the funds. It's hard work, being a party bagman, and it's thankless work, in these days when there isn't much patronage to play with.
>
> A bagman's lot is not a happy one unless, as sometimes happens, he hits the jackpot in the form of an appointment to the Senate.
>
> Bagmen generally deal in boxcar figures, and so it is not inappropriate to mention what a Senate appointment means to them as a tangible reward for their services.
>
> The most recent appointee is 41 years of age. Should he live to 75, his total emolument at $15,000 a year would be $510,000—a lifetime income dwarfing such measly items as the cash award with the Nobel prize, or a win in the Irish sweepstakes, or a football pool in Britain.

I am not complaining from the point of view of some of my Liberal friends across the way, like the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Habel), who all of us hope before the sacred age of 75 rolls around will be called; but some of us feel that the other place should be reserved for people like Azellus Denis, and Yvon Dupuis, because that is the natural place for them. The last seven or eight appointments have been made along this line.

This new approach from the radicals, the reformers, over on the other side is just too much, Mr. Speaker, and I felt I had to draw the attention of the house even at ten o'clock to how inconsistent and how silly the Liberals' claim to be the reformers and the radicals is.

The real question is, when are they going to get rid of the Senate? I should have liked to have the time to go back and read a beautiful little speech made by the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill) in 1962. I would refer all my friends who would like to read something of charm about Senate reform to page 1153 of *Hansard* for the session of 1962, wherein he refers to Mackenzie King's stand on Senate reform and stands bravely forth as saying that aside from that one boner in 1925 the Liberal party has always played it nice and safe and cozy on Senate reform. They certainly have played it cozy without going so far as to say they are really going to reform the Senate. In 1962 they did suggest they were going to limit appointments to 15 years. I suggest that even if Mr. Aird or Mr. Lang or these other characters are wonderful party bagmen, they are a little too young to be given this fantastic emolument until the age of 75 and, of course, at the rate the Liberals move on some of these reforms we are not even sure they will get this reform setting an age limit of 75 through the house. My friend points out that even this reform does not apply to people who were appointed before the bill comes into effect.

Mr. Habel: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, you know it is against the rules.

Mr. Habel: I wish you would.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

Hon. J. Watson MacNaught (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely sure that the discussion of Senate reform is in order tonight because, as the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) said, there is an item on the order paper, order No. 40, which provides for a measure of Senate reform.

Mr. Knowles: I have one there too.

Mr. MacNaught: This measure will be brought on for debate as soon as possible after the legislation outlined by the Prime Minister has been dealt with by the house, and I am sure there will be ample opportunity then to discuss all aspects of Senate reform.

I also detected in the remarks of the hon. member for Port Arthur an inference that this party is only interested in appointing what he referred to as party bagmen. I want to point out to him that when I first entered the house back in 1945 a very learned legal light from Stanstead in the province of Quebec, Mr. John Hackett, was sitting on the opposite side of the house. He was appointed to the Senate by the former prime minister, Louis St. Laurent.

I also seem to recall that on another occasion Mr. St. Laurent offered a Senate appointment to Mr. M. J. Coldwell which he, for reasons best known to himself, refused. I do not believe that by any stretch of the imagination these two men could be called bagmen of the Liberal party.

Mr. Fisher: Look at the last eight.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 17, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

STANDING ORDERS

Fourth report of standing committee on standing orders—Mr. Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce).

UNITED NATIONS

PROVISION FOR PURCHASE OF CANADIAN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS BY CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT UNION

Mr. J. N. Ormiston (Melville) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-139, to provide adequate national agricultural credit to the food and agriculture organization (F.A.O. and the Canada pension plan).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Ormiston: The objectives of this bill are spelled out in considerable detail in the explanatory note, so in the interests of brevity and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from the first paragraph:

> This bill provides for a United Nations co-operative credit union whereby more than 100 nations may buy the food and agricultural products of Canada on term credit; and by so distributing these products, actively contribute toward an expanding world economy, vitally strengthen Canada's position in the food market of the world, and assure a rising standard of living for Canada's farmers, fishermen and forest workers; and, in so far as revolution marches on an empty stomach, contribute to world peace.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO INCREASED FOREIGN AID CONTRIBUTIONS

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. Is it the intention of the government to greatly extend and increase Canada's aid under the Colombo plan during the current fiscal year? If so, is the minister in a position to make the appropriate announcement prior to the discussion of his estimates?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I have already made the announcement, on November 14.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister care to tell the house about any increased contribution Canada is going to make by way of foreign aid, particularly through technical assistance programs of the United Nations, as has been announced in the press? Can the minister tell the house whether any steps have been taken by the various nations toward making up for the decision of the United States not to contribute to this program, with a view to seeing to it that the program is not curtailed as a result of the United States withdrawal, temporary though it may be?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There has been no action taken with regard to the last part of my hon. friend's question. The United States contribution represents about 40 per cent of the total program. The United States has not said it will not irrevocably meet its normal commitment. Yesterday we pledged our contribution totalling some $7,325,000 for 1965. This includes our contribution to the special fund in the amount of $5 million and our contribution to the expanded program for technical assistance which will be at the same level as in 1964, $2,325,000.

Mr. Douglas: Since at the moment the United States have not indicated their willingness to contribute, if the remaining nations were to double their contributions this would certainly make up the deficit, and it would not be a very large sum. Is the Canadian government giving any thought to doubling its contribution if the other nations participating are willing to do the same, so this program does not have to be drastically reduced?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I do not think Canada need be ashamed of the support it has given to this program. Canada, as a close and understanding friend of the United States, is aware of the contribution that country makes to the activities of the United Nations. I cannot believe that the

United States will not, in the light of developing situations, continue to be one of the mainstays of the organization.

Mr. Nesbitt: As a supplementary question, since the Secretary of State for External Affairs stated in reply to an earlier question of mine that he made an announcement concerning the increase in aid to the Colombo plan countries last Saturday, some place or other, I wonder if the minister could make the announcement in this house as to the extent of the increase in aid?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I did make an announcement in the house on November 14—

Mr. Monteith: We were not sitting on the 14th.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —November 14, 1963—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —when I outlined a three year program, including the provisions for 1963-64 and 1964-65. I also answered a number of questions along this line which were addressed to me by my hon. friend in the external affairs committee during this session of parliament.

Mr. Nesbitt: Now that the minister has specified what year he was referring to, is he in a position to give us some indication of the specific amount of the increase in aid to the Colombo plan countries? Can he do that?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has perhaps forgotten that on that date, November 14, 1963 I indicated that we were increasing our contribution by some $70 million in general terms. I went into considerable detail on this in the external affairs committee when my hon. friend was present, acting as a very distinguished and able vice chairman.

Mr. Nesbitt: I am sorry to belabour the point, but I have one further question. In view of the minister's circumlocution in this regard could he answer one question? Is an announcement to this effect going to be made to the United Nations within the next week?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend says "to the United Nations." The announcement is not made to the United Nations. This program for the developing countries is one provided under recommendations made by the government to this parliament, and has nothing to do with the United Nations as such. My hon. friend is probably confusing this with the question asked by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam which had to do with the technical assistance program of the United Nations, and the UN special fund.

CONGO—EFFORTS TO OBTAIN RELEASE OF CANADIAN HOSTAGES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

During the last few hours did he receive any communication from his representative in Africa, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson), who went out there to see if it would not be possible to obtain the release of the Canadian hostages held at Stanleyville?

We read all kinds of reports in newspapers, but we have had no official statement from the minister.

The house would like to know if the minister's ambassador was successful in obtaining the release of the Canadian hostages held in Stanleyville.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Red Deer is dealing with a critical and very important situation. He is doing his utmost, together with representatives of other countries. Unfortunately, the situation is so serious that we have not yet received any very favourable report.

But I may assure the hon. member that our friend is doing his best, and we acknowledge his efforts with pride and gratefulness.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN POSITION RESPECTING RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the coming apparent change of attitude of the United States toward China, particularly with reference to recognition of China, does the minister not think now is the time for Canada to take a lead by diplomatically recognizing China and thus put his words into action?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the validity of the premise involved in my hon. friend's question; therefore I could

not usefully answer the remaining part of the question.

Mr. Woolliams: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government prepared to recognize China?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): As I said last week, Mr. Speaker, I dealt with this matter rather fully on May 22, 1964.

Mr. Woolliams: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since May, 1964, have the circumstances changed? In view of the fact that China now has some knowledge and information about nuclear weapons, has the attitude of the minister or the government changed or remained static since May, 1964?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, these additional factors, to which my hon. friend directs our attention, naturally are playing a part in studies that are current.

TRADE

GATT—REQUEST FOR LIST OF CANADIAN GOODS TO BE CONSIDERED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the fact that yesterday at the conference in Geneva 17 nations submitted proposals for tariff reductions, when will the proposals that were submitted by Canada be made known to the members of this house?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the negotiations that began on November 17 by the tabling of offer lists and exceptions lists in Geneva are being carried on in secret, and I hope that until the negotiations are concluded members of this house do not hear about them.

Mr. Olson: How long will it be until some of the producers in this country know which products are being offered for tariff reductions?

Mr. Sharp: I would hesitate to give a forecast of the length of the negotiations. I think they will extend over a very considerable period, and an announcement will be made when agreement is reached.

Mr. Olson: Has the minister any reason to believe that these negotiations will succeed if there are no proposals respecting agricultural commodities, the inclusion of which is insisted upon by the United States and France?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, we would not be engaging in these negotiations if we did not think they will succeed. The only decision that has been made so far is that of November 16, the suggested reductions in tariffs on industrial products should be tabled by the various participating countries. The question of the reduction on agricultural products has not yet been decided in the sense of the method for negotiation or the tabling of lists, but it is the firm view of Canada and of the United States that these negotiations should cover the full range of the articles in which we are interested.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I do not wish to press the minister to give any information which might injure the negotiations which are going on, but since the European common market countries have already made it known that they have submitted lists of items with regard to which they are not prepared to agree to reductions, and these items constitute 16 per cent of the total, can the hon. gentleman tell us whether Canada has submitted a list of items with respect to which it is not prepared to permit reductions and, if so, what percentage of the total would be involved?

Mr. Sharp: As most hon. members know, the form of our participation in these negotiations is different from that of the United States and Europe. We have not agreed to the general formula of a 50 per cent across the board tariff cut; Canada will be making reductions of equivalent value in terms of access to other markets. The form of our list was therefore a positive one. It was not a negative list; it was a list of reductions we are prepared to contemplate on the assumption that the other countries are making a 50 per cent across the board cut without exception. This is one of the reasons it would be most disadvantageous to our bargaining position for any of the present lists to be published; they are merely the opening of negotiations and not necessarily the lists which would be effective when we reach the end of the bargaining.

Mr. Douglas: I appreciate that point, and ask the minister whether he could give the house some idea of the percentage of the total items which would be involved in the positive list which Canada has submitted in respect of which we would be prepared to consider making reductions for equivalent value.

Mr. Sharp: No, I am not in a position to do that, because we are not proposing an across the board cut of equal amount. The list we have submitted is not in that form at all. It is a positive list of reductions we are prepared to make in return for a 50 per cent cut in other countries' tariffs. To ask what proportion is covered is to ask a question which it is impossible to answer in a comparable form.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

S.I.U. CONTRIBUTIONS TO CAMPAIGN FUNDS OF CABINET MEMBERS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice.

In view of the position of the Minister of Justice and the rumours which were going round in Montreal over the week end, can he tell us whether he has been in touch with the election organization in his riding and his campaign manager to find out if he was among the Liberal members who allegedly received $1,000 from the S.I.U. and Hal Banks during the last election campaign?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, there is no need for me to make an investigation to give a negative answer.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

May I put the same question to the Minister of Industry and Minister of Defence Production? Has he been in touch with his campaign manager to find out if he received $1,000 either from the S.I.U. or Hal Banks?

[*Text*]

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will put that question on the order paper I will see that it is answered.

PENSIONS

CANADA PLAN—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC REPORT

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. Now that we have been supplied with an actuarial statement regarding the Canada pension plan I wonder whether the minister would supply the members of this house with a statement on the economic report in regard to the Canada pension plan.

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend might have made that suggestion during the course of the previous debate on the bill, not at this time. There has never been any suggestion that the economic report would now be brought forward. At present we are at the second reading stage of the bill, dealing with the matter of its principle. The actuarial report was brought forward in order to assist the individuals concerned. We already have had reference to an economic report and some of its findings in the white paper which has been out for some months now. Also, a number of economists are assisting my hon. friend, some of whom are in the other place and who are often in this chamber's gallery.

It seems to me quite reasonable, Mr. Speaker, since we are dealing with a bill at hand and not general matters, and considering that this afternoon there will be an opportunity to hear the Minister of Finance on this point, that all the information necessary will be available without further discussion of the economic report.

Mr. Winkler: A supplementary question to the minister. The minister herself has now suggested that such a report is in existence, and I believe her parliamentary secretary at one time stated that it was in existence and completed. Therefore, because of the broad ramifications of the matter and the broad interest as indicated by the minister, surely this is the proper stage to have this document, not later on.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question which I will address to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that after second reading the pension plan will be referred to a special committee, would the Prime Minister consider at the same time referring the economic report on the Canada pension plan to the economic council for their study?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the economic implications of the plan are referred to in the white paper which my hon. friend has no doubt studied and which the committee can also study. I understand that the Minister of Finance will be making a statement later in the debate, I hope this afternoon, on the economic implications of this plan.

Mr. Starr: I would again ask the Prime Minister whether he would consider referring this report to the economic council for their consideration and views.

Mr. Pearson: I do not think that course would serve any useful purpose at this stage, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Winkler: A further supplementary question to the minister. I should like to ask her how far she anticipates proceeding with the bill as it is presently before us before prorogation.

Miss LaMarsh: Well, Mr. Speaker, we are of course in the hands of the house now. Presupposing—as I hope will be the fact—that approval in principle is given by this house, we will then be in the hands of the committee and it will be up to them how quickly they deal with it. We will give them all the information they need, as we have indeed given it in this bill. There was more supplementary information given both to this house and to the public about this plan than about any other piece of legislation in history. It is only unfortunate that some of my hon. friends opposite do not read it.

Hon. George C. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance which the minister has attached to this bill, is it not all the more important that we be given a copy of the economic report? And is there any reason in the world why we, as the House of Commons, should not receive that economic report before this matter is referred to the committee?

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

MANITOBA—SUGGESTED UPWARD REVISION OF MAIL CONTRACTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Nicholas Mandziuk (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Postmaster General. It is prompted by the fact that an additional gasoline tax has been imposed in the province of Manitoba, thus imposing great hardship on mail contractors using trucks. Has the minister given instructions for an upward revision of these mail contracts to take care of the gasoline tax increase in the province of Manitoba?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I hardly think that the effect of the taxes of the different provinces on postal contracts is a question for the orders of the day.

Mr. Mandziuk: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Postmaster General is quite prepared to answer and could have answered the question. If I put it on the order paper it will bog down.

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I suggest that the hon. member do put it on the order paper.

PUBLIC WORKS

QUEBEC—INQUIRY AS TO RIVER DREDGING

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. Could he tell me if his department intends to proceed this year with the deepening of both the Mille Iles and Back rivers?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker—

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely there is no great urgency that would require a reply at this time on orders of the day. Would the hon. member put his question on the order paper.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pigeon: But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that I had given notice of my question to the minister and he is willing to reply.

[*Text*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR EQUALIZATION OF WELFARE PAYMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. In view of the fact that there is a great disparity between the welfare payments made by the various provinces and the welfare payments made by the Indian affairs branch, will the minister undertake to guarantee that the Indian affairs branch welfare payments will be raised to a level equal to those paid by the provinces, in order that by means of higher welfare payments the provincial governments will not entice native Indians to come under provincial plans when they may not desire to do so?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is surely a very good question for the order paper.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

REMOVAL FROM CITIZENSHIP COURTS OF PORTRAITS OF QUEEN

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Will he now table in the house the instructions issued under his authority to the citizenship courts to remove portraits of Her Majesty the Queen, and at the same time will he give the house an explanation of his unprecedented and unwarranted action?

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the right hon. Leader of the Opposition had the courage to make charges against the government about this yesterday, at a press conference, I do not feel it would be proper for me to reply in his absence, and I would very much like him to be in his seat when I do give him my answer.

[*Text*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION OF DEPARTMENTAL ESTIMATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, in order to see whether the government's courage is on the same level as that expressed by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, would the President of the Privy Council as house leader tell us whether we can have the estimates of the Department of External Affairs on Thursday, in order to dispel the web of obfuscation so ably woven by the Secretary of State for External Affairs with regard to Canada's position concerning a number of aspects of international relations?

An hon. Member: Come on. Where is the courage?

Mr. Woolliams: Where is the courage on Banks, too?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it is usual to announce the business at the conclusion of the day's sitting, and I will be glad to announce Thursday's business tonight.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that the time is fast approaching when the United Nations will be meeting officially, could the minister advise the house whether he expects his estimates will be studied before that meeting, so the official delegates and parliamentary observers from Canada will learn the opinions of the house, prior to the meeting of the United Nations, on some of the important matters which undoubtedly will have to be discussed there?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I shall have to speak to the house leader about this.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question of the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as house leader. Will arrangements be made for the estimates of the Department of External Affairs to be brought before the house prior to the meeting of the United Nations, so the opinions of the house can be conveyed to the official delegates and the parliamentary observers on the important matters that are bound to come before the United Nations?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I shall note what the hon. member has stated. A decision as to the business of the house will be made by the usual methods, which may involve consultation with the various party house leaders. I hope to make an announcement at ten o'clock.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

FLIN FLON, MAN.—ATTEMPT TO BLOW UP FEDERAL BUILDING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Postmaster General. Has the minister anything to report or can he say what action is being taken in relation to a serious attempt which I understand was made yesterday to damage or destroy the federal building in Flin Flon, Manitoba, by the placing of some 14 to 16 sticks of powder with fuse attached in the mail depository box?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the incident was brought to my attention within a very short time after it occurred, and it is under active investigation by the police and the other authorities.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT OF APPEAL BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Has he or has the government given any further consideration to the suggestion I made on July 17, which he said might involve government policy, that an independent appeal board similar to the courtmartial appeal boards in the armed forces should be set up for the hearing of cases such as the one in Montreal that is under the minister's consideration at the moment?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Surely this is a question for the order paper. There is no pressing urgency.

Mr. Nielsen: May I respectfully submit that the urgency lies in the treatment of the human, individual and private rights of members of the R.C.M.P. I suggest that any matter involving treatment of an individual, whether he is a member of the R.C.M.P. or otherwise, is surely a matter for urgent consideration. I think the minister has given consideration to such a procedure, and I am simply asking him whether any progress has been made in setting up such a board, which I feel to be an urgent matter.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I believe we have had this subject before the chamber on several occasions in the last two weeks, so there is not that degree of urgency that the hon. member alleges. Furthermore, the minister has said that he has the matter under observation and consideration and will in due course make a statement. For all these reasons and many more may I suggest this is a question for the order paper.

Mr. Nielsen: I serve notice that I wish to debate the matter at ten o'clock.

FINANCE

BANK OF CANADA HOLDINGS OF BONDS TO BE REDEEMED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Bert Leboe (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. It has to do with the offer of $475 million in government bonds designed to redeem some $645 million in bonds falling due December 1 and December 15. Can the minister say whether the Bank of Canada holds any of the bonds to be redeemed and, if so, how many?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in the first place the bonds to be redeemed on the 1st and 15th of December total $465 million, not some $645 million. I will be glad to look into the matter and advise my hon. friend tomorrow.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES—PROPOSED TIE TO COST OF LIVING INDEX

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister?

Since we are now considering a national pension plan related to the cost of living, would the Prime Minister tell us whether the government intends to introduce soon an amendment to the Family Allowances Act so that they might also be increased according to the cost of living index? Will such an amendment be introduced in 1964?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): This is a matter of financial policy which cannot be answered on orders of the day.

AIR CANADA

INQUIRY AS TO SERVICE FROM HALIFAX TO BERMUDA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Is the minister now in a position to inform the house whether negotiations have been completed for the establishment of an Air Canada service from Halifax to Bermuda?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Obviously at this time of the year this is a very important and even necessary question, but it is a question for the order paper.

Mr. Regan: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. This matter is of very great importance from the point of view of trade and has been under consideration for some period of time, I understand.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Regan: I will raise the matter at ten o'clock.

Inquiries of the Ministry

WATER RESOURCES

ELLIOT LAKE, ONT.—REPORTED RADIOACTIVE POLLUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I have a question for the Prime Minister. Does he intend to make a statement on water pollution by the uranium mining interests?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I have already been in communication with hon. members who asked this question yesterday to explain that while I have the information, I got the last report just before I came into the house. I should like to study it and make a statement tomorrow.

LAKE HURON—ACTION RESPECTING PREDICTED DROP IN WATER LEVEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. John Loney (Bruce): My question is directed to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. Is the minister aware of the recent statement by the United States engineers predicting a further drop of two feet in the water level of lake Huron? If so what action, if any, is the minister's department taking?

Mr. Speaker: If I am not mistaken this question was asked either this week or last week. While it is a very serious question, nevertheless it certainly is a question for the order paper.

FRASER RIVER—REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT ON TRIFURCATION PLAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Public Works when we can expect an announcement regarding the Fraser river trifurcation plan, which has been under study by his department for some time.

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I think the appropriate time would be when the study of my estimates is resumed, which I hope will be very soon.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

POINT EDWARD NAVAL BASE—ALTERNATIVE EMPLOYMENT FOR WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Associate Minister of National Defence. Will the minister report to the house any progress in the alternative work program that was established to help replace men in work who were laid off at the Point Edward naval base?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, there is not very much I can add to what I have already said. The *Swansea* was supposed to have been completed; then I understand two auxiliary vessels were to be refurbished between now and the beginning of March.

Mr. MacInnis: The minister says he cannot add anything to what he has already said. He has already said nothing. I would like to know what are his intentions with regard to the older workers, especially those over 60 years of age, whose employment has been terminated and for whom nothing has been done.

Mr. Cardin: The department has done everything it possibly can to replace the people laid off at the Point Edward naval base and other bases coming under the department. There has been a considerable amount of success in doing this, and our efforts are not completed.

Mr. MacInnis: As a further supplementary question, the minister has indicated that there has been a considerable amount of success. Would the minister name one man or rather one position that has been filled by somebody laid off at that base?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

APPLICATION OF WINTER BONUS TO SUMMER COTTAGE CONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour, even though he is absent.

Can the minister tell us whether it is a fact that the $500 bonus for winter housing can also be applied to summer cottages, as mentioned in some newspaper advertisements at present?

[*Text*]

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I shall bring this question to the attention of the minister.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Mr. Churchill: I have a question for the Minister of National Defence—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the fact that the Minister of Labour has just resumed his seat it would perhaps be normal to allow the hon. member for Chapleau (Mr. Laprise) to ask his question anew?

[*Text*]

Mr. Churchill: May I proceed, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think it would be in order for this question to be put again. I did not get the gist of it myself and perhaps the hon. member who was listening did not, either.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, my question concerns the Minister of Labour.

Could the minister tell us whether it is true that the $500 bonus granted for winter housing construction is also applicable to summer cottages, as mentioned lately in certain newspaper advertisements?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: This is a question for the order paper, surely. The hon. member for Mégantic.

Mr. Churchill: May I proceed with my question now after all these interruptions from the floor?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Mégantic.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Those advertisements which are published in the newspapers at the present time can lead to confusion and I think it is important that we get an immediate answer in this regard.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps it is my fault, perhaps it is not. In any event, let us solve the difficulty by calling upon the hon. member for Mégantic and then the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Mr. Churchill: I respectfully raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was recognized and started to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence. I was interrupted by a point of order raised by the hon. member for Villeneuve—I am sorry, the hon. member for Lapointe. Surely, I should have the opportunity of asking my question now.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I have assumed full and adequate responsibility for the mistake, so I still intend to recognize the hon. member for Mégantic.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—CANADIAN POSITION RESPECTING MULTILATERAL FORCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Since this is NATO week in Paris, and in the light of reports last night to the effect that President de Gaulle of France had taken a special stand on nuclear forces while Prime Minister Wilson was taking an opposite stand, what is Canada's position?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is a question which is far too wide in scope for an hon. member to expect to receive an answer at this time.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

IRISH REGIMENT—INQUIRY AS TO REPRESENTATIONS FROM TORONTO MEMBERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence with regard to the removal of the Irish regiment from the order of battle. What representations to retain that regiment on the order of battle have been made to the minister by members of parliament from Toronto?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): There have been a number of representations, Mr. Speaker. Practically all the Liberal members from Toronto have spoken to me about the Irish regiment, and their pride in this great regiment is understandable. I have, of course, taken their representations under advisement. I regret as much as anyone else that this great regiment, along with some others, must be placed on the supplementary order of battle.

EDUCATION

STUDENT LOANS—INQUIRY AS TO OTTAWA CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Battle River-Camrose): I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the minister has stated that the student loans measure is being administered successfully, would he care to comment on the ramifications of the federal-provincial student loans conference which took place yesterday in the west block?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): There has been a meeting—not the one to which my hon. friend refers—over the last two or three days, of all the provincial authorities who have been administering this bill with the federal officials. I hope to have a full report on it before the week is over, at which time I will make a full report to the house.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance supplementary to the one asked by the hon. member for Battle River-Camrose in regard to the student loan fund. Can the minister say whether the confusion in the administration of this fund that has existed in southern Ontario, particularly in the city of Toronto, is the fault of the administrator, who I believe was previously his executive assistant?

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, in the first place I do not accept the premise to the question, and in the second place the suggestion is completely wrong. As my hon. friend should know, the administration of these loans is the responsibility of the provincial governments and—

Mr. Winkler: Who is the administrator?

Mr. Pearson: The Conservative government in Queen's Park.

Mr. Gordon: I do not want to mention names, except to suggest that the one my hon. friend was alluding to was not among them to the best of my knowledge.

AGRICULTURE

OTTAWA VALLEY—EMERGENCY LEGISLATION RESPECTING DROUGHT CONDITIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. J. Greene (Renfrew South): In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture I shall direct my question to his parliamentary secretary. In view of the very grievous and pressing drought condition that exists in the Ottawa valley, I wonder if the Department of Agriculture contemplates any emergency legislation to cover the hardship which is being suffered by the farmers of Renfrew county.

Mr. Speaker: This is a very important question, we all admit, but it is not the type of question which should be asked, it seems to me, on orders of the day.

[Mr. Smallwood.]

Mr. Greene: With respect, Mr. Speaker, this question is current and it is causing hardship at the moment. I give notice that I am going to debate it at ten o'clock.

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Battle River-Camrose): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Prime Minister if he would look into the situation in the Renfrew area where cattle are suffering from drought and farmers are being forced to sell them. Could he make a report today?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I looked into it and I think the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Agriculture has a statement to make on it.

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the government, of course, is always interested in the hardships imposed by virtue of drought and other conditions. On July 20 the government authorized the Minister of Agriculture to enter into agreements with the provinces whereby the federal government would share with the provinces the cost of the moving of fodder and the moving of cattle to market. On August 14 this agreement was entered into with the province of Ontario, and on October 26 with the government of Quebec.

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): As a supplementary question, when the parliamentary secretary is dealing with this question later in the day would he also deal with the drought of income that farmers in eastern Canada are experiencing?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, on November 9, I directed a question to the Prime Minister respecting the disaster situation involving feeder cattle in western Canada. In view of the situation now existing in eastern Canada could the Prime Minister tell us whether the government is going to bring forward legislation to try to cope with this situation that faces the farmers of the country?

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, the government's legislative intentions will be made known in due course.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Nasserden: I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. Would he bear in mind that "in due course" might be too late for those suffering this disaster?

Mr. Pickersgill: That was too late even for an interjection.

TRADE

CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN GERMAN TRANSPORT EXHIBITION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Can the minister indicate to the house whether Canada will have an exhibit at the world transport exhibition to be held in Germany next year?

Mr. Speaker: Surely this is a question for the order paper. There is not that pressing urgency in connection with this matter.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, my reason for asking this question is that I understand the time for applications is about due to expire. The suggestion has been made that Canada would be represented at this exhibition, which encompasses all phases of transportation.

LABOUR RELATIONS

WINNIPEG—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN LABOUR DISPUTE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry. Is he in a position to make any reply to the question I asked him yesterday regarding the dispute between Canadian Aviation Electronics in Winnipeg and the U.A.W.?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I have made some inquiries in Ottawa and elsewhere, and I am glad to report that a meeting has been arranged on Thursday next between the management and the union concerned with a view to resolving this dispute.

BROADCASTING

SUGGESTED INCREASE IN NIGHT TIME POWER OF RADIO STATIONS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Transport.

In view of the fact that we are being invaded by American broadcasting, especially at night, a fact which imposes restrictions on Canadian stations, does the government intend to ask the board of broadcast governors to review some Canadian licences so that Canadian stations may have the same broadcasting power, not only during the day but also in the evening?

[*Text*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Sir, I would like to think about that question before answering it.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

REPORTED STATEMENT BY QUEBEC PREMIER ON PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Could he tell the house whether the federal government intends to accede to the request of the premier of the province of Quebec who has advocated, in Toronto, a special regime for Quebec and a larger degree of autonomy for the provinces in general?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No such request has been made.

PENSIONS

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTRIBUTORY PROGRAM

The house resumed, from Monday, November 16, consideration of the motion of Miss LaMarsh for the second reading of Bill No. C-136, to establish a comprehensive program of old age pensions and supplementary benefits in Canada payable to and in respect of contributors.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): There are many matters which could be discussed on the second reading of this bill, but what we are really deciding now on second reading are not questions of detail. In normal circumstances we would be deciding whether or not to accept the principle or principles of the bill.

In this particular case we are presented with an unusual situation. After second reading the measure before us is to be referred to a special committee of this house and of the Senate where the whole subject of the pension plan is to be considered not only in detail but in principle. This committee, when

it starts its work, will have unusually broad powers if we accept the statements of the Prime Minister in this regard, and the indications given in the correspondence which has been filed.

Earlier this year I requested certain information in motion No. 101, and this information was filed in sessional paper No. 202G of May 8, 1964. It consisted of letters and telegrams sent by the Prime Minister, as well as statements made by him, outlining the duties of the committee it was intended to set up. I should like to mention two of these documents in particular because they give a clear indication of the government's intentions with regard to the work of the committee. The first is a letter sent from Ottawa and dated March 4, 1964. It is addressed to a Mr. Higgins whose address is given. In the course of this letter the Prime Minister makes the following statement:

> The committee will have full power to hear the advice of interested organizations and to make any recommendations, of principle as well as of detail, concerning a pension plan—including, indeed, the recommendation if it so wishes that the plan as proposed should be fundamentally revised.

There was a second letter, also from Ottawa, dated February 22, 1964 and sent to a Mr. Mitchell, and I should like to quote from this as well. Incidentally, both these letters are signed by the Prime Minister. It says:

> The committee will have full power to hear the advice of interested organizations and to make any recommendations, of principle as well as of detail, concerning a pension plan—including, indeed, the recommendation if it so wished that the plan as proposed should be fundamentally revised.

There are a number of other letters to the same effect, but I think the idea is clearly expressed in those two quotations; that this bill, when it goes to the committee, will be examined not only in detail but fundamentally. It seems to me therefore that all we have to decide in this house at the present time is whether or not a pension plan is desirable. While we may discuss many other things on second reading, the extremely broad powers given to the committee leave us with this single question to be decided. The effective date, the amount of contributions and payments, whether this is to be a pay as you go or a funded plan, the question of who would be included or excluded, are all, I believe, still subject to revision at the hands of the special committee.

With this in mind I should like to proceed to deal with another topic, one which concerns the time element the committee will

have to face. We now have before us a bill of 125 clauses as compared to the 88 clauses of the previous bill. It is admittedly a complex measure whose effects will reach far into the future. The bill itself was only made public in its revised form a very few days ago. There are many organizations, both public and private, which wish to study the legislation in its new form and appear before the committee for the purpose of making recommendations.

I can hardly believe that the committee will be able to complete its hearings by the end of the present session or in the four or five weeks which are left ahead of us. If it tries to do so it will be doing an inefficient and incomplete job. I believe many of the organizations to which I have referred would require many weeks to examine the bill, discuss its implications and prepare briefs for presentation to the committee. It seems to me that the government has allowed itself to get into a time problem, but this should not be permitted to derogate from the importance of the bill itself. I hope, therefore, that the government does not expect the committee to rush the bill through in the course of the current session.

Arrangements will have to be made, I think, in one of two ways. Either there should be provision for the committee to carry on its work during the next session or, alternatively, the government should arrange for the bill to be renewed at the beginning of the next session. Members of the committee could proceed now to hold preliminary discussions and hear explanations by departmental officials until the end of the current session. Then by agreement the bill could be renewed at the beginning of next session when the same committee could be set up to carry on the work which had been interrupted. I do not think we should ask or expect the special committee to finish its work during the present session.

I should like now to discuss a technical problem in connection with the special committee. We have set up a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons, and I think there will be no great difficulty with respect to the members of this house who have been chosen. The bill will have had its second reading in this house and will have been referred to the committee.

But I should like to ask this question. What is the position of the members of that committee who come from the Senate? They will be considering a bill which will not even have been introduced into the other place, let

alone given approval in principle. The procedure now being followed assumes that the Senate will give second reading to the bill, and I think that is assuming a great deal. What will be the position of a senator who sits on this committee and takes part in a complete revision and overhaul of the bill before us as a result of which a report is made to the House of Commons? Where will he stand when the bill comes up in the Senate? Where will the Senate itself stand if a majority of its members does not agree with the work done by the committee of which representatives from the other place formed a part? They will have considered the form, the effect and the detail of the bill before ever having discussed or passed upon the principle.

There is a more practical aspect involved. To whom will the joint committee report? I assume it will report to the House of Commons, after which I suppose the measure will be considered in committee by the whole house and read the third time. But the committee could not send its first report to the other place because, first of all, the senators do not have the bill before them and in the second place they will not be set up for the purpose of reporting. I ask, if questions are raised in the other place on second reading, does the bill go back to the joint committee again?

These are not just rhetorical questions, Mr. Speaker, or raising difficulties; I see this as a real difficulty with regard to the procedure that has been adopted. No matter how you go about it there is this assumption that the other place is going to go along with whatever the House of Commons does and whatever its committee recommends. I assume that the gentlemen in the other place will have something to say about this, but I believe it should be said here also; because there is a serious problem involved in the assumption that the Senate will be automatic in their concurrence in the principle of this bill. We certainly know there are gentlemen in the other place who have very serious doubts about the whole question of priorities, as have some hon. members in this house, and we will not have had the opportunity of testing that opinion in the other place before we go into the special committee.

There is another matter, Mr. Speaker, that has already been raised briefly. It is also a technical problem and relates to the provisions for amendment of the act. I refer to the provision that requires two thirds of the provinces having two thirds of the population to be consulted and approve of any change in the bill. This bill is a simple enactment of the parliament of Canada. It requires no approval by any of the provinces because by an amendment to the British North America Act they have given this parliament power to legislate on questions of pensions, survivor benefits and disability allowances. Therefore it requires no consent for its passage; it requires no consent for its repeal.

I think it is a well understood principle that no parliament can bind a future parliament in this way. I suggest that if the government wants to make it binding on future parliaments that the provinces must be consulted and must agree to amendments to this bill, that would have to be done by way of approval of an agreement between the federal government and the provincial governments. By this means an agreement would be ratified which would become binding on future parliaments and would be effective in the event that this is a desirable provision. But as it now stands I think the inclusion of this particular provision is worthless and empty, because I see no reason why next year or in any future session of parliament this particular section of the bill could not be repealed and there would be no need to consult any of the provinces to so repeal it. I believe it is merely a unilateral declaration of intention and nothing else.

But, Mr. Speaker, going beyond the mere form of the amending principle, we have to ask whether such a restriction is desirable; that is, that the parliament of Canada would be unable, if it so desired, to amend an act of parliament which had not had the approval of another legislative body. I presume that the objective is portability; that this is written into the bill in order that there may be some evenness in pension legislation across the country so that before the federal parliament makes amending provisions the provinces shall have been consulted and shall have agreed. If that is the intention I do not believe that result is achieved, because the section only affects those provinces which will be in the plan and specifically, as I understand it now in any case, it will not include the province of Quebec. So if the desire is to deal with the question of portability, surely we cannot accomplish it by merely requiring the consent of two thirds of the provinces having two thirds of the population. Since Quebec is not in the plan it would not have to be consulted, and the whole question of portability across the country would be thrown out of gear very simply.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if it is portability that is desired by this clause, it cannot be achieved in this manner. If it is a case of the contributions being agreed to by the provinces, I cannot see that having the agreement of two thirds of the provinces with two thirds of the population will achieve this result either; you are still going to have a number of the provinces which presumably do not agree but are going to be forced into this position. Therefore it is not going to be a general agreement across the country at all; it is merely going to be a majority decision. For this reason I cannot, personally, see that the effect has been legally achieved in the bill that we have before us; and second, even if it could be, I doubt whether it is a desirable provision and whether it will achieve the result that the draftsmen of the bill have suggested. I think it fails on all these grounds. While that is not a good reason for rejecting the bill, I think it is a question which deserves very serious consideration in the committee.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there are many questions which have to be asked about the effect and detail of this bill. We do not have, for example, the economic report which has been requested concerning the effect of the bill. The fact that the minister is keeping this report for the committee strengthens my belief and contention that the committee has basic powers of amendment or rejection in principle; because if the committee is to consider the economic effect of this pension plan on the country as a whole, surely the committee is considering the principle of the bill and the question of whether a pension plan of the magnitude that is now proposed is really desirable.

I think a large number of things have been done backwards in this bill. I think the committee will have trouble with it, and that there will be technical difficulties as between the Senate and House of Commons members of the committee. I think it is not in accordance with the basic fundamentals of the scheme that the economic effect of the pension plan should be studied by the committee. Surely this should normally be done on second reading, when we are discussing the principle of the bill.

Therefore I take the view, as do I think all my colleagues, that on second reading we are falling short of what should be decided in consideration of a public bill. Rather we are deciding, as in the case of private bills which come before the house, the mere question whether or not this is a bill which ought to be given consideration. On that ground alone there could be no objection to this course. If any limitations were imposed on the committee I think we would have the right to insist on more complete discussion on second reading; but with the complete freedom of the committee to consider the whole problem, including the economic effects of the bill, I believe that most of these questions can be left until the bill has gone to the committee.

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, we have before us one of the major pieces of social legislation in Canada's history. It is a pleasure and a privilege for me, as I am sure it is for other hon. members, to be in a position to support it wholeheartedly.

The objective of the Canada pension plan can be stated quite simply. It will provide the community with a means by which the people who are working can assist, or support, those who are no longer able to do so. The Canada pension plan will assure those who are unable to work, the aged and the disabled, that they can live in decency and dignity.

A secondary result of the Canada pension plan will be the accumulation of funds for many years at least, which will be available for pressing social capital needs. Everyone recognizes the urgency of making available more technical and vocational schools, more hospitals, greater urban redevelopment schemes, expanded street and highway systems, and more university buildings. All these are the responsibility of provincial and municipal governments, and these governments will be greatly assisted by the accumulation of capital which will become available as a by-product of this social security scheme.

The Canada pension plan is a logical culmination of one of the major social trends evident in any industrialized society. This is the trend toward the maintenance of separate family units for each generation in the family. In rural societies, in more traditional societies, older people or those who for some reason or other are unable to work are cared for by the immediate family, usually in the home of that family. But as the community becomes more industrialized and the family becomes less of an economic unit, we have seen a trend away from this kind of social organization. It is true that many older people remain with their families or are assisted by them; but I think it is fair to say that most older people now come to be supported by other means. One of these is charity; another

takes the form of social aid provided by the state, including, in Canada, the old age security scheme; and still another is the provision of retirement benefits by pension or annuity plans.

But this mixed approach has not been adequate; indeed it has become increasingly unacceptable to the Canadian community. Even now only about 30 per cent of the labour force is covered by private pension plans, and some of these plans provide very small pensions indeed. Social aid is an important adjunct of these plans but the community has never really been satisfied that this is the appropriate form of assistance for people who are no longer able to work. The same is true of charitable support.

Consequently there has developed over the years a growing insistence that a comprehensive public pension plan be developed to meet the basic retirement needs of all Canadians. In 1927 the Canadian government began paying old age pensions on the basis of need, and in 1952 it established the old age security scheme for all people over 70 and began to contribute toward the support of people between the ages of 65 and 70 who were in need.

The Canada pension plan is the logical next step in the provision of a national pension plan. It will provide Canadians with an adequate retirement pension, not one which will finance a high standard of living but a reasonably adequate one. It will remain for the private pension plans to supplement the basic pensions paid through the Canada pension plan; their contribution will be to bring the standard of living of retired people up to the level they want, or have been able to provide through their other savings.

Now I shall say only a brief word about the secondary result which the Canada pension plan will achieve. Everyone recognizes the urgency of Canada's social capital needs, and I think there is a general consensus—I hope there is—that there should be a greater flow of capital in the direction of education, transportation, health and urban development. There is no suggestion that the plan should be fully funded, but in a pension plan which has reasonable contribution rates and which has a transitional period during which pension benefits are built up to their ultimate level there will be some accumulation of capital funds. These funds will be made available to the governments which are responsible for financing the various pressing social capital needs to which I have referred.

Hon. members on both sides of the house look forward, I am sure, to the introduction of this truly national pension plan. It will be a tribute to federal-provincial co-operation and a manifestation of national unity. In fact the plan in its present form was agreed to with the interests of national unity uppermost in mind. Canadians or their survivors in all provinces will receive exactly the same benefits on retirement or disability. They will be able to move from one province to another with complete freedom; in other words, there will be the kind of portability that my hon. friend was questioning just a few minutes ago. This in itself is an important and necessary factor in the preservation of our national unity.

There are, of course, opponents of the Canada pension plan. They have attacked it on a number of grounds. One of these is that it will discourage thrift, that everyone should provide their own pensions through their own savings. The point which these opponents miss, it seems to me, is that everyone will be doing this under the Canada pension plan in considerable measure, only they will not be doing it through private channels. Each generation while working will be contributing to the pensions of retired people, and in return the next generation will contribute to their pensions when they retire. This is simply a different method, and it seems to me a very sensible one, for an individual to provide for his retirement.

What these opponents of this plan really mean, I think, is that they would like to see these pensions provided not by governments but through privately controlled financial institutions. The truth is, however, that private pension plans cannot do what public plans can do, provide for the kind of intergeneration transfers which I have mentioned. Moreover, a large percentage of Canadians have been unable or have felt unable to provide adequately for their retirement through private plans.

But the main criticism advanced against the Canada pension plan, and the one I should like to discuss for a few minutes, is that Canada cannot afford it. I have often wondered what these critics mean when they say we cannot afford this plan. I am sure they cannot be suggesting that the younger generation should not be asked to contribute toward the retirement of older people, that the younger people cannot afford to do this, on the understanding, of course, that succeeding generations will contribute to their retirement. For it is surely possible, given the

standard of living that most working Canadians enjoy, for a working man to contribute for this purpose $1.80 a month for each $100 he earns over the basic $50 exemption, subject of course to the built-in maximum.

I suggest it is rather more likely that the critics do not really mean that we cannot afford the plan; rather they are predicting that its consequences would be to weaken the economy and to make all Canadians poorer.

An hon. Member: Is there a difference?

Mr. Gordon: If my hon. friend will wait a moment I will carry on and perhaps I will convince him, but I know his point of view and I am not so sure of that. For our part, we believe that Canadians can afford the plan if they want to, and we believe that the great majority of Canadians do want to. It is of course a question of personal priorities. In the opinion of members on this side of the house provision for our older generation is entitled to a high priority.

Let me describe the essence of the plan in economic terms. I think this can best be done by speaking of it as it will be when the benefits come to equal the contributions. This is the position we likely will be in some 20 years from now. The figures I will be using will refer to the estimated aggregate effect of the Canada pension plan as it would operate in nine provinces, plus the Quebec plan which will be virtually identical to the Canada plan.

When benefits come to equal contributions, income will simply be transferred from the active members of the labour force to those who are retired, as far as employee contributions are concerned. This transfer should lead to an increase in consumer demand since retired people need to spend and do spend an even larger proportion of their pensions than working people do of their wages. To the extent that this happens we will have provided the kind of floor to consumer expenditures which is desirable in a growing economy.

The consequence of higher levels of consumer expenditures is, of course, a relative reduction in personal savings. This is true to the extent that the active working people reduce their savings as a result of having made pension plan contributions. The effect of this must not be exaggerated, however. Total individual contributions in 1966 will be about one eighth of personal savings, that is, about 12½ per cent. It would be surprising indeed if personal savings were to be reduced by as much as 5 per cent of what they would have been were the Canada pension plan not in effect.

In the long run, that is, after the initial adjustments, it is highly unlikely that the rate of personal saving will be reduced at all. Certainly this has not been the case in other countries which have introduced social security schemes. In Canada the rate of personal saving has remained roughly unchanged despite the introduction of old age pensions, family allowances and other social security measures.

As for the consequences of the employer contributions, the adjustments required of the business community are not as great as some people have suggested. Business costs will, of course, increase. But the increase will not be substantial. Indeed I would guess that it will not amount to more than 1 per cent of payrolls. I point out that the contribution rate of 1.8 per cent does not apply to incomes below $600 or to those above $5,000. The effective average rate will be about 1 per cent. When you compare this one time 1 per cent increase in business payrolls—I repeat this is only a one time 1 per cent increase—with the repeated average annual increases in wages amounting to 3 or 4 per cent of payroll, which we have seen in recent years, you can only conclude that this will be a relatively minor adjustment. Moreover, increases in productivity normally enable business to absorb the higher costs without raising prices.

I freely acknowledge, however, that the pension plan contributions must in the short run be absorbed either by a reduction in profits or by price increases or by the negotiation of smaller wage increases than would otherwise have been granted. But again I must emphasize the magnitudes involved. The whole of the employers' contributions will not exceed 4 per cent of estimated profits after taxes and I simply do not believe that all of these contributions will be absorbed through reductions in profits.

Some businesses will pass on this cost. Where they did so through higher prices, total real consumption would rise at a slower rate, thus offsetting in part the increase in consumer demand brought about by higher pensions. The same effect would be felt if, instead of price increases, wage increases were restrained. But let me remind hon. members again of the magnitudes involved. The whole of employer contributions to the Canada pension plan, including the Quebec plan, will likely be only about one half of 1 per cent of the gross national product in 1966.

This leads me to say a word about our international competitive position. The government is very much aware of the role that the improvement in our international position has played in our present expansion. We have done this in part through maintaining relative price and cost stability while the price levels of our overseas competitors have been rising. In these circumstances our export and import competing industries will surely be in a position to absorb the minor increases in costs which I have just outlined.

So far I have been talking largely about the economic effects of the Canada pension plan when the benefits come to equal contributions, that is to say, the long term effect. The difference between this and the short run can be simply stated. Instead of the whole of the contributions being transferred to retired people, part of them will remain in the Canada pension fund, a large part in the early years of the plan. The economic question here is what happens to these funds.

The transfer in 1966 of some $550 million to $600 million, including Quebec, from individuals and businesses to public pension funds would, on the face of it, seem to have deflationary consequences. However, one must trace through all of the economic results in order to perceive the true effect of the transfer. For the apparent deflationary consequences will be offset by three factors: the reduction in government revenues that flows from deducting pension contributions from taxable income, the extent to which private savings have simply been transferred into public hands, and the effect that increased availability of loan capital may have on provincial and municipal capital spending. I should like to elaborate on each of these factors.

First, it must be recognized that the $550 million to $600 million that will be paid into public pension funds in 1966 is not the true measure of the extent to which private purchasing power will have been reduced. One must deduct from this figure the reduction in taxes that would otherwise have been payable by the individuals and businesses concerned. It is estimated that in 1966 individuals and businesses will reduce their tax payments to the federal and provincial governments by approximately $100 million as a result of charging their pension contributions against their taxable income.

Second, it must be recognized that a part of the public pension funds will represent simply a transfer of private savings to public savings. Put another way, we can expect that in the short run there will be a slight reduction in the private savings in favour of the savings which will flow into public pension funds.

It is clearly impossible, as I said earlier, to estimate the magnitude of this effect on private savings, but to the extent that private savings are replaced by public savings the deflationary effect of the introduction of the public pension plans will be reduced.

The third factor to which I earlier referred is the possibility, perhaps I should say the probability, that provincial and municipal governments would increase capital spending as a result of the availability of more loan capital. The need for schools, urban development and redevelopment, highways and streets and other important categories of expenditure, is so great that this result is entirely possible. Indeed it has been represented to us, and to previous governments, that provinces and municipalities have been hampered in undertaking social capital projects by a shortage of loan capital. If in fact these governments do respond to the availability of capital in the pension funds by increasing their capital expenditures, then there will be a smaller adjustment for the economy to make than would otherwise have been anticipated.

There is another point that should be mentioned, and that is the effect the plan may have on the level of interest rates. To the extent that private savings are not reduced by the full extent of the new public savings, or to put this another way, to the extent that aggregate savings increase, one would reasonably anticipate a reduction in interest rates. This would tend to result in higher public and private investment, the magnitude of which is impossible to predict. This would be a further offset to the deflationary effect of the accumulation of the funds.

It will be apparent to hon. members from this analysis that any deflationary effect of the Canada pension plan in its present form will be far less than might appear at first glance. In contrast, the deflationary effects of a fully funded plan, as originally advocated by some people, would have been very serious indeed. If I have the time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a further word at the conclusion of these remarks about the kind of results that might have flowed from this fully funded plan.

Inevitably there will be social and economic changes resulting from the introduction of the Canada pension plan. But these must be considered in the perspective of a rapidly expanding economy. It will be the respon-

sibility of government to ensure that the rate of growth of the Canadian economy is not interrupted.

I should like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that our thinking has been based on two major premises. The first is that concern for older people is a valid and a high priority. The second is that an economy which is growing rapidly, as ours is and has the capacity to do, can easily make the adjustments that are required in order to give effect to this concern. The evidence supports this view. It cannot be said that the Canada pension plan will seriously impair the capability of businesses to generate new funds for expansion, or distort the structure of costs and prices, or impair the country's international competitive standing. Nor is there any evidence that social insurance programs of this nature inevitably cause a slowdown in economic growth. We are fortunate that the Canadian economy, and the Canadian people are capable of paying adequate pensions to older people. This is a noble endeavour in which all of us should be pleased to participate.

If I have a moment or two longer, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a further word about the original proposal of a fully funded plan. A fully funded plan would, of course, be one in which the initial contribution rate would be good for all time. I have indicated why such complete funding would not be good economics in a nation-wide plan. The partially funded plan that is proposed is, I believe, quite reasonable. It has, of course, the implications which the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) pointed out yesterday. Since we do not have complete funding, the time will come when the contribution rate may have to be raised. When that time will be, no one who understands the uncertainties of these matters will claim to be able to predict exactly. What we can say is that, at the contribution rate proposed, this plan will continue to generate funds—the income from contributions and interest on investments will exceed the outgo in contributions—for at least 20 years. That is true on even the most conservative of the chief actuary's estimates. All of those estimates are designed to avoid the danger of underestimating the cost of the plan. It is quite possible, even within the fairly conservative range of estimates, that the fund will go on growing into the 1990's. In other words, it will be fully a generation hence, perhaps more than that, before our successors have to decide to what extent they want to continue partial funding of the plan. Obviously they will make that decision according to economic circumstances which none of us can now claim to predict. The one thing we can say is that, even at that point, the change in contribution rate that may be made 20, 25 or 30 years from now is not likely to be a big increase. That, again, is true even on the conservative projections of the cost. If those projections should turn out to be right, the rate might go up by a quarter or a third. That is to say, it would still be under 2½ per cent each for the employee and the employer. That would remain a modest price to pay for the benefits in security and social insurance which this plan provides.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): I would like to ask the minister a question, though perhaps I should know the answer. I presume that the contributions by employers under this plan are proper deductions as an expense to their businesses?

Mr. Gordon: They are certainly perfectly legitimate and proper deductions for tax purposes.

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I am always interested in the statements and observations of my friend, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon). I always find myself in hearty agreement with all his objectives, but am always saddened by the fact that when the issue is joined the minister has an attack of caution and moves back and largely counteracts the benefits he has been foreseeing.

I felt that very much in his presentation this afternoon. He appeared to be spending a great deal of time reassuring the house that this pension plan is not going to have very much effect, is not going to disturb the economy in any way, is not going to move society in any particular earth-shaking manner, and that it will provide—I do not think even he was prepared to say comfortable pensions for the aged—reasonable pensions for the aged.

I have for long been of the opinion that any legislation that is produced that has an economic content should be considered at least high on a level of priorities with the development of a more egalitarian society. I think most of us agree with that today. At least we pay lip service to it. It seems to me this pension plan is a case in point, and that the government is missing a bet in its very careful and cautious approach to the possibilities of this plan.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion that this plan is, or should be, very

closely linked with three other pieces of projected legislation the government is presenting to parliament. It seems to me that it is, or should be, concerned with the very problems we have been wrestling with in our banking and commerce committee of late when dealing with the minister's bill with regard to insurance and trust companies.

Here we are dealing with legislation that is designed in some way to offset some of the more socially objectionable features of our present private insurance industry. We are going to great lengths and taking a great deal of time in developing very complicated formulae in order to deal with the private handling of public savings in Canada because that, after all, is what the insurance industry is all about. It is the private handling of public savings.

The bill before us now deals in a very modest way with the public handling of public savings, and I was puzzled a few minutes ago to notice that the minister made a distinction between the funds that flow into private pension plans, or the private insurance industry, and those that will flow into the pension fund authority, a distinction he described as private savings and public savings.

I would suggest this is a really bad—not merely a semantic error—serious misreading of economic facts. I suggest that actually we are dealing in both cases with public savings that in one case fall into irresponsible private hands not responsible to parliament or to the public and which, in the other case, fall into public hands which are controllable by the people's representatives and are responsible to the parliament of the country.

I feel this bill is also, or should be, connected with the legislation regarding the designated areas, this government's attempt—a very praiseworthy attempt—to try and decentralize some of the economic concentrations that have taken place in Canada; its attempt to develop the areas that have been falling behind, and to do so it has adopted legislation which encourages—using both the carrot and stick formula—private enterprise to enter into these areas of the country that have not proven profit making in the past. It has in the case of the maritimes made available a sizeable sum of money from the public treasury to stimulate private development in that area, a measure I heartily support. This also is again dealing with the question of the savings of the Canadian people, how we are going to use them and who is going to have control over their use.

Then there is another projected piece of legislation which, as I said earlier in the session, I almost hesitate to mention. I see the minister has guessed which one—the moribund Canadian development corporation that apparently has been put into the morgue, or somewhere, to preserve it for the time being.

Mr. Fisher: It is left in "Troubled Canada."

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Yes, that is right, it is left there. R.I.P.

I suggest that had the government presented some comprehensive legislation dealing with all of these various aspects of handling the savings of the Canadian people we might be moving more rapidly towards the development of what I have suggested earlier should be our goal in a country such as Canada, a more egalitarian society.

I have been contrasting this plan presented to us—and I must admit presented by the minister in a way which will assuage all the fears and anxieties of those who fear any incursions into the preserves of the acquisitive society of today—with some other plans, in particular the Swedish plan. One of the most striking contrasts is that in the first place the Swedes consider the principle of extracting the money from those who can best afford it is a good one to follow, and in Sweden all contributions are paid by the employers. The employers pay the employees' contributions, and in 1960 this amounted to 1.9 per cent of the earned income of an employee. This year it has risen to 4.5 per cent and it is anticipated that legislation will be introduced shortly which will finally set the limits of these contributions up to a probable limit of 10 per cent.

By the end of this year the fund in Sweden will have grown to the level of some 7,500 million krona, which is about $18 million and, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from a report by Mr. Ernst Michanek, who is under secretary of state for the minister for social affairs, labour and housing in Sweden. It is a report issued this year and in it Mr. Michanek says this:

> The fund will continue to grow during the initial two or three decades of its operation, but the pace of this growth will gradually decline as the number of pensioners and the amounts of benefits increase.
>
> The decision to build up a huge fund was prompted by the need for making up for the decrease in private savings and private pension funds which was an anticipated effect of the adoption of the new pension system.

The investment of this fund is, to my mind, a very interesting factor to be considered too.

Canada Pension Plan

A maximum of one half the total of premiums received by the pensions found in any calendar year will be made available for loans—amortizable in ten years—to those having paid premiums, if their premiums amount to certain minima. The remaining revenue (premiums and yield) not required for the payment of benefits will be invested in public and private bonds.

Not long ago an article appeared in the London *Economist* dealing with the Swedish fund in which it stated that at present, already far sooner than the Swedes expected, this fund now has in its control some 45 per cent of all the investment capital of Sweden. As a consequence, the Swedish authorities have been able to organize the economy in a much more direct way than was possible at an earlier stage. This is where the present government is exhibiting the usual Liberal party hesitancy, the usual combination of lofty aims and pedestrian methods which always results in those lofty aims not being reached; their wagons are not hitched to stars, or even to treetops and consequently they usually remain on the ground. The minister himself has observed this on a number of occasions.

I believe this plan should have had two, or perhaps three objectives. As an old man myself I can agree with the minister that I am interested in the care of the aged. But as an ancestor I am interested in the sort of Canada in which my numerous descendants will live. I would not say I am more interested, but I am at least equally interested in the latter aspect of our affairs. Here we have a golden opportunity to begin that direction of the economy to which the present government has paid lip service ever since it came into office. Members will recall the establishment of the economic council of Canada which was to play an important part in directing the economy of this country. Silence has been the only answer from that council to date; we have been told it has been too busy setting its house in order to undertake any housekeeping. Always this government has fallen short of placing in its own hands the power to take any decisive step toward the economic direction of the country. Here in this pension plan there was an opportunity to provide the government with funds which could have been channelled into the Canadian development corporation, if it is not completely dead —funds which could have been used to carry out some of the aims which the minister has attempted to achieve on three or four occasions. One of these I mentioned earlier—the attempt to deal with the problem raised by foreign ownership. Here was another opportunity missed by the minister and by this government to take some real, decisive action in order to regain some control over our own economy. Here was an opportunity to pool the savings of the Canadian people in very large measure in public hands and, having done so, to devise a weapon by which this increasing and continuing expansion of foreign ownership might have been reversed.

There is another purpose which I think the plan should have had in mind. I have been thinking of it constantly while we have been struggling ineffectually with this ineffectual piece of legislation designed to overcome some of the dangers which arise when privately owned financial institutions control the savings of the Canadian people. It does seem to me that this pension plan should have been the first step toward a public insurance scheme for Canada which would in the end remove most of the care for this type of savings from private to public hands. But the government has been careful in this regard to assure those who have made a handsome profit out of caring for the savings of the Canadian people that they will be allowed to continue to control the vast bulk of those savings.

There is another aspect of the present plan which I find disturbing, namely the provision whereby the provinces of Canada are to have complete access to all the funds which will be accumulated. The minister has mentioned certain areas in which he thinks the savings of the Canadian people should be channelled and no one will quarrel with him about the fields of investment he mentioned. Certainly, they should be channelled into the building of schools, hospitals, and roads—I think those were the undertakings coming within the jurisdiction of provincial legislatures which he mentioned—and certainly the provinces should have access to a proportion of the funds which will be accumulated under this plan. However, I suggest that the development of our economy and the direction in which this development takes place are of equal importance. I believe we shall have to do very much more with regard to the encouragement of development in those areas of Canada which have been lagging behind the more prosperous sectors. I think anyone who has observed the direction of economic development in Canada—and it does not differ to any degree from the trend in other industrialized countries—must have been disturbed by the manner in which greater and greater concentration of industrial potential and financial strength has been flowing into a few restricted areas, leaving a large part of the country to wither, as it were, on the vine.

It is true that the government has been making some praiseworthy, even if ineffectual, attempts to cope with this situation and reverse the trend through legislation designed to benefit designated areas, and through financial aid to the Atlantic provinces. It does seem to me that here is an opportunity to do something decisive in this regard. This will not be an inexpensive project; we shall not do it on the basis of a handout of $100 million to the Atlantic provinces to last them for an indefinite period. We shall require a continuing flow of public investment into these areas. I do not think any of us have any illusions that we can coax private enterprise into unprofitable areas successfully. Some industries will come, of course, as long as there are benefits to be derived from public contributions in the form of exemption from taxation, depreciation allowances, and so on. But in the end we shall have to wrench our economy away from these areas of concentration into these poorly developed areas, and this will take a very large part of the savings of the Canadian people.

The bill before us does not propose to do anything very much in this direction. In the first place, it does not propose to take any sizeable part of the savings of the Canadian people. The minister himself has been at pains to suggest it will not do so. I maintain the plan should have aimed to do just that. It should have aimed to control the majority of the savings of the Canadian people.

Moreover, and I think this is another of the failures of this legislation, we have apparently abandoned the idea of placing the burden of this scheme on the shoulders of those who have the best ability to pay. We are limiting it to $5,000. I see no reason why income above $5,000 should not be taxed for this purpose. I see no reason why we should ask those in the lower income brackets to help finance the old age of those in their own income brackets. This is what I call sharing poverty and I thought our goal was sharing wealth, at least to some degree. Again there is a failure to move toward an egalitarian society and I am at a loss to understand why this government thinks there is anything commendable in placing the whole burden upon those who are least able to bear it while exempting those who are best able to pay.

If there is a case to be made—and I think there is; the case the minister made this afternoon—for those who are now gainfully employed contributing to the welfare of those who have passed that period of their lives when they could be gainfully employed, there is an even stronger case to be made for obliging those who have benefited most from our society to contribute to the welfare of those who have benefited least. We observe this principle at least to a limited degree in our income tax legislation. There are, of course, other pieces of legislation in which it is not observed. The old age security regulations provide one example, with their limit of $60. It has always struck me as a scandalous thing that we should limit income in this way.

Mr. Knowles: It is $120 now.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): My hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) assures me it is now $120. I might have known that this government would extend it to $120—a full $10 a month. I still do not understand why this government finds it necessary to be so assiduous in its care of the more fortunate members of society while insisting that the less fortunate should be left to finance each other. I believe the Salvation Army have a little saying which they like to bring out at Christmas when they are collecting money—"Its the poor wot 'elps the poor." The government thinks this is a sound principle on which to proceed. It does happen to be a fact of life that those who are less fortunate in their portion of the world's goods are usually more generous about sharing it. But I do not think this government should take advantage of this.

I think, on the other hand, the government should be prepared to place the burden where it should be placed, namely on the more fortunate members of society. I am not for a moment suggesting that those in the lower income brackets should not make their contributions; but I see no reason whatever why this government should not be prepared to build up a really effective fund of the savings of the Canadian people by imposing a large part of the burden on those in the best position to shoulder that burden and to move then toward that transformation of society in the form of an egalitarian society about which the Liberal party is so very voluble when it is not in office. The members of the Liberal party have always assured us that their party is clutching to its bosom this same principle that some of the rest of us have, but they forget about it once they get into office. They say, "We shall not upset the foundations of our acquisitive society but shall, on the contrary, reinforce it by making

sure that those who are not so fortunate in their lives within this acquisitive society will have enough to keep them alive". I am not satisfied with that. I am not satisfied with anything that reinforces what I consider to be a profoundly immoral and a profoundly unworkable form of society and economy. But I do not hope for anything better from the Liberal party. I was naïve enough to hope that the minister might perhaps break ranks, because I know he has professed more advanced views than some of his colleagues; but this afternoon I must confess I was more impressed with his timidity and caution than with his liberalism and progressive ideas. I hope that before this bill comes out of committee some of these shortcomings may be remedied, but it is a faint hope, I suspect.

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the debate, after some very fine contributions by members on both sides of the house, speeches by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh), the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson), and the speech we have just heard this afternoon by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) dealing with the economic implications of the Canada pension plan, it is not easy to say much that has not already been said. I do, however, wish to comment on a few of the general principles involved and make a few points which perhaps may add a little to the debate.

The Canada pension plan, as has been said, is truly a milestone in the development of Canada's social security programs. The Minister of Finance this afternoon reviewed the background of pensions from 1927 to the present measure, and in the debate in this house yesterday the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) indicated the development of pension in terms of general concepts which he outlined as, first the acceptance of public pensions as a public responsibility in 1927, the development of universality in 1952, and he then added the further concept of adequacy of pension plans. I would like to say a few words in the latter part of my remarks about the hon. member's discussion of adequacy and the problems which are involved in arriving at and applying this principle. In the beginning, Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear why we have to adopt the principle of a pension plan which is related to earnings. I was surprised to hear some things from certain members of the house, such as the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. McCutcheon), who said as reported at page 9916 of *Hansard*:

[Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

I suggest the self-employed and the farm people would be much better off under a modernized, up to date flat rate plan.

It is very easy to advocate this when you are not in a position to implement it. The government must bear the financial responsibility of these measures. Using a flat rate plan to achieve adequacy is, first, very very costly. No one is more aware of that, of course, than the Minister of Finance, with his strenuous efforts to improve our budgetary situation. The second reason why the flat rate benefit cannot be used for this purpose is outlined very well in the white paper which was placed before this house; it is simply that the same dollars do not mean the same things in different parts of the country. Seventy five dollars in the city of Vancouver, metropolitan Toronto or metropolitan Montreal is not the same thing as $75 in some of the Atlantic provinces or some of the smaller rural areas where the cost of living is different. The only way one can cope with the problem of different needs in different parts of the country, related to the very complex problem of what is the standard of living we are talking about, is to provide a plan which has some adjustment features in it. This plan has some of these adjustment features in it, and I think it combines them very well.

The second point I would like to make is in regard to actuarial studies. I was disturbed at the remarks of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) when I read them in *Hansard*, and perhaps I have misinterpreted them. In *Hansard* of last night, as reported at page 10125, the hon. member is reported as having said:

I hope she—

The hon. member was referring to the Minister of National Health and Welfare:

—will tell us whether or not this report was drawn up by the chief actuary of the department of insurance alone or whether there were outside actuaries, or others, involved.

Apparently the hon. member for Perth places a great deal of importance—if I have interpreted him correctly—on whether or not outside actuaries were used in this connection. I hope I am not doing him an injustice, because I had the privilege of serving as a civil servant when he was a minister and I know that his relationship with the civil service was admirable and strictly correct. Therefore I hope this is not a reflection on the actuaries of the department of insurance.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I can assure the hon. member

now that this was not so. I meant to congratulate the minister on using the government's actuaries.

Mr. Francis: I appreciate that the hon. member has set the record straight, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is possible of being misinterpreted the way it is reported in *Hansard*. But even when we have dealt with the question of the actuaries' report—and in many circles a great deal of importance has been placed on the actuaries' report—I think we have to bear in mind the comments made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare in her remarks of last night. An actuarial report cannot mean the same thing when dealing with public plans as it means when dealing with the private insurance industry. When an actuary makes his studies for a private insurance company he has to deal with two basic assumptions, the expectation of life—and here it is not as mathematically precise as one might expect; life expectancy is increasing, which is a very fine thing—and the second is the interest on the money invested. The actuary has to make assumptions in these respects. These are assumptions of a very broad, general nature. But within this scope the actuary can apply his technique and training in a way which leads to a fair degree of precision.

But look at the additional assumptions that have to be involved when you deal with a public plan. The minister pointed out that the basic and variable assumption is the question of the level of earnings on which the contribution is going to be raised. This first involves the question of the number of people who are going to be employed and assumptions with regard to the rate of unemployment. It involves the natural growth of the labour force; and when we start looking at the natural growth of the labour force we are dealing with things which are not predictable according to the generally accepted techniques of actuaries. We have to think of immigration to this country, which is a great deal; we have to think of birth rates, which are generally remarkably variable and are not predictable. Then we have to think of the attitudes toward employment. These attitudes are reflected in the approach to the retirement age. I am not at all sure that the desire of everyone in the future will be to retire from active employment at as early an age as possible, for reasons of self-satisfaction, pride and self-respect itself. Many people choose to be employed as long as they are physically and mentally able to be employed. It may be that with an increase in the expectancy of life we may see a different approach to the whole question of the retirement age, which will in turn affect the number of people who will be employed. Then we think of the number of married women who go back into the labour force after their children reach a certain age. All these factors will influence the number of people involved and the payrolls affected by the pension rates. They are not predictable in any conventional sense.

The minister again pointed out the problem of prediction of prices and price changes, and on top of that productivity changes. All of these are involved in projections of rates of growth of funds in future years. They are not predictable financially in any greater sense than they are predictable by an economist, a statistician, or a large number of other people trained to deal with these matters; as a result we get a wide spread at the high and low of the fund. But that is no reflection on anyone; it is merely a reflection of the great difficulty of making any estimate of the growth of the fund in which we could place the confidence we should like to place in dealing with these matters.

The third point I should like to make deals with the integration of private plans. Again I am disturbed by the remarks of the hon. member for Lake St. John (Mr. Lessard) as reported at page 9909 of *Hansard*, when he said:

> Many people are wondering what is going to happen to the amounts already invested in private companies. What assurance will they have that they will not go bankrupt now that they are losing that income? None, actually. What assurance will they have that those company pension funds will not be nationalized by governments? There again, absolutely none.

I disagree, Mr. Speaker, completely with that kind of remark, which I consider to be irresponsible and the kind of thing which should not be said by people in public life. The white paper which was laid before us makes it abundantly clear at page 22 that the Canada pension plan will not take over and absorb reserves which have been built up by private pension plans.

There is a problem of integration. I thought the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) was going to deal with the problem of the integration of plans for the benefit of public servants under the Public Service Superannuation Act with the Canada pension plan, but I am informed that his parliamentary secretary may deal with it. But from looking at the existing scheme it is quite clear that this plan will permit an improvement in

benefits under private plans for the same level of premium, or a reduction in premium for the same level of benefit, or possibly a little of both. The Canada pension plan is a better deal, dollar for dollar, than the existing plan. I should like to say, through you, Mr. Speaker, to all public servants both in Ottawa and in Canada that the reports which have been appearing in the press to the effect that public servants will be adversely affected by the Canada pension plan are completely without foundation. This plan will permit a degree of integration to their benefit either through reduced premiums, increased benefits, or possibly both. Because the Canada pension plan is that much better value dollar for dollar.

The question of integration of existing schemes has to be worked out plan by plan. They will have to be negotiated by management and unions, and a decision must be made whether or not they simply want to add the Canada pension plan or whether or not a component will be substituted. This plan is a good plan, one which offers benefits which are very generous compared with the benefits offered by private insurance.

By the same token there is a great role for private insurance in this country, and there will continue to be so. In 1950 when a joint committee of this house and the other place met to consider the problem of the old age security plan which was eventually evolved, representations were made to the effect that this step would prove very harmful to the insurance industry. But the reverse was the case. The effect of the old age security plan which was implemented in 1952 was to make people more pension conscious than they ever were before. It increased the sale of life insurance and made more people aware of the need for planning a retirement income on an adequate scale. I am confident that this will again be the case. We have not yet approached adequacy; nor can we approach it on the scale we should like in view of the standard of living many Canadians have built up for themselves. It reminds me of the old story that a man's reach must exceed his grasp; else what is a heaven for? Obviously we must strive for a higher and higher standard of living. As we achieve more we want more, and that will always be the case.

It will be the job of the private insurance industry continuously to add extra supplements to the public plan, which is merely the floor. These supplements provided by private insurance will be in terms of individual requirements and resources and will be tailor made. I confidently make the prediction that the effect of this plan will be to make people even more insurance conscious. It will not be harmful to the industry but will provide the base which will be much more defensible in terms of all sections of the community; and from this the private insurance industry will benefit.

The last point I want to make is in connection with adjustments to the plan. I was a little disturbed by some remarks made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—I cannot find his exact words in *Hansard* at the moment—to the effect that $10 a month was old hat and that we will have to do very much better than that now. He also said that the adjustment made a year ago does not amount to anything now and that adjustments must continually be made. Let us look at the adjustments which are built into this plan. First of all there is the cost of living adjustment. It is true that this is limited to 2 per cent in any one year and it is not possible to implement it before 1968. The second adjustment is based on the earnings index. The minimum $600 and maximum $5,000 are adjustable according to the formula as earnings adjust. Earnings themselves will slide up as the general productivity of the economy advances.

I do not think that the hon. members who are complaining about the lack of flexibility in making adjustments to future pensions are so much worried about the Canada pension plan; they keep coming back to the old age security component of it. Nevertheless, I come back again to this point, that it is the responsibility of the government in power and the responsibility of this parliament to guarantee not only a basic dollar and a basic pension but also the integrity of the dollar and the integrity of the pension. That is the greatest contribution which any government could make. If pension increases are followed by massive deficits year after year at the height of the cycle as well as at the low points of the cycle, which in turn leads to inflation, then we are not serving our old age pensioners or anybody else well. Fiscal responsibility has to be the core of the guarantee of the actual worth of the pension dollar.

It is very easy to say, Mr. Speaker, that adjustments should be made to the old age security pension and that perhaps it would be possible to vote the necessary dollars and to run up further deficits. But we all know the consequences of continuous massive deficits without regard to the business cycle. When times are bad or in times of recession

there are very few in this house who would not believe it proper to run up deficits on a large scale. But I would argue that very few of us would be prepared to say that deficits should be run up on a massive scale regardless of the high point or the low point of the business cycle. That would be irresponsible and would lead to inflation.

Pension adjustments have to be related to the state of the economy and to productivity. Hon. members who argue for pension adjustments have offered no criterion for automatic productivity adjustments because such criterion is not easily found; but within the Canada pension plan I submit that there are built-in adjustments. It is true they are limited but they are better than those which have been devised so far.

Within the old age security component we have a cost of living adjustment. I for one hope the cost of living adjustment provision never has to operate, because if it does not a stable dollar will make a greater contribution than an inflated dollar, which will mean that the cost of living provision will not have to be used.

I am also confident that over a period of years there will be an orderly, responsible review in terms of the productivity of Canada's economy. This and this alone must be the final guarantee of what we can do. If we do not create conditions for growth, if we do not create conditions for a high level of employment, if we do not create conditions under which expanding incomes are possible, then the rest is not possible.

Mr. Knowles: I wonder whether the hon. member would permit a question?

Mr. Francis: Yes.

Mr. Knowles: In view of the fact that at least one of the changes being made in the Old Age Security Act by the terms of this bill is to come into effect on January 1, 1966, namely, the right to take a pension at an age below 70, does he not think it would also be possible to make another change and institute the cost of living bonus as at January 1, 1966?

Mr. Francis: I think this is a question which should properly be debated before the committee. I do not think an answer can be easily or satisfactorily provided in an exchange of this nature on the floor of the house. I am sure the point will be raised in the committee and that at that time a satisfactory answer will be given.

Mr. Knowles: The invitation was not necessary but it is accepted.

Mr. Terry Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I have spoken before in the house on the pension plan, but it was on the earlier plans introduced and at the time I spoke I expressed a note of caution and said that I was quite unhappy about some of the deficiencies in the other plans. I am very happy this afternoon that the plan we now have before us contains provisions for dependant children, widows, disabled persons and so on.

We in the opposition have been quite conscious for some time that any time we have criticized the government it has been called obstruction. I am not sure how successful the Liberals have been in selling this idea, but this is certainly the echo we see in the newspapers every day. Therefore I think it is only fair for me to say now that if it were not for such obstruction we might have been saddled with that first plan which the minister introduced so proudly, so politically and so long ago.

Mr. Bell: Three maple leaves, too.

Mr. Nugent: In fact, we might even have been saddled with the second plan. I am not suggesting this plan is perfect but certainly it is a great improvement. I think it is basically a very good plan and I hope we will be able to work very hard on it in the committee stage and make a few more improvements.

I thought the remarks of the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) were quite valid. I am not convinced that the only thing we should talk about at this point is whether the plan is desirable because that would leave us with no debate at all, but he did mention that the committee would need a considerable amount of time. The bill is very large and complex. There are not many members of the house who are trained or equipped to deal with all aspects and phases of it, but I do think that most members are quite familiar with the effects of certain sections. They are very familiar with the needs of certain parts of the population. I am sure that all members are most interested in the bill, so the fact is that we will need to do a great amount of work on it.

I do not believe any time limit should be suggested. I would hate to think we would have to start all over again if this session should be prorogued. Therefore I hope that something will be worked out in order that the committee can look into the bill thoroughly and completely, so that its work

will result in solid progress which will not be lost but which will be carried forward into the next session.

I followed with considerable attention the remarks of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Cameron). I was particularly impressed by his remarks about the fund that would be accumulated and the use that the state could make of this money in directing the economy of the nation. I am sure most of us realize that in today's world the governments of most countries have been directing the economies of their nations more and more. Some go about it to a greater extent than others and different methods are used.

The only point on which I can agree with the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands to any extent is that I am not sure I want to see these funds in the hands of the provinces rather than in the hands of the federal government. I think we all agree it is a good thing that the provinces through this fund will have additional moneys available that can be lent to municipalities for various purposes, but I do think we are missing the boat a little by putting these funds into the hands of the provinces from which they are raised.

We have seen over the last few years that the biggest and richest provinces are not necessarily those that need the most help, and if the vast amounts accumulated in this fund go straight back to the provinces whence the money came it will do nothing to help the have-not provinces and will deprive the federal government of an opportunity to use these funds or part of them to provide extra assistance in those provinces where additional assistance is so obviously needed at the present time.

The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands referred to the Canada development fund as proposed by the Liberal party in the last election campaign. In fact, several members have mentioned it but the emphasis of their references has been more on its absence. I am not sure that any Liberal spokesman has explained why what was so good at election time is so repugnant now, but I suppose if we were to ask them to explain all those things that were so good at election time which they have failed to do they would hardly be talking about anything else in the house.

While I have said I have some reservation about the advisability of turning the funds over to the provinces, and while I think the federal government is missing a chance to even up the needs of the provinces, I have never been too sold on the general idea of the federal government amassing a fund of money which it can use for investment purposes to direct or assist the economy. It has always been my belief that, rather than encouraging our people to save more money by putting it into the hands of the federal government to lend, our people should be encouraged to invest more of their money. Canadians are the most cautious investors in the world. They are also the most consistent savers. Therefore if we are to retain more of the profits of industries within this country I think the Canadian people, rather than just receiving interest on loans, should be persuaded to engage more in risk investment, that is, in the share capital of companies.

The question of the provinces building up funds and having control of them is not my only reservation with regard to the present plan. If the province of Quebec has the same plan as the federal government, frankly I am unable to understand why that province wants to operate its own plan. I am unable to understand why any other province would want to set up a plan essentially the same and to opt out of the federal plan. I have never believed in this opting out process at all. If something is good for the country, I do not think one Canadian is that much different from another and I think it should be quite possible to so arrange the plan that it will be generally suitable throughout the country, and once we have it in that form it should then be a federal scheme, not a partly federal scheme which applies to only nine provinces now, which next year may only apply to eight and the following year may only apply to half a dozen.

There is another point about which I am somewhat puzzled, although perhaps further study of the bill will clear it up. When there is this opting out principle and when the province of Quebec has its own scheme, I cannot understand how the federal pension plan can be truly portable. Certainly, if a province opts out, the only logical reason I can think of for its preferring to run its own scheme is that there is some difference in its scheme as compared with the federal plan. If they already have control of the fund and they want to opt out, there must be that difference, and that difference is a very significant one. If the difference is a significant one, then those Canadians who are going from province to province will have to accept the significant difference in their pension plan. How can we then call the plan a portable plan? If these differences are insig-

nificant or likely to be, then I am left all the more puzzled as to why any province wants to run its own plan. I would dearly love to have that explained.

I was happy to hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) say he felt the Dominion of Canada could afford this plan. I am sure there has been nothing in his budgets to date to indicate that the government has found any way to manage the financial affairs of this nation in such a way as to get rid of deficits. We are aware, of course, that while they have followed the general economic policies practised by the previous government, the full effect of those policies has meant comparatively good times. The gross national product is up. We can therefore expect a much higher return from some taxes. However, the note of optimism from the minister was almost as surprising as it was welcome. I found it a little surprising when the minister stated that the revenues from income taxes alone received by the federal government, once this plan gets into operation, will drop by about $100 million. I hope I understood him correctly. I had no idea it would be that amount. Certainly, we must all bear in mind that this is an extra cost of administration of the scheme. It is costing the federal government $100 million per year at the outset, once this plan goes into operation.

I am sure that with the rising standard of wages, when the scheme is adjusted higher, there will be a similar adjustment in the revenue loss of the federal government through income taxes. This should be calculated as a cost of administration. I am not sure if the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) added this item to administration costs when she spoke of them. I think it is well for us to take a look at it. Perhaps we can examine it more closely in the committee.

I was much impressed by the argument presented by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Cameron). He said he thought this plan did not go far enough. He wanted it to be an all-Canada insurance plan. I am afraid that he is quite socialistic. While I was impressed with his argument, I am afraid that I cannot go as far as he did in adopting that argument. I am happy, however, that there is room for private insurance plans. I believe that individuals have a right to look after themselves if they desire to do so. The duty of the government is to help those who need help rather than force everyone to come under a scheme. There are a good many people, even in the low income brackets in this country, who resent the thought they will be accepting a government handout. People look for a plan like this when they have not found it possible to get involved with an employer-employee scheme, or perhaps they have not been able to make financial arrangements to enter a private insurance scheme. The only assistance they really want is a government direction to make it possible for them, in their income group, to get into a scheme or a pension plan for which they can pay. Then, they can say, I am carrying my own load.

Sometimes in today's society we lose track of the human value and benefit there is to individuals who want to be able to say they are standing on their own two feet. This is especially important, I think, when we reflect that so many of us feel that success or adequacy can be measured by the amount of money a person can earn. Even in the lower income brackets, this feeling of adequacy is there. There is much pride in being able to take care of oneself. The extent of the assistance given in this plan, and the form of assistance, is all that is requested by some. I am quite aware of the fact that there are many in the lower income brackets who feel quite a bit different. They feel that those who are rich should pay for everything. There is a constant struggle in this house about that principle. Perhaps the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands gave us the best answer to that struggle when he said that we take cognizance of it by means of the Income Tax Act. Certainly if there is a great need to adjust the extent to which the rich shall contribute to government schemes, the Income Tax Act is the one means by which it can be done very fairly.

I hope that when this matter is referred to the committee its work will be arranged so we will not be rushed. I hope the organizations that may feel they will need considerable time to prepare properly a brief to deal with the part of the plan which most interests them will be given a sympathetic hearing, and that there will be a great deal of cooperation between the various groups so that they may present their arguments in an orderly manner. I hope the committee may know from day to day what they are likely to be considering and that they will not have to be sitting day and night, day in and day out in order to meet a deadline. I should like to refer to the flag committee for a moment in that regard. I was not a member of that committee, but I do feel it was asking a little

too much of the members of the committee to sit so often, day after day, and concentrate to such an extent on that subject. I could certainly understand the feeling of those who wanted to get the matter completed and relieve the pressure on us.

I submit that the same pressures are not present in connection with this matter. When the committee is studying something as complicated as this pension plan, there should be no suggestion of a deadline because that would have only harmful effect on the work that should be done. I do not want to be misinterpreted: I think we all wish to see a pension plan. However, we have had enough experience in the house to know that sometimes we jump a little too quickly, and a second thought or a little assistance from someone might be of great value. I suggest that having waited a long time for this we want to make sure it is as good as we can refine it to be in committee, rather than face the immediate necessity of amendment just as soon as it is passed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note how the Canada pension plan and the formula which made it possible were established.

On the judicial and constitutional levels, this measure falls under section 92(13) of the British North America Act which gives the provinces exclusive rights over property and civil rights. As Mr. Ollivier clearly pointed out in one of his treatises, a distinction must be established between pure civil rights and social legislation. This distinction, however, was recognized in amendments to the British North America Act, the first of which was in connection with the Unemployment Insurance Act introduced in this country by a Liberal government. Needless to say that this amendment had first been approved by all the provinces just as a similar amendment and a similar agreement by all the provinces have made possible the setting up of a Canada pension plan. It shows also the priority of the provinces in that field, as their consent is required for the establishment of any social legislation, and also the right of the provinces to discuss the matter and lay down conditions.

On the Canadian political level it was necessary to prevent what some people call the "balkanization" of the country. The agreement reached ensures co-ordination between the Quebec plan and the Ottawa plan,

[Mr. Nugent.]

and the pensions will be portable for those who are moving from one province to another. The rates and benefits will be the same throughout Canada, and the danger is avoided.

From the economic standpoint the public reserves accumulated by the federal plan will be made available to the provinces, which will be able to use them for their own purposes: education, highways, the development of their natural resources and other matters of provincial jurisdiction. The source of the right being provincial, it was normal to let the receipts go to the provinces.

There will be two pension plans but their application will be co-ordinated and standardized for the benefit of the Canadian taxpayer who, after all, will pay the shot.

Such is in my opinion the result of a formula which is called co-operative federalism. That formula deserves to be looked into, since it makes possible the achievement of a very important piece of social legislation.

The result is important; it shows that the formula has the required flexibility to meet the present needs and that far from being an exception intended to isolate one or the other of the provinces in the confederative pact, the formula strengthens unity by guaranteeing to all Canadians equal benefits under the pension plan.

What does Quebec ask? The guarantee that it may freely use its constitutional rights. What does Quebec do? It co-operates; here, it reveals the details of its pension plan which, after being studied in comparison with the federal scheme, enrich both plans. Who benefits from this co-operation? The Canadian taxpayer wherever he lives.

The Quebec people are not street fighters. They are moderate, peaceful and they hate disorder. In Quebec city they did not turn their backs on the Queen, but on terrorism. If the Leader of the Opposition would only stop blaming the province of Quebec and the Quebec members of the federal cabinet and work in the general interest, he would find more co-operation not only in the province of Quebec but also among the French Canadian members of his own party and among the English Canadians who still have some objectivity.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like to ask the hon. member how he can tie in his remarks about the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) with the pension plan now before us. I feel he is

completely out of order in leading the discussion onto such ground.

I should like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule the hon. member out of order.

Mr. Cantin: If my hon. friend will just wait a moment, he will see the connection which exists between the present formula and the attitude of his leader.

Mr. Ricard: The hon. member is absolutely out of order.

Mr. Cantin: Quebec intends to play a constructive role in Canada. The Quebecker is jealous of his civil rights; he will retain them. He wants his language to be respected, he will defend it. He is proud of his French culture, he will spread it. He intends to take his place in the economy, he will make it grow. But he understands that he must develop and assert his personality in a climate of understanding and peace. From now on he will believe in dialogue at the conference table; he will sit there.

Even if agreement between the provinces and the federal government was not easily achieved, even if four federal-provincial conferences and numerous other consultations between the federal and provincial governments were needed to bring about the creation of a pension fund, that bill will remain in the field of federal-provincial relations a true picture of the bi-racial character of the founders of this country and of a province which is not like the others, for the well-being of a Canada which is longing for unity and which can, thanks to this fact, feel that it is different and distinct from a North American melting pot.

In the federal-provincial relations field, this bill is further evidence of the efficient and up to date formula put forward by our government: co-operative federalism.

I must commend the minister for her success. Being a woman, she knew the virtue of patience, which led her to the true understanding of the problem with which Canada was faced in the establishment of a comprehensive pension plan.

[*Text*]

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, we have before us a pension bill which is the third one introduced by the government and, in opposition to what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) said, may I point out that we on this side of the house are not neglectful of our old people. In fact we hope this bill, after being properly tailored, will fit the need.

As it stands I do not believe it will fit the need, and after making a few criticisms I shall try to show in a positive way what we should do about it. It is an old trick, to claim that the opposition has no consideration for old people; but if one looks at the record of social justice and at the record of performance by the previous administration it will be seen great steps were taken during the period of that administration to improve not only the conditions of old people but to solve problems of social justice in all fields.

At this stage of the bill it is necessary to talk principles, and it is difficult to do that without going over the history of some past mistakes. I for one think our present old age pension scheme is one of the best in the world. I do not think we are far behind most countries of the western world, free enterprise countries, in looking after our old people. Of course I am not satisfied to leave it there. We must not rest on our laurels. I do not think many people can live on $75 a month. But as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) has said, it is the basic thing which concerns us and I think it would be as well for us to confine the compulsory part of the plan to this very matter. It would be a strange thing indeed if in a free enterprise country such as Canada—and I hope and pray it will always remain such—we should provide any compulsory system of old age retirement benefits designed to give people what I would call a luxury standard of living. On the other hand I do not want to see any segment of our population left without provision for meeting their basic needs.

As I see this bill, it will not bring a great deal of benefit to those who do not already have a considerable measure of security. Coverage is supposed to be universal I am sure we would all like to see this brought about, but are we likely to get it under the terms of the present bill? It appears to me that after agricultural labourers, all those employed in lumbering, fishing, horticulture, and those who are handicapped or disabled for one reason or another have been excluded, a large section of our population will not be protected. My feeling is we should retain the principles of our present system of old age benefits, a system which includes everybody regardless of income or occupation.

The basic rate is, in my opinion, still not high enough. At the present time a single person cannot possibly get along on less than $100 a month and a married couple might need double that sum, or possibly $175 a month.

It would be easy to get into an argument about where the money is to come from. Well, it can only come from the earning power of our people, from the gross national product. I do not wish to become involved in a long discussion about whether it is better to take the money out of our left hand pocket or from our right hand pocket or whether we should take it from the employer or from the employee. It all comes from the same source, the ability of the Canadian people to create wealth. If we end up providing $300 a month, somebody will have to pay for it; if we provide such a pension for everybody beyond a certain age it means we are asking those who are presently working, the youth of the country, to pay the shot.

There are features of the bill which I like. I like the recognition that we cannot jump into this scheme right away. I like the recognition that it will take time to build up a fund capable of meeting payments of the kind proposed. But I am not in favour of a system which would place all the burden on the young people who are actually producing the wealth. We should take a good look at this plan to make sure we are not setting up a pension scheme which will be badly broken almost as soon as it comes into operation.

It has been suggested that once the fund has been built up we shall be able to lend all the money to the provinces. I am not at all sure that there will be a large enough fund even to meet its commitments, let alone have hundreds of millions left over to lend to the provinces. We all feel strongly about looking after our old people but I feel strongly, too, about looking after our young people, those who are presently wage earners. If this is to be really a national scheme I would be more in favour of the compulsory portion of the bill. In a democracy we are all in it together, I suppose; we are all paying equally according to our means. This at least is fair. But it does not seem to me that this bill will be fair. It seems to me that a great many people will have to pay very heavily for the privilege of retiring in comfort, while others will get something like a bonanza. It has been my experience that bonanzas do not come easily; somebody has to pay for them. We must make sure that in seeking to look after our old age we who are closer to retirement do not place an unnecessary burden on those who are now in the most active and productive stage of their lives.

Personally, after I was married and had the responsibility of raising a family, the security I wanted was in the years when the family was young. The whole idea of saving seems to me to be getting out of line. We are obsessed with the idea that we should all retire at the age of 70 with $300 or $400 a month. I suggest this is almost sad. If a man has lived all his working life and has never had a real opportunity to give his family and children the things he wanted to give them, there is something almost sad in retirement on a pension of $300 or $400 when it is too late.

I am against compulsion in all its aspects. I would accept compulsion only if I was sure it would lead to a better system of security than any scheme I could work out on my own. I am one who thinks it is inefficient to expect the government to do our planning and saving for us. It has been said that private industry is incapable of handling retirement funds. I think some of the plans which private industry has produced are both efficient and generous. I would much prefer to see the companies themselves putting attractive retirement plans in operation and making sure that government interference is unnecessary, rather than that they should be placed under compulsion in any way. I should like to see the government tailor this bill so as to make its provisions available to everybody and so attractive that we would all be glad to participate, even management.

I get tired of hearing the same old wail from the far left to the effect that those who can pay should pay. This assumes we can carry on this Robin Hood type of taxation forever. I suggest there are not enough rich people in Canada to pay this whole shot. Those who are very well off are already paying enormous amounts out of their hard earned incomes in support of all kinds of social legislation, and some of it is wasted. I am in favour of giving help to those who need it but I am not in favour of killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. Whenever our socialist friends wish to prove that socialism is a good thing they point to the example of Sweden. They tell us everything is rosy there. But no one emigrates from Canada to Sweden—the flow is all the other way. Most of us in Canada, the pioneer type, came out here because we wanted the right to enjoy the fruits of our labour. We wanted to own property. We wanted, if you like, to have the right to gamble. We gamble with our lives every day. Others gamble with their money by putting it into investments. I do not think

they should be chased down the road for ever and amen, and robbed.

This Robin Hood type of government is very appealing. It is particularly appealing when one does not have the responsibility for producing the money or even for taking it from the people who have it. Socialism will not work in Canada; but social justice does work and has worked. Our present old age pension has relieved the minds of thousands and thousands of people and given them a modicum of security which they never enjoyed before. I think we should continue our old age pension system very much as it has been in the past, with this exception—that we should raise it. Then having raised it perhaps a little more to make sure there is no distress amongst our old people, our younger people should be encouraged to save money on their own. They should be given a really comprehensive plan, and where industries are already heavily taxed in contributing these funds perhaps we could bring in a system whereby we could amalgamate all our pension plans and simplify the whole procedure.

I do not think complete control of our industry, our pensions and everything else will work as well as properly organized free enterprise. I do not think that a compulsory system of making our young people save is half as good as encouraging them to get out and earn, and then save in a sensible plan of their own choosing. At least they should have the choice of opting out. If we allow one province to opt out it means we are not enforcing our democratic will on minorities; and I for one look upon this question as dealing with a minority of one. Every individual person in Canada must, in my opinion, be allowed to retain some of his freedom of movement, and I resent being told that I have no ability to look after my own affairs, and that I must bow to a paternal form of government.

Mr. Macaluso: Let us have a plebiscite on it.

Mr. Bigg: Perhaps we should have a plebiscite on it. I can remember very well that when it came to a question of whether or not we volunteered to defend our country, we had a plebiscite; and that plebiscite was instituted by the great William Lyon Mackenzie King and his able assistant, the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill). We had a plebiscite then. I did not need a plebiscite; I was already overseas.

Miss LaMarsh: Hurrah.

Mr. Bigg: I hope that answers the question of my hon. friend in the rear row opposite.

Mr. Macaluso: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member whether he is in favour of a plebiscite on this Canada pension plan?

Mr. Bigg: I have not mentioned a plebiscite. I think we are here to try and thrash this matter out, and I am delighted to know that it is going to a joint committee where the details of the plan will be thrashed out. I said I was going to talk principles this afternoon. I think before we can decide the details of a plan we should know where we are doing. If gentlemen opposite are willing to hand Canada over to a socialistic form of government, let them stand up and say so. Let us be fair about this. If they believe in free enterprise, like I do, let them stand up and say so, instead of heckling me; and let them do a little thinking for themselves.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bigg: If they have a contribution to make, I suggest they should stand up on their own feet and rely on their own words, rather than reading speeches which are written in the back rooms, which are read all the time by members opposite.

Miss LaMarsh: Which people have prepared.

Mr. Bigg: Yes; and I would have someone preparing my speeches for me, if I could, instead of doing it myself and sometimes having to do it three times. We are told by ladies and gentlemen opposite that we have no feelings for our old people; at least that is the insinuation that is left in their remarks. This is a straw man that is put up on their part. We have every feeling for our old people. We are here to discuss method, and I am making the plea that we do it in such a way without interfering with the freedom of the individual, without putting an unfair burden on any one sector of the population and without leaving anybody out. What is fair for one man is fair for another; that is what I claim. It is exactly the same as the right to serve your country; what is fair for one person is fair for another, and we should not have to have a plebiscite to decide things like that.

Miss LaMarsh: Only the flag.

Mr. Bigg: I have made myself clear on the flag question, too. I will go for any flag that tends to unite our country. I say, one flag for one country; a flag for each and every one of us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I would request the co-operation of the hon. member in limiting his remarks to the bill before the house.

Mr. Bigg: It was because of interjections from over there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Even if there are interjections, I think it is the responsibility of hon. members to try to limit their remarks to the subject matter being discussed.

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Bigg) is absolutely correct in this regard, and Your Honour was correct in bringing him to order. But the fact is that there was an interjection about the flag debate which, left without being answered, would look as though the hon. member accepted what was said by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh), who is very good at making interjections; in fact, I have always marvelled that she has so many up her sleeve at all times. I would say the hon. member was merely answering the interjection made at that time.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Speaker, I will relate my remarks to the bill before us, and I would ask the co-operation of people opposite in relating their questions to the bill, if they wish to ask any. This is supposed to be a universal bill; one for all Canadians. My criticism of it is very plain, namely that it leaves out a vast number of Canadians who I think should benefit under the bill—those who need it the most. I do not know what is going to happen to those people who have not been mentioned in the bill and are considered as having automatically opted out due to the industry in which they happen to be engaged. Apparently they are not going to be able to have the full benefit of the bill.

What about the self-employed people of Canada, of whom there are still a great number and of whom, I might repeat, I hope there will always be a great number? I refer to those people who own their own small farms or their own small businesses. What kind of a deal does this bill as presented give to these people? I am not a Philadelphia lawyer, but as I read the bill, it offers them a chance to benefit under the bill at double the cost of other people; and incidentally, in a great many cases it means they will start at the age of 18, perhaps, and pay for 30 or 40 years at a double rate. This does not seem equitable to me. I think this is something we should look at, not only in this house but in committee. Let us make it a universal bill and have it apply equally to every citizen of Canada. If there is a compulsive part in it—and I think there are times when you must have compulsion—let us have the compulsion equally distributed amongst everybody.

With regard to portability, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the bill at least purports to say that this plan will be completely portable and you will be able to receive your pension if you move from one job to another in no matter what part of Canada. I think this is fair to everybody and I do not know why anybody would want to opt out. Nobody wants to opt out if it is perfectly fair to everybody. What is the benefit in having a special scheme for one province or another? Why not act like a nation for the people in this great Canada, all under one flag, all with equal rights, and with the priming pumps in every province making sure we get a full flow of water. Why allow a particular section to opt out? If you must be compulsive, be compulsive and put us all over the same block.

It is not good enough to say, "Let us make it universal; let us make it portable". It has to be practical. How are we going to pay for it? I suggest we should take a good look at this aspect of the question, because this afternoon the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) said he is not at all sure that ten years from now we are going to be able to afford this plan. I am not at all sure we are able to afford it now.

Miss LaMarsh: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not have a copy of the speech of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) with me, but I was in the house during the whole of the time he made his speech and I heard him say he believes the country can afford it, will be able to afford it and wants to afford it. I think the statement my hon. friend has just made is certainly incorrect.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether we have to wait for a ruling or whether this is even a point of order. The hon. lady is excellent at raising points of order.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) left no doubt in our minds that he was not 100 per cent convinced that this plan would work or whether we could even finance it today. He hopes, as indeed we all hope, that it will not be a burden around our necks. But what of the young businessmen who are just starting up? They also hope that this added expense will not be a rope around their necks.

What is going to happen to the few independent housebuilding contractors that are left in Canada? Will they be able to survive? Some 225 of them went broke this year alone, a year when everybody else is getting along well and able to afford all the new fringes. Why did these men go broke? They went broke, of course, because their overhead was greater than their income. Even the Minister of Finance would know that.

If the opposition are expected to accept this third scheme holus-bolus, why should we imagine that it is any better than the first two? Certainly until the matter is thrashed out in committee—and believe me we are going to look at every angle of it and see whether there is anything wrong with it—we will not accept it. I know we are only a minority and that the government can impose its will in many ways, as we have found out; but we are not going to be party to a bill of which we do not approve until we have had a good look at it. If in the end, after all the argument has been made, we do think that there is something to be gained here by the people of Canada as individuals as well as collectively, then we will vote for this measure. So let hon. members opposite not bother to put up any straw men or to put words in our mouths by saying we are criticizing this or that, until they hear what the critics say. Why should the Minister of Finance put words in our mouths? This debate is still young and I think that even some of the points I have made have some validity. The plan is not universal. We are not all sure it is really portable. And what is the good of a universal plan or a portable plan if you cannot afford it, Mr. Speaker? That is the practical consideration here.

As far as equity is concerned we do want it to be equitable in addition to universal, portable and practical. It is very practical to tax the so-called rich. It is very practical for a labouring man to put his employer to the wall—until he loses his job, at which time he is not in the category of a man who is even able to contribute, even to the extent of $1.80 a month, toward his pension. He would find himself unemployed, and one of the reasons for this would be because we are breaking the individual, little firms in Canada.

Are we heading, Mr. Speaker, toward the socialist state? Are we going down the road to socialism, the road of no return? This is the stage of the bill at which we should consider this point, before we start something which will affect us all, our children and our grandchildren. If socialism is the answer, all right; then hon. members opposite will be strengthened mightily by the hon. gentlemen on my left who have supported the government the last 18 months without any qualms. As far as I can see the government is on the road to socialism, and not a very economic socialism at that.

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Bigg: When I am through, if you do not mind.

High sounding phrases are no answer to this problem. I think the government should be only too delighted to let us, with our experience, put forward our criticisms and try and come up with a bill which really will work. There are certainly many people in the country today who are not happy about it. I am not talking here about insurance companies who may have an axe to grind. They may want to run the scheme by so-called private enterprise. But I am worried about compelling people to go into a scheme they do not want and cannot afford, for the reason they have already committed themselves to private schemes of their own. I want them to have the opportunity as individuals to opt out of this plan, the same way as larger groups. If whole provinces can opt out, then why not the individual if we really believe in democracy?

I object to the Minister of Finance or anybody else telling me what is good for me when I can see that I cannot afford to pay any more for my old age security than I am paying already. I have looked after my old age security as well as I can since I started working. I have always contributed part of my salary toward my retirement. If I am expected to put by even a small amount like $1.80 a month into this fund, I want to be convinced that this is right and now is the time to find this out before it is too late.

Other countries have enacted similar schemes to this and have put their heads into the noose of socialism many times. Socialism is not new, it has existed since the beginning of time. And sometimes disastrous results have ensued. As countries get on their feet and reach a position similar to ours in Canada, one of the most favoured nations on earth, they do not have to resort to socialism in order to get along, any more than we do. Instead of priming pumps why not dig a few decent wells? You cannot get any more out of a hole than you pour into it. Just pumping water is no good; let us dig some more wells

and get our working people both young and old into a frame of mind where they are glad to work. I am all in favour of fair wages but I want to be able to choose my own job. With socialism in the country you have no choice. You are graded from birth, like an egg. And who is going to do the grading?—eggheads with pink banners.

An hon. Member: Not red?

Mr. Bigg: No, not red. They are not communists. They only use force when it is necessary; I admire them for that. They are patient, gentle people; but behind the offer of free this and free that there is always the mailed fist. We in North America, both in the United States and Canada, have developed a standard of living second to none as a result of free enterprise and individual effort. It is to create this atmosphere of getting every person in Canada willing to work on his own two feet, to contribute to our mutual defence and security for which we strive. We do not need socialism for that; what we need is character.

I am surprised at the sneers from the Liberal benches, because at one time this objective was supposed to be the soul of Liberalism. Where has it gone? There has been a complete abdication of the position of the Liberal party in the world. The name "Liberal" is now beginning to mean nothing at all, and more people who want socialism are beginning to look to the socialists for leadership.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is my duty pursuant to provisional standing order 39A to inform the house that the questions to be raised at ten o'clock this evening are as follows: The hon. member for Skeena; Indian affairs, request for equalization of welfare payments; the hon. member for Yukon; R.C.M.P., inquiry as to establishment of appeal board; the hon. member for Renfrew South; agriculture, Ottawa valley, emergency legislation respecting drought conditions.

It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

[Mr. Bigg.]

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

PENSIONS

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTRIBUTORY PROGRAM

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Miss LaMarsh for the second reading of Bill No. C-136, to establish a comprehensive program of old age pensions and supplementary benefits in Canada payable to and in respect of contributors.

Mr. Joseph P. O'Keefe (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of attention, though possibly with less interest, to the speakers from the official opposition on this bill, but to me at least their arguments were not particularly persuasive. Before I proceed further I should like to assure the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Bigg) that this speech is my own and was not written by any of the backroom boys. It is my own opinion. It is as I feel.

As a Canadian and as a Newfoundlander I am happy to support this legislation. As a member of parliament I am as proud to be a member of the party which has presented it as I will be of the government which makes it law. Representing a district in one of the larger provinces of this country, Newfoundland-Labrador, one of the richer provinces in everything but money, I can easily see the effect which this complex bill will have on the people I have the honour to represent, many of whom now suffer from substandard incomes. This situation is changing, but not quickly enough for those of us who are in a hurry.

I am not an economist, Mr. Speaker. Yet I have had the basic test applied to me, the test of meeting a weekly payroll, and that for a good many years. This is a test which I suggest might be applied to some of our theoretical economists. The reason I support the bill is that I believe it will provide for a nation-wide system of social insurance for every Canadian no matter where he may live, whatever his circumstances may be, whatever moves he may make, and whatever economic changes may occur.

Before coming to Ottawa I lived very near a home for the aged and infirm which is operated by the Sisters of Mercy. It is a model for all homes of its type. We have many others, of course, in St. John's. There is a home which is very well operated by the Salvation Army and also one operated by the

United Church. There are others as well and they are all excellently run, but because I lived near this home I had occasion to visit there often. While this home was run perfectly, while the guests had every attention and care, I found that so many of them were unhappy. I sensed that basically there was a sense of loneliness, of uselessness, but above all a sense of insecurity. They simply did not have enough money.

I remember one old gentleman saying to me: "You know, the tragedy of old age is not that one is old but that one is young". I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you and all other members of the house know many people with young minds imprisoned in aging bodies. Some of us have some security. There are others, far too many, who have none. There are many who listen, wait, eat, sleep and dream. Time is relentlessly pursuing these people. In a few years someone younger will take their jobs or possibly a machine will replace them. What will retirement mean to them? This legislation means, I suggest, security. It also means dignity and decency for the elderly, the old, the people who have borne the burden of the heat of the day. They are people who deserve our respect and who need our help. That is why I welcome and support Bill No. C-136.

This government has been called many things. It has been called indecisive, ineffective. This can be and should be refuted. The government has tackled courageously many difficult problems. It has solved many and others are in process of solution. I should like to commend warmly our planners, our government and in particular the minister for what I like to think of as their future-mindedness, their concern for the future of all of us who will one day be old.

The minister and others have explained in detail the background of the bill. May I now for a moment or two attempt to answer some of the questions that I feel Canadians are asking. I know my own constituents are asking these questions: How much will I pay? What will the benefits be? Will there be other benefits? Yes, there will be other benefits. As to the question, how much will I pay, the answer is that the contribution rates will be designed so that the average rate is 1½ per cent for both employer and employee at the average level of earnings. In view of the fact that no contribution is made on the first $600 per annum of earnings, this will mean that the contribution rate on earnings from $600 to $5,000 per year will be approximately 1.8 per cent for employer and employee. The contribution rate for self-employed persons will be double that because they must pay both the employer and employee contributions.

The proposed contributory plan will become effective as soon as the constitutional amendment concerning survivor and disability benefits is passed and this legislation is passed by parliament. This will take some time but I am quite sure it will be in effect not later than January 1, 1966. The benefits will amount to approximately 25 per cent of the average adjusted wage. The term "adjusted wage" is used because in calculating the benefits, the wages on which contributions were actually paid will be adjusted upwards as the level of wages rises in the country. Benefits will also be adjusted upwards because of the fact some persons may have had some years of very low income during their period of contribution. In calculating the average wage on which benefits are based, one year of low income may be dropped for every ten years of contribution.

Perhaps at this point I might give some indication of the scale of benefits which will be received under the Canada pension plan. For purposes of comparison, I will use the example of a man or woman whose average salary is $300 per month. His or her retirement pension, payable at the beginning of the third year, will be $15 per month; at the sixth year, $37.50 per month, and at the eleventh year, $75 per month. This is, of course, in addition to the present old age pension of $75, or a total of $150, if there is no further increase made in the present $75 pension.

Now, a great deal has been said about the effect of this plan on other pension plans now in existence. Questions have been raised as to whether this plan would attempt to control the benefits of private plans. Well, the Canada pension plan leaves it entirely to the operators of the private plans to determine whether, and if so to what extent, private plans will be modified. Of course there are many employers who have not yet introduced plans of their own. It is the hope of this government that the Canada pension plan, by providing a basic pension, will also provide encouragement for others to augment it by a supplementary pension plan.

In the case of existing plans, particularly where these plans are not overly generous or the employer may have been considering an improvement in any case, many employers may simply leave them unchanged. This Canada pension plan would, in these cases, simply be added on and so provide a much

better total pension. Other employers, who know that people are far more important than profits, with adequate pension plans may wish to have the same over-all benefit levels as before, and adjust the contributions to the level required to produce these benefits. In any event, because deductions will not be made from salaries under $600 or over $5,000, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) estimates the plan will cost only 1 per cent of the cost of the payroll. This 1 per cent is also tax deductible.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Canada pension plan is good, sound, beneficial legislation. As I said before, it is an example of the future-mindedness of our minister and of the government. I warmly support it and urge the earliest possible enactment of it.

The late President Kennedy, soon after assuming office, called a conference on aging. In view of the fact that the aged now form, and will continue to form, an increasingly large part of our population as health standards improve, I suggest some thought should be given to this problem. It is a fact that people over 65 are increasing at a rate of a little over twice that of the national average. I know, of course, the government is keenly aware of this problem, and for this I am happy. I am happy to notice, too, and commend the good work now being done by the Senate committee here on the same subject.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that it is this government's hope that as each of us reaches the time of slowing down it can be done in health, dignity, serenity and security, with the satisfaction of being needed and wanted, of still being a part of our vital society. In a month, a year or perhaps longer, every Canadian will have to leave his job and give it up to someone younger than he is or to an electronic machine. He will then begin his period of retirement. Is he or she sufficiently protected? I am concerned about the 30 per cent approximately of our people who already have protection, but I am far more concerned about the vast majority who have not. Are the children protected? The legislation I support today, Mr. Speaker, is the beginning of this security, the beginning of dignity for the aged in Canada. I support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. Gene Rhéaume (Northwest Territories): I welcome the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of saying a few words on the Canada pension plan, just as four days ago I had the pleasure of welcoming the hon. lady minister to Baffin island where she had taken the time to come to open a new hospital for the Eskimo people. I think I should tell the house that the hon. lady did herself proud on the island. After all, she was before an audience of some 300 Eskimo people who can constitute a unique sort of truth squad, not truth in the sense of whether the words correspond with the facts, but truth in the sense of whether you are sincere or not. I can tell the house that she was well received, because they knew she was busy, they knew she had many other things including this pension plan to prepare for the house. I will welcome her back into the Northwest Territories any time she wants to come, with the exception perhaps of during the next general election campaign.

I wanted to make a few remarks on the Canada pension plan tonight, remarks that put forward essentially my own ideas gathered from ten years of welfare administration prior to entering this house, based on training in the field of welfare and more recently, in the last few years, based on reading, and the first two versions of the Canada pension plan, as well as assorted other opinions I have been able to gather. I shall put forward my own ideas in this case and shall do so as a person representing nearly all the Eskimo people in this country, and many of our Indian people who, after all, have a lot to gain from any system of expanded social security.

I open my remarks by saying that I strongly believe Bill No. C-136 should have been referred to a parliamentary committee prior to second reading. I know this can be done and no doubt hon. members who are as new as I am, who have never been here before the twenty sixth parliament, can think of an instance in which it has been done. I think of this instance particularly because it concerned a bill that would have had the effect of dividing the Northwest Territories into two separate territories. After much discussion in this house and much uncertainty, it was decided by unanimous agreement of the house that the best course of action would be to refer the matter to a parliamentary committee prior to second reading. This did not have the effect of killing the bill, for the very good reason it was a controversial matter upon which many persons in this country wanted to make representations. It was decided to refer it to a committee prior to second reading so that the government would not feel that any substantial changes in that particular legislation would involve any backing down or

votes of non-confidence. I am sorry this course was not adopted in connection with this legislation, but I assume the government has no intention at this stage of changing its course and referring it to a committee before second reading.

After listening to the debate I also resent the approach of some of the speakers, notably those on the government side, which suggests that any members who object to any phase of the pension plan are trying to deprive the lame, the halt, the blind, the widowed and the orphaned from receiving a decent standard of living. This attempt to label anyone who has any criticism to make, be it constructive or not, as some sort of callous monster of the extreme right, places us in an unfortunate position if we honestly try to put forward our objections.

However, I have a proposal to put forward which I think could have been considered by the hon. lady, though she never asked me for advice and I am not surprised about that. I wish to advance a suggestion merely to show there are other possibilities of accomplishing the same sort of things that are involved in Bill C-136.

It seems to me there are five or six principles that any expansion of social security must meet. These are practical principles, assuming we all agree that Canadians want to retire in dignity and decency. The first of these is that a plan must be readily understandable by those who are to receive benefit from it, by those who are to pay for it, and by all Canadians who at one point or another are going to be called on to vote for the government that brings in this plan. There must be a clear understanding of what they are voting for and against.

The second practical principle of any social security scheme is that it must be the best way not only of meeting existing needs but of filling in gaps in the social security program. I recall at the time of my graduation from the British Columbia school of social work that the guest speaker was the then deputy minister of welfare, Dr. Davidson, and he described Canada's social security system as a Joseph's coat of many colours. He was followed on the podium by Dr. R. E. Davis of the Canadian welfare council, a man involved in the day to day administration of welfare, and he said that rather than a Joseph's coat of many colours it might be likened to a good old Canadian patchwork quilt. I mention this because there are many different ways of looking at this and of meeting all the needs. I suggest the Canada pension plan is only one of the possibilities and not necessarily the best.

The third practical principle in welfare administration is that the administrative costs of any program must be kept to an absolute minimum so that the bulk of the funds collected go to the people they are designed to help, and so that they are not collected by the government to maintain a huge army of employees taking in each other's paper work.

The fourth practical principle of a federal program is that it must be the same for all Canadians. It must have complete portability no matter where you go and it must be under the control of the same authority. As a Canadian I am not prepared, having gone to another province, to reapply for benefit and to be placed under the control of the provincial authority, and it does not matter which of the ten provinces is concerned.

As a fifth practical principle it must be able to stand the scrutiny of those of us here and now who want to look at it, and it must stand the test of time.

The sixth practical principle in social security is that whatever scheme is introduced must cause a minimum of disruption in the private and public sectors of the economy. I want to state in a paragraph an alternative that I have in mind.

I believe that we would have accomplished suitable care of the elderly by raising old age security payments to $100 a month immediately, by lowering the eligibility to 65 years immediately, by pegging payments to the cost of living, by keeping it a totally federal program with no possibility of opting out, and by financing it through the required increase in the three taxes that now finance it, sales tax, corporation tax and income tax.

In order to meet the needs of another large group who would not be covered by this scheme—because after all I am only talking about those over age 65—in keeping with the request voiced by one province and which had general support, I would suggest that the federal government convene a meeting to look at the whole area of services to the disabled, the blind, and the mother's allowance programs now in effect through the provincial authorities. It should allow these programs to remain under provincial control, with whatever necessary federal guidance and help that would be required by the provinces.

The advantage of my suggestion is that everyone in Canada can understand what $100 a month is. It would be available to everyone, and when I mention pegging it to the cost of living I suggest that the cost of living for

1965 be equal to 100 points and, not as presently calculated, to 100 points in 1949. Mr. Speaker, if you follow what I am saying you will see that what I am suggesting is that we guarantee to every old person over 65 years $100 a month in purchasing power, no matter what happens to the cost of living from now on.

If my plan were adopted it would not be necessary to increase old age security immediately prior to an election. Everyone would understand the benefit would be $100 a month and the cheques payable would be pegged to the cost of living as of today, not as of 1949. This would have the advantage of payments beginning on a universal basis at the age which is now generally accepted for compulsory retirement. At present there is a gap. In many instances people are compulsorily laid off at age 65 and cannot acquire old age security until they are 70.

I want to read one subclause from the bill, and by no means is it the most complex.

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Rhéaume: No. The hon. member can make his speech when I am finished.

Mr. Moreau: Thank you.

Mr. Rhéaume: Clause 22(3), relating to contributions to be made by employers and employees, reads as follows:

> Where an employer has been informed in writing on behalf of the minister pursuant to an inquiry, other than an application for determination of a question under section 28, that he is not required to make a deduction from the remuneration of an employee under this act and it is subsequently determined or decided under section 28 or 29 that such a deduction should have been made, except where the employer was so informed on the basis of information furnished by him to the minister that was incorrect in a material particular the employer is not liable for failing to make the deduction or for any amount that should have been deducted before the determination or decision is communicated to him, but is thereupon liable, without interest or penalties under this act, to pay the contribution required to be made by him with respect to the employee from whose remuneration the deduction should have been made, and upon payment by the employer of any amount as or on account of the contribution so required to be made by him the employee shall be deemed to have notified the minister as required by paragraph (b) of subsection (1) of section 14 of the employer's failure to deduct that amount from the remuneration of the employee.

Now what in God's name does that mean? I have taken this clause apart phrase by phrase and it is simply not understandable. I suggest that the first requirement of any adequate security program must be that it can be understood by those who receive benefits, by those who are to pay for them and by the voters at large.

Now I want to get on to my next point. It is that the administrative costs of any plan should be kept to a minimum. Let us look at the plan before us in terms of what it will cost to administer. What would it cost us to number Canadians and keep track of them throughout their working lives? What would it cost us to transfer files from one area to another as people move from one area to another, or to other countries, to work? What will it cost us to determine whether a man is disabled under the terms of this act? This has proved a major source of difficulty and expense already in connection with the Disabled Persons Act. What about the cost of appeals made before the quasi-judicial bodies which will have to be set up to determine blindness, disability, and so on? What about the procedure involved in transferring from the federal program to the provincial program when a province has decided to opt out? Who will transfer these files? What vast army of bureaucrats will be necessary to carry out this work even assuming its members do not engage in empire building and spend all their time watching each other? What army of officials will be needed in every province of this country to keep track of all these things? Compare this with the program I have put forward under which we need keep track of no Canadian until he reaches the age of 65 and establishes his eligibility.

I have said that a program of social security if it is to be effective must be the same for all Canadians. At this point only a single province has decided that it will not implement this plan but that it will implement its own. As a Canadian prepared to pay federal taxes and prepared to be a Canadian, I object to having to place myself or my parents or my children in the future under the control of the provincial authority of any other province of this country. I object to this most strongly when we are using federal funds.

I have said that a social security system must stand scrutiny now and that it must stand the test of time. According to the minister's own paper we do not know what is going to happen in a few years; we cannot carry the projection beyond a few years. By pegging the pension at $100 a month based on the cost of living in 1965 equalling 100, the old people will know what they are going to get. At present many of them think they will be reaping good benefits if this measure

goes through, although in fact if in 1967 the cost of living goes up by 1 per cent a person now in receipt of old age security benefit will end up in receipt of the grand total of 72 cents a month added to his existing pension, enough to handle the correspondence between himself and the local office of the Canada pension plan to find out why he is not getting more.

I have also said that a good social security system must cause the least possible disruption to the private sectors of the economy. Under my plan everyone reaching the age of 65 would be entitled to $100 from the state, and no more. Those who are able to look after themselves and who are fortunate enough to be able to arrange for their own insurance would have that in addition. There would be no need to disrupt a single existing pension plan. The pension or benefit from state sources would amount to $100 and I do not think the state has a responsibility to guarantee any person more than $100 from public funds. Under the proposed Canada pension plan no one knows for certain what the future will bring. We have been given brave assurances by the minister that somehow or other, through some strange Liberal magic, integration of the Canada pension plan with private plans will occur.

I have tried in the brief 15 minutes I have taken to outline one possible alternative to the Canada pension plan, one which would not require a pound and a half of printing to describe it, one which would be understood by every Canadian. It would be understood by every Canadian voter when the time comes to have another go at the polls. This is important because there will be no element of fooling; the people would know. I put forward this suggestion not because I expect the government to accept it but merely because I want to point out as a person trained in the field of welfare and as one with a good deal of experience in administering provincial plans that there are other ways of achieving the benefits which the minister and all of us in this house wish to achieve for Canadians. It is regrettable that the government should refuse to allow this to go before a committee before second reading, where this kind of thing could have been studied and documented. I repeat my request now. If the minister would agree to it, it would at least establish that at least the government is not afraid of taking this particular 125-clause bill to a committee—is not afraid to let it stand the test of close scrutiny.

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member permit a question? I was wondering if the hon. member for Yukon could tell us what his instant pension mix would cost and what changes in the taxation formula it would require.

Mr. Rhéaume: I am certain the hon. member for Yukon could; but I am the hon. member for the Northwest Territories and I should like to try it. I was suggesting that we could calculate the cost rather finely and that we would finance it out of stated tax increases in the three fields from which we are now financing old age security benefits. I have no access to the kind of advice the minister has available to her, so it is not possible for me to give the figure, but I suggest that in no circumstances would my proposal cost more than it would cost to maintain an army of bureaucrats to keep track of every Canadian, to number them and follow them from job to job, in and out of employment, overseas and back, as we will have to do under this scheme. I submit that the total cost would be less than it is going to cost us anyway, and under my proposal we would know where we are going.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I feel that any member seeking to intervene in a debate at this stage, if there is to be any point at all in the remarks he is to make, should attempt to deal with some of the issues that have developed during the course of the debate. I must say I am rather glad that I did not secure the floor until I had the opportunity of listening to the speech which has just been made by the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Rhéaume), because I believe that he did make an honest attempt to put forward a straightforward presentation of his views; he did attempt to outline his own criteria as to what was required in the matter of a pension plan for Canada and for Canadians.

I would like to say at once that as I listened to him outline the points of his criteria, in my assessment the plan as we have it proposed in the bill that is before us pretty well meets all the criteria which he outlined. This is my assessment of the plan in its outlines as I have been able to understand it up to this point. I do share with him the regret that I am sure a great many Canadians feel, namely that it is not going to be completely integrated in its administration. While one can express regret that it is not possible to have a plan which is administered uniformly from one coast of Canada to the other, nevertheless the

plan as it is proposed, and with the understanding that we have of action that is to be taken by the one province which indicates that it does not want to share in it completely, has the criterion of universality which the hon. member outlined. I think all of us must agree that this is a step forward.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that I was glad I had not been called upon to speak until I had listened to the hon. member's speech, because I must say that up until he spoke I had a feeling that it was very difficult to grapple with any issues that had developed in the debate. I had listened to some of the speeches made by his colleagues in that part of the house, and up until his speech I was reminded of a refrain from an old song which, if I have it correctly in my mind is, "She wouldn't say yes, and she wouldn't say no".

Mr. Skoreyko: Judy.

Mr. Barnett: This, quite frankly, was the way I felt about the speeches from the Conservative quarter of the house to which I had been listening. I had not heard anybody stand up and say, "I am against this plan". This would have given us a clearcut issue to fight on, as far as I am concerned. Possibly the closest we came to that this afternoon was in the speech made by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Bigg). As far as I could judge, the gist of his speech seemed to be that we socialists were leading the government around by the nose and persuading them to embark upon a very dangerous course which would probably bring about some form of totalitarianism in Canada. I did not feel that was really a very constructive assessment of the Canada pension plan.

The hon. member for Northwest Territories did make a fairly definite proposal which he felt would be better than the one proposed in this pension plan. Let me say at once, Mr. Speaker, that I would be quite happy to support the proposal he advanced, namely that the present old age security be increased to a level of $100 a month and that it be made available at the age of 65. However, where I part company with him is in his assessment that this would be what he termed an adequate basic provision for old age security in this country. As far as I am concerned, I would say let us have his proposal and the one the government is making as well; then we would be approaching a plan which could be considered, to use the words of the minister, reasonably and modestly adequate as far as retirement for the elder citizens of our country is concerned.

An hon. Member: We will be getting $100.

Mr. Barnett: We certainly will not be getting $100 under the plan the minister has been proposing. But her colleague the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) at least held out a few teasers to us when he spoke last night, in that he said if we lived long enough and were able to draw the pension long enough, we might possibly see something like that happen.

Before I came down to the chamber, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering just what are the issues with which one can grapple in dealing with the principle of this bill. I found that I really had to go outside this house to find anybody who was prepared to stand up and say he was opposed to the Canada pension plan. I recalled what I had read somewhat earlier in an address which was given in the city of Winnipeg by a Mr. Kilgour, entitled, "Let's raise a storm". This he delivered in the city of Winnipeg on September 9, 1963. I was rather interested in the concluding paragraph of his speech as it was reproduced, because he said:

> We have three short weeks in which we either can or cannot succeed in having parliament stop, look and listen before this die is cast.

As I have said, this speech was delivered on September 9, 1963, and certainly Mr. Kilgour was a little out in his estimate of the speed and haste with which the government was going to proceed with this plan. Members will realize that he was obviously dealing with a proposal that differed in some respects from the one which we now have before us, nevertheless a proposal which in its main essentials was similar to the one contained in the present bill. Mr. Kilgour had this to say as part of his remarks. He was talking about the proposal of the province of Quebec to introduce a plan which had a greater funding element in it than was being proposed at the federal level, or indeed than is proposed in the bill that is before us. He said:

> This is a completely new role of government, certainly in North America.

Of course, he may be right in that connection as far as North America is concerned, but in the wider application I think Mr. Kilgour was somewhat off the mark:

> Whether the public can wisely turn over its life savings to the investment wisdom and political pressures of an elected government is a question which should have the deepest and most thoughtful appraisal—but this is not the time.

That is a pretty good Liberal phrase, of course, even though Mr. Kilgour was rather

vigorously attacking certain of the proposals and was indeed rather vigorously attacking the minister herself in this speech. He went on to say:

> The fact remains that we appear to have pressed the panic button on pensions. We are doing this at a time when unemployment insurance is thoroughly insolvent, and there are wide expectations by many people that medicare is just around the corner. Our social priorities or capacity to pay unlimited taxes are not even under debate.

Then he goes on to make this suggestion later in his speech:

> Let's raise a storm. Let's make it a good one—the strongest most lightning-packed, angry wind that has blown around parliament hill for a long, long time. It could sober this country as it sorely needs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if we had people getting up in this house and making speeches with the vigour and directness of that made by Mr. Kilgour we would really have something we could get our teeth into.

I think this is one of the elements which has been lacking in this debate. I would have been quite interested and intrigued if somebody—I could only envisage its being somebody over in the quarter of the house which comprises the official opposition—had been prepared to get up on his hind legs and say that this whole pension idea as far as any public application is concerned is for the birds, and parliament should not even be looking at it. But the strongest suggestion which we have had came from the hon. member for Northwest Territories, who suggested that this bill should not be proceeded with past second reading but that it should be referred to a committee prior to second reading; and he was regretting that this had not been done.

I would suggest to him and his colleagues that that is a motion which is perfectly in order. If that is the way he and his colleagues feel about this bill why do they not make that motion and test the house on it? I made a motion like that on the 12-mile fishing zone bill not too many weeks ago. It did not pass the house and I really did not expect it to when I moved it, but at least I tried to say that I thought the bill was so inadequate it should not pass the house in its present form. If that is the way any hon. member of this house feels about this bill I wish he would get up and make that motion so that we would find out exactly who feels what about this pension plan, and then we could get on with it.

I suppose the main function of a member of the opposition is to consider and assess the proposal which we have before us.

Mr. Woolliams: Do you think anybody thoroughly understands it, other than those who worked on it? Let us be fair.

Mr. Barnett: The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) asks me whether anyone understands it thoroughly. I do not profess to understand it thoroughly in every detail. I do not profess to understand every phrase in the clause which the hon. member for Northwest Territories read. But I will say this, that I do understand it well enough to know whether I am for it or whether I am against it. It is true that there are a lot of complicated clauses in the bill, but the principles of the bill are very simple. I suggest that anyone who wants to sit down and take the time to read it and who has had at least a grade eight education can understand what it is about. I have talked to people in my constituency, not about the details of this plan but about some of the details of an earlier version of the plan, and I found that the average person I talked to had no difficulty in understanding what it was about. Most people in my constituency have some idea what is meant by universal portable pension plans. Most people understand something of what is involved in making contributions over the period of one's working years into a pension plan.

I know one is not supposed to impute motives in this house, but having listened to some of the speeches I have heard in this house I find it difficult to believe that some people, like the former minister of national health and welfare, are being anything but deliberately obtuse as far as their alleged difficulty in comprehending the terms of this plan is concerned. I certainly reserve my right as a member of this house to assess and examine the representations which will be made with regard to this plan, either in connection with some of its broader terms or its details, in its committee stage of consideration. I certainly agree with some of the things said earlier in the debate by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Cameron) in connection with some of the terms and some of the inadequacies of the plan. But, Mr. Speaker, I just cannot believe that my colleagues in this house in the Conservative party are quite as stupid as they are trying to make out they are.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Barnett: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I started to say a little earlier I think one's principal function as an opposition member is to try and assess the proposal as it is put forward by the government, and to assess what has been said by the various ministers who have spoken in the debate.

In this connection I had the feeling when listening to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) this afternoon that one of the things he was trying to do was to soothe the fears of people like Mr. Kilgour. My colleague for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands dealt with some of the remarks of the Minister of Finance, I felt much more in sorrow than in anger. But as far as I could understand it, the gist of what the Minister of Finance was trying to say this afternoon was: Well now, you fellows—people like Mr. Kilgour, who freely admits he is somewhat interested in the plan and was quite forthright about admitting that he had an interest in it as president of a private life insurance company—this thing really does not amount to very much; it is only a minor factor in the economy of the country and nothing for you to worry about. Which, of course, is and has been for a long time rather typical of the attitude taken in Canada by Liberal governments. Their general attitude seems to me: Well now, we must be very careful not to do anything to rock the boat. I think the Liberals must have a congenital weakness which makes them liable to seasickness; they are always so afraid of rocking the boat.

I thought the Minister of Finance gave us this afternoon a perfect example of just how touchy he is as far as the dangers of rocking boats are concerned. I suppose I could suggest that there are such things as seasickness pills; and if the Minister of National Health and Welfare could provide as part of the health services for the country some seasickness pills for the members of the government and the members of her own party who are so afraid of rocking boats perhaps she might be able to bring forward a better and more adequate proposal than she has put forward in this bill.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those who are so concerned or inclined to be concerned about group security plans provided under the aegis of public authority are really people who refuse to recognize or to realize just how radically the structure of our society has changed and how, as one of the consequences of that change, the older generation have tended to be pushed into a sort of side line position in our economy.

I think that the fact of this change was perhaps illustrated by some of the considerations we had in mind when we recently dealt with the redistribution bill. During the discussion it became quite clear, as it has through many other avenues of knowledge, that the structure and economic status of Canadian society has radically changed because of the movement from rural areas into urban areas, and the question of adequate security for old age is part and parcel of that development.

In a simple rural society largely established on an agricultural base the question of security for the aged tended to take care of itself as a result of the rather simple and basic fact that by and large the ownership of the means of production rested in the hands of the older people. In other words, father owned the farm and, while the sons might work it, as long as father was alive he had a proper right, title and interest in the products of the farm. On the other hand, let me take an example that pertains to the area of the country from which I come with regard to the society in which we live today. In the society of today the father no longer owns the pulp mill or the paper mill, and once his active working years are over he has no automatic right, title or interest in the continued production of that pulp or paper mill or in any of the other complex industrial institutions which operate in our society today and which represent our main economic base.

I think it is out of that change in the structure of our society that the need for public pension plans arises which will ensure that the older generation will continue to enjoy some of the fruits of current production. In my view it is in that context that this kind of plan has to be assessed, and it is in the context of the productivity of the industrial machine that the adequacies or inadequacies of proposed levels of pension plans must be considered.

There has been a good deal of talk recently about priorities. Some of it has arisen out of the fairly recent statement by the premier of the province of Manitoba on this subject. A recent newsletter of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce quotes from the statement of Premier Duff Roblin and then proceeds to make certain assertions which they suggest arise out of the premier's statement. They completely overlook the fact that the premier's statement dealt with the matter of a co-operative effort on the part of the provincial and federal governments to assess their sources of revenue and to work out

some co-ordinated plan for the manner in which expenditures are to be made. The chamber of commerce goes far beyond the context of Premier Roblin's remarks. In their newsletter they say:

> The newly elected board of directors of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce urges federal and provincial governments to co-operate in establishing priorities in respect to government expenditures.

They go on to say:

> It is clear that the tasks which the nation undertakes in the fields of education, old age security, health and other programs affecting the public sector of the economy must be considered and dealt with on a priority basis.

I do not claim to be an economist, Mr. Speaker, but I have enough knowledge of the proper use of economic terms to realize that this statement emanating from the board of directors of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce is utter and complete nonsense. They talk about programs affecting the public sector of the economy as if the public sector of the economy comprised such things as education, health and old age security. To me this is a complete misuse of that term, because as far as I am concerned the public sector of the economy refers to such activities as public enterprises, publicly owned railways or the Polymer Corporation or Air Canada, which are part of the economic life of Canada. To suggest that matters such as education, old age security and health are matters of concern only to the public sector of the economy does not make economic sense to me.

In my view nothing is more important to the private sector of the economy than that we have educated and healthy citizens. In my view nothing is more important to the private sector of the economy than that all Canadian citizens have the kind of incomes which will enable them to purchase the products that our industrial economy is capable of producing.

I have referred to this statement in order to suggest that we in parliament as well as people throughout the country are in danger of putting such questions as old age security, education and health services and the matter of whether or not we can afford them in a completely false perspective. So many people tend to look upon these things as something to be put to one side as luxuries. To me this is a completely false assessment of priorities. The only sound basis of assessing these things is within the total public and private sectors of our economy and their potential productive capacity.

Viewed in those terms, Mr. Speaker, and thinking of a proper sense of priorities as to the things which are really necessary I would say, as I said earlier, that it would not be too much so far as the field of old age security is concerned if we were to put together the proposal advanced by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) and the proposal which the hon. member for Northwest Territories made in reference to the increase in old age security. I would suggest that is the least we can do that would be adequate.

I attempted to point this up in a question I addressed to the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) when he concluded his remarks last night. I asked him if he would indicate to the house the position of people who are now of retirement age or who will be at the time the proposed pension plan comes into effect. To me this is something that should not go unnoted in the house, because what it means is that we are taking steps now to ensure that some of us who are of age now to benefit from the plan when we reach retirement age will receive the proposed pension. But apparently the government is content to let those who are now of retirement age fall by the wayside, to simply let them go on living in many cases on the verge of want and starvation.

The Indian society of an earlier day on the west coast of Canada at least had a simple and effective means of dealing with the problem of old age. When the people in some of these societies got to the point where they were no longer productive and could not fend for themselves, they had the very happy custom of taking them down to the rocks at the seashore at low tide. They simply left them there until the tide came in to the top of the beach. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, this is what we are doing under this plan as it stands. We are simply saying to the people who are now at retirement age, so far as this parliament is concerned we are quite prepared to leave you on the beach at low tide and let you be submerged. If I have one basic criticism of the proposal of the government, it is this niggardliness. I do not believe the Canadian people really want parliament to be this niggardly with these people who are being completely left out except for this very minor modification of old age security being tied to the cost of living.

I suggest that this nation, on any proper assessment of its economic capacity, on any proper assessment of priorities, should say that it is prepared, as part of this plan, to close that gap either by increasing the present old age pension to an adequate level or by the abbreviation of this transitional period in the Canada pension plan. Through this parliament the people of Canada should pick up the tab for the people now of retirement age or the people now on retirement. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, this is the only valid, fundamental criticism of the proposal that we have before us. Certainly I hope that before this plan becomes law or even before the bill passes second reading, we will have an indication that there will be general support in this house for something being done about this aspect of the proposal.

Mr. Jean Chrétien (St. Maurice-Laflèche): I want to reply to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett), Mr. Speaker. He said we were afraid to say where we stand on this pension. I will say that I am for the bill, all the members on this side are for the bill and I believe the same is true of members on the other side of the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to commend the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) and the government for their persistency in preparing this bill.

We have heard several hon. members mention that the government presented two, three or four versions of this bill. I wish to commend the government for this attitude which illustrates its broadmindedness.

Had the federal government not taken this action in 1963, there would be no pension plan covering all Canadians, and there would not be any either in the province of Quebec for several years.

It may be said that the federal government had to back-track and to compromise with the government of the province of Quebec but what counts, in the final analysis, is that with this piece of legislation we have reached our goal: a comprehensive pension plan will be established across Canada, from Vancouver to St. John, Newfoundland, a plan which will follow every worker in Canada whenever he transfers to another province to earn his living.

This excellent piece of legislation is vitally important to the mobility of the Canadian labour force because we have often seen people residing, for instance, in eastern

Quebec, go and work for a few months or a few years in New Brunswick; we have often seen people in western Quebec finding employment in northeastern Ontario.

So, this plan which was worked out in co-operation with the provinces, gives Canada a very important security measure and I think this is an important date in the history of social security in this country.

In the last 12 years, we had not had many new measures in the field of social security. In 1952, a general old age pension plan for Canada was inaugurated but between 1952 and 1964, except for the hospital insurance plan, Canada did not do much with regard to social security.

Today, with this pension plan which covers all Canadians, I think that we are taking a great step forward.

It was not an easy task to prepare and draft that bill on account of the many constitutional objections it gave rise to. But because the governments carried out cool-headed discussions a solution was found. Section 94A of the constitution, following the 1951 amendment, allowed the federal government to legislate with regard to pensions. However, that gave prior rights to the provinces if they decided to take the initiative in that field.

When the present government announced its intention to establish a national pension plan, the province of Quebec said that it intended to set up its own plan and, in conformity with the rights it has under the constitution, it evidently was entitled to do so.

In my opinion, from a confrontation of the Quebec and federal plans there resulted appreciable benefits for both. This confrontation greatly improved the federal as well as the provincial plan.

I am not mentioning the pension plan put forward by the province of Ontario, because it was a security plan for insurance companies rather than for workers.

Mr. Caouette: Oh, oh. Will the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Chrétien: If you do not mind, after I have concluded my speech, I will be glad to answer you.

Mr. Caouette: My question is quite pertinent and should be asked right away, because it refers to what you have just said.

When the hon. member for St. Maurice-Laflèche mentions that the pension plan is such that it could replace some other social legislation, does he mean that old age pensions, for instance, would be replaced by the

retirement pension plan proposed by the present government?

Mr. Chrétien: In reply to the hon. member for Villeneuve, I must say I mentioned no such thing. On the contrary, the pension plan now before us will supplement the old age security which now exists. I did not suggest that the pension plan now before us would replace anything. This is a new measure which will be additional to old age security.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the confrontation of those two plans resulted in the improvement of both, the federal one and the provincial one.

Among the social security improvements to be found in the federal plan, there is a capitalization which will be most useful to the federal government as well as to those provinces wishing to use the amounts made available to them for investment purposes, as mentioned in the bill, especially with regard to the investment programs of each of the provinces.

The second improvement brought to the federal plan since its first draft is that it is now compulsory for everybody. All citizens have been put on an equal footing. In my view, it is very important to compel every one to take part in this pension plan, because if they had been free to do so, some individuals would not have taken advantage of this pension plan, and upon reaching the pensionable age, they would have been second class citizens deprived of the protection which every citizen must receive in a relatively modern society.

Another advantage which was brought about by the confrontation of both plans was the extension of this plan to invalids, widows, orphans and also the granting of death benefits. In my opinion, the fact that both plans were compared at a certain time allowed the central government to obtain authorization from the provincial governments to amend the constitution so that the benefits of this pension plan could be extended to those persons who, during their working life, for instance, may become destitute because they were not included in this pension plan.

Then, thanks to this pension plan, these people will receive benefits, even when a member of the family leaves them for a better world.

This is very important for the security of our fellow citizens in general. In my opinion, this improvement was essential. And even if this were the only result of the confrontation of the two plans, this event was worth while.

As far as improvements to the Quebec plan are concerned, I could mention the following: first of all, a reduced rate of contribution from 4 per cent in the original Quebec plan to 3.6 per cent.

Another improvement is the reduction of the number of years prior to the date of coming into force of the plan. Under Quebec's original scheme, the act would not have applied to citizens for 20 years. Because it was possible to combine both schemes, the citizens of my province will benefit from that great social security legislation ten years hence. That is a tremendous improvement.

Another advantage I mentioned earlier is the portability of the pension, which means that throughout the country the worker is sure that wherever he goes his pension will go with him. In my opinion, the Quebec worker would not have enjoyed that advantage under his own plan if there had not been an agreement with the federal government. That additional improvement must be greatly appreciated in the province of Quebec.

Both plans also contain a very important principle I want to point out.

This is the first piece of social security legislation which recognizes the very important principle that benefits will increase when the cost of living increases. I think that is a new principle which is being accepted and that in the future it should gain a wider acceptance than in the past because we notice, unfortunately, that social security legislation enacted several years ago has not taken into account the rise in the cost of living, which has considerably reduced its usefulness.

In closing, I think that the federal pension plan now under consideration holds many advantages for the citizens. I am happy to see the bill referred to a committee at this stage so that all its provisions may be studied.

For instance, some complain because the contributions will have to be paid on incomes ranging from $600 to $5,000. It would perhaps be advisable to examine more closely the possibility of increasing it up to $7,000 or $8,000 in order perhaps to reduce the minimum rate, because some labourers who have very low earnings will find it too difficult to contribute to a certain part of the social security provided in the pension plan.

It is true that the minister has amended the plan two or three times and I again

congratulate her. It is an excellent thing to reach an agreement after some negotiations and nobody must be blamed for reaching a compromise; indeed it has often been said that an arrangement is concluded by two intelligent persons.

We should not withdraw into rigid positions. I want to compliment both governments that looked calmly into the situation and found through constructive negotiations a common ground for the utmost benefit of all Canadian citizens. This constitutional crisis has been settled to the advantage of all Canadians.

Quebec needed funds for its economic development and it got them. The Ottawa government wanted a comprehensive pension plan for all Canadians and we have it. May this example be followed in the future. We should not be ashamed to make a compromise like this one, because we will have in the near future, included in our pension plan, an eminently social measure that the people of my province as well as those from all Canada must welcome wholeheartedly.

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks on Bill No. C-136. This bill will put Canadians at the mercy of a government or an institution. It will put them in a straitjacket and encroach upon their freedom as individuals, either directly or indirectly.

Man, by his very nature, was created free to organize his life according to his aspirations provided they do not harm society. But now the state wants to force Canadian citizens to set aside part of their production and amass something from which they will benefit 52 years hence, that is the period which will elapse between 18 and 70 years of age. And this law is compulsory, if you please, as if it were feared that the earth would quit producing and bearing fruit.

Through this plan, money will pile up, but what exactly will it be used for? Will it not be, for that matter, money which has been taken forcibly? Canadians will be bled white economically, the very minimum requirements for a decent living will be taken away from them, to be used to improve their standard of living 50 years from now.

Mr. Speaker, when I see how little attention the government ministers pay to what we say, I often feel like taking a drastic decision: that of never opening my mouth again in parliament and taking every other available means to fulfil my duties as a member of parliament, as a representative of the

Canadian people and as the member for my district.

However, Mr. Speaker, if hon. members on the treasury benches have ears, but do not hear, and eyes, but fail to see the people's plight, I should, nevertheless, try and raise my voice to a still louder pitch to throw more light upon the matter whenever I get an opportunity.

As far as this Bill No. C-136 is concerned, Mr. Speaker, this considerable effort made by the government further to mislead a suffering and disheartened people, I shall rise once again in the desert of this House of Commons, and this Canadian parliament, which I had thought were more favourably disposed towards the Canadian people.

This famous Canada pension plan bill, in spite of its bombastic title, offers the Canadian people but another opportunity to see their daily bread curtailed, rationed, dried out and shrunk to a mere abstraction, a mere memory or hope; a war-time memory when money was plentiful while blood was flowing in remote parts. Five years of war brought prosperity to the Canadian people and healed the scars of that decade of depression between 1930 and 1940; but, from 1945 to 1965, after 20 years of peace, our whole hard working, peaceful and generous people have gone back to the days of depression, unemployment and destitution.

And to answer the peaceful demands of the people, all the government has to offer is Bill No. C-136. That is all our wise economists, accountants, scientists, experts, engineers and administrators have managed to offer us, the representatives of the people. And you would like us to express satisfaction at such a hazy, cumbersome and devious project as this Canadian pension plan. You are surprised that we do not think of congratulating you for that ridiculous discovery.

Fortunately, ridicule does not kill.

So you do not understand yet that the people no longer want compulsory savings deducted from their salary cheque which is already too small and inadequate for the daily needs of the dedicated worker and his family.

You have not understood as yet that our very presence in this house, we members of the Social Credit, members of the splinter parties, is a popular challenge to your bad political administration; it is a refusal to cooperate in your system which protects the wealth and capital of large institutions and lets a whole people starve or die of misery and poverty while producing plenty? Will such

conditions go on forever? Have not the people reached as yet the end of their hardship and misery? They will have to accept one more deduction from their daily earnings, so that the governments may pile up billions of dollars from the pittance of the people who lack the necessities of life.

What else can we do? Have we not tried everything to open your eyes? Have we not offered various plans which could at least get your attention and your appreciation? But no, our only appreciation is your mockery, when it is not your contempt. Never mind. We are forging ahead just the same. A day will come, which is not far, I hope, when common sense and the natural intelligence of the people will upset once and for all not only the whole system of those bad pieces of legislation intended to pile up capital to the detriment of the human being, but also those schemes, those hindrances which further reduce the freedom of individuals, and especially of the Canadian citizens.

Just imagine a young man 18 years old, earning his first dollars and going into the world full of hopes, not yet entitled to vote, who sees that a deduction is made from his small salary so that he may get a pension when he reaches 70 years of age. Fifty two years later. Old age is not his main worry. He is forced to make a sacrifice today in order to reap crumbs at the end of his career when he reaches 70.

I suppose that your pension plan, as it stands and as it will be applied, will raise further the cost of production and reduce the purchasing power of the people.

What was already wrong is now still worse. Consumers' revenues will decrease and the cost of production will increase all for the purpose of increasing government capital when the government has the power to create capital through the Bank of Canada.

But no, the government prefers to further reduce the purchasing power of the Canadian people. It is more in line with the absurdity of our present system. This absurdity must always be preserved since it is serving the purpose of a few.

Out of an annual production of $46 billion, we allow a few Canadians to pile up profits and capital amounting to $14 billion after paying taxes and making a good living, but we do not want the small earner to enjoy even the bare necessities of life. It would be too dangerous if the people had security. This surplus must be taken away from them even before they have a chance to look at it. It is taken from them even before they cash their pay cheques. They are being deprived of it without ascertaining whether or not they need it for their own children, to buy them shoes. But that does not enter into the picture at all. We must at all costs increase the capital of our poor governments who entrust others with the power to create money, capital, under any possible debt forms.

Imagine, besides, that this Canadian pension plan, which deprives the poor in Canada of their daily bread, will serve to increase the pension of the wealthy, who have already all the necessary reserves to ensure their old age. It is not without any reason that we find in the gospel: "Who hath not from him shall be taken and whosoever hath to him shall be given."

The writers of those days already saw what was going to happen in Canada in 1964 at the federal government level under the leadership of Christian ministers, defenders of the faith in Christ.

Now, imagine, Mr. Speaker, that in this Canada pension plan no thought is even given to all our Canadian citizens. Our citizens will not all be entered on this pension list. A great number of them will still lack the essentials of life and will not benefit from this pension plan. What will you do then with those citizens who have none the less to defend themselves against the mishaps of destiny, this famous bill of rights guaranteeing to each individual in Canada his right to life, freedom, security of the person? Go and see, I invent nothing. Look up the Canadian Bill of Rights, which was passed unanimously by the 265 members, without any exception, of the parliament of Canada, where it is declared that each citizen is entitled to life, to the necessities of life, but where care is taken not to say that each citizen is entitled to the amount of money necessary to his life, his freedom, his subsistence.

And yet, what can we do without money? Would the ministers themselves have been able to get elected without the fabulous sums that elections cost? Where does this money come from? But to secure a strict minimum for Canadian citizens, it is impossible to guarantee each Canadian citizen the minimum amount required.

If we have the right to live, if the pension payable under the Canada pension plan is a strict minimum, even inadequate for a decent living, why are we required to pay more money for what is already a recognized right in our legislation? Why make anyone pay for

something which is already recognized as a right of each individual in Canada?

Is a dog obliged to pay to have the right to live?

Mr. Speaker, only man, that proud and superior animal, is subjected to that vile and degrading slavery. Only man, among all God's creatures, is obliged at 18 to start saving for the time when he is 70, if he lives that long. Only man is thus obliged to provide against God's kindness.

That is to explain, Mr. Speaker, why science is only the third of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit or the Holy Ghost, as you wish. It is just as good if not better than party spirit.

God's wisdom, or God in His wisdom, has given the earth the power to produce all that is required for the nourishment of all its inhabitants, yearly and for every year.

Our monetary, economic and political systems should abide by this will of God that is so well expressed in nature. I was going to say in the Bible, but nature is, still more than the Bible, the word of God. Nature is rather the act of God, than the word.

When in your Canada pension plan you are asking, you are requiring an 18 year old boy, who is not yet entitled to vote to start paying taxes out of a meagre salary, so as to save money in order to get the benefit of it in 52 years, when he is 70 years old perhaps, if he is still living at that time, in the year 2016, you are guilty of a sacrilege, a sacrilege against God, against his Bible, against his gospel, against your oath of allegiance.

When a young man has not enough money to live decently at the present time, to marry, to carry on his studies, if he so wishes, you force him to put aside certain sums which will serve to pile up billions of dollars—according to the Minister of National Health and Welfare $8 billion will be accumulated in ten years—I submit that this is disgraceful. In fact, I believe that as Canadians, as representatives of the people, if we cannot find a more logical formula which would be more acceptable to the people, it would be preferable for us to resign and go back home, because not one of us deserves to represent the people.

Those were the remarks I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

Mr. H. E. Gray (Essex West): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to speak in support of second reading of this bill to create a Canada pension plan. I suppose it is understandable that I do have a certain pride in the fact that whatever the interests of the other parties might have been, this Liberal government has been the first to actually present to parliament legislation to create a comprehensive, portable pension plan for Canadians. While this legislation may represent the end result of a series of conferences and discussions with provincial governments and others, this should not be a reason for concern or criticism if it has led to a better plan than would have been the case without those conferences and discussions. I think this is what has happened. The turmoil, the ill will that followed the introduction by the former New Democratic party government of Saskatchewan of its medicare program shows what can happen when far reaching measures of social welfare are introduced without first having adequate consultation and discussion involving all groups concerned.

It is important that any such measure be the subject of the fullest and widest consultation and discussion so that it will work relatively smoothly from the very beginning and provide the benefits intended. This smooth operation has characterized the introduction of every social welfare measure created by previous Liberal governments. Old age security, unemployment insurance, family allowance all worked properly from the beginning without breakdowns due to conflicts, disputes or constitutional arguments; and I am sure that as a result of the consultations and discussions which preceded this piece of legislation, it will work equally well.

The introduction of this legislation with the approval of the provinces, who would otherwise have had the constitutional power to block it, demonstrates the true effectiveness of this government not only in maintaining but also in strengthening national unity. It has been a vindication of its concept of co-operative federalism, involving as it does consultation with other levels of government in matters of common concern in order to create programs in the national interest. Without this concept of co-operative federalism there could not have been a national pension plan at this time and national unity would have been the weaker. In getting the agreement of all provinces to this legislation and introducing it into parliament at this time, this government has done more in a solid and meaningful way for the cause of national unity present and future than any number of dramatic opposition speeches, no matter how

colourful and flowery and no matter how often they contain the word "Canada".

Mr. Nielsen: Read on.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, this legislation is creating a standard of retirement benefit, of survivor and disability benefits for all people in this country no matter where they live. It has made it easier for people to take advantage of opportunity no matter where it may exist within our boundaries. With this bill this government has woven strands essential to the strengthening of the national fabric—

Mr. Grafftey: Stephen Leacock.

Mr. Gray: —and has created another powerful reason for all of us to continue living together as Canadians. The definite need for this plan at this time is surely demonstrated by the fact that almost 75 per cent of our total labour force has no coverage at all under private pension plans, and many of those who do belong to such plans do not have anything that could be called adequate coverage. The existence of 4,600,000 workers without coverage and the nature of the coverage of the many who are in private plans show to what extent private insurance companies have not—

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, I would ask for the author of the document from which the hon. member is quoting.

Mr. Rhéaume: Tom Kent wrote that.

Mr. Gray: I am pleased to inform this house, Mr. Speaker, that I happen to be the author and I have to take responsibility for what is in it, for better or for worse.

An hon. Member: It sure is for worse.

Mr. Gray: It is not as bad as some of the things those on the opposite side of the house have said. Perhaps I may continue, Mr. Speaker. Private insurance companies have not used the opportunity that is theirs to fill this definite social need—an opportunity which some of these companies at least have now been asking governments to leave entirely to them alone.

Questions have inevitably been raised as to whether or not we can afford this type of social security, this type of social security system embodied in the Canada pension plan. But those asking these questions overlook the ability to support this type of plan existing in our buoyant economy and the ability that will come through increasing productivity and the continuing growth of this economy. Canada certainly spends less of its gross national product, according to the recent white paper on this subject, on its old age security program and on programs of supplementary aid for the elderly than other English speaking countries. In the 1962-63 fiscal year Canada spent only 2 per cent of its gross national product for that purpose, while Australia spent 2.3 per cent, the United States 2.7 per cent, and 3.4 per cent was spent by the United Kingdom. It is expected that when this Canada pension plan is operated fully our country's spending on the aged will increase to only 2.3 per cent.

There have also been criticisms of the plan because it has been suggested that full benefits would be available to some, even though they have contributed for only ten years and their contributions would not equal the benefits they would be obtaining. But this would be true only in so far as it applies to those reaching pensionable age at the end of the initial ten year transition period; it would not be true in so far as any other ten year period of contribution under this plan is concerned.

After all, Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons for creating a national contributory pension scheme at this time is to make sure that reasonable retirement benefits are available to those in their 40's or 50's who are nearing retirement age, most of whom belong to no private pension plan at all or have no adequate coverage under any private plan. There would be not much point in creating such a plan now if these important groups of people were to be overlooked. But this is exactly the same thing that has been done by many private pension plans when they have been set up by employers which give credit to their employees for years of service rendered before the new plan goes into effect. This means that employees who have worked for the maximum period required by the plan are entitled to full benefits when they retire, even though they have not contributed over the entire period before the plan went into effect. And the right to enrol in such private plans is frequently restricted to employees of 55 years of age or less who can be expected to work at least another ten years before retirement. If they complete these ten years of service they would then receive the full pension benefits.

This is exactly what happens under the Canada pension plan. People who can serve another ten years of pensionable employment from the date the plan comes into

operation will be able to get full benefits when they retire, even though the benefits they are to receive would be far in excess of their contributions. Therefore the Canada pension plan, in the same way as private plans, recognizes the past service of employees, the contribution they have made to their country, and permits them to receive full benefits. This certainly cannot be considered an unfair burden on our younger people who will be contributing to the plan for a long period. After all, they have benefited from the efforts of those who are now reaching retirement age. In any event, it would not be correct to say that the difference between the amounts contributed by those who do receive full benefit at the end of the transition period and the amounts of these pensions would be paid solely by the younger people. This difference would undoubtedly be made up, at least in part, by contributions from employers.

However, the argument has still been made that in creating the Canada pension plan we will be placing future generations in a situation where they have an overly onerous burden placed upon their shoulders, forcing them to pay the costs of the benefits which we may be establishing today. But this plan's approach is basically the same as that of our existing old age security system under which those now working pay for the old age pension of those who are retired; and the same can be said to apply with respect to our other existing social welfare benefits—that those not getting them help pay for those who are, to the benefit of the entire population. If the contributions of those who come after will pay for the pensions of those already retired, they in turn will be in the same situation.

The minister in her speech on second reading pointed out the unlikelihood of an increase in contribution rates for a generation; but if after 20 years some increase does become necessary surely it will be no different from increasing taxes, as we have done from time to time, to bring about needed increases in existing old age security pensions. I am sure that, as is the case today, members of future generations will be more concerned with the percentage of their income which they pay to the plan and the benefits they receive from it than the possibility that they are also helping to pay for benefits for others.

This Canada pension plan finally before us has also been subject to criticism because it provides for the building up of a sizeable fund in its initial stages which will be available to the provinces in proportion to the contributions from them. It seems curious to me that some of this criticism has appeared to come from some of the very same people who criticized the complete pay as you go basis of the first version of this plan on the ground that it was not actuarially sound. While in this house we cannot attribute motives to speakers within its walls I do not suppose that there is anything to prevent us from doing so with regard to those who criticize in this way legislation of this type. In any event, there has been a lot of discussion lately about priorities of government expenditure, what should come first, whether it should be pensions or education or medical care. But this question cannot be answered by fixing on only one of these needs to the complete exception of all the others. The sick, the aged, the young are all part of our society, as they always will be. None of them can be ignored completely while another group is being looked after.

Therefore, the priorities can only be priorities of emphasis and of degree. You cannot decide that for the next ten years, for example, you will spend money only on schools and nothing on pensions. Some way must be found to meet these needs to one extent or another. The building up of a fund from the contributions made during the initial years of the Canada pension plan provides a way, at least a partial way, of dealing with this question of priorities for the next several decades, of harmonizing seemingly conflicting needs of different segments of our population, all of which have a right to be taken care of to some degree at the same time.

I wonder if I might call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Rhéaume: Read another couple of pages.

Mr. Gray: I see there are still a few minutes so I will continue with my remarks.

There has been a tremendous demand for schools arising out of our rapidly expanding population and its need to adapt to changing technology. This same population has created a similar demand for hospital facilities and these are considered amongst the most pressing needs for social capital. However these fields fall under the responsibility of the provinces and are likely to do so certainly for the immediate future. To meet these demands for social capital today the provinces must have the necessary finances. The Canada pension plan provides a way for them to

obtain these finances and at the same time enables Canadians to begin providing for themselves a reasonable, basic standard of income for their retirement years.

Some concern has been expressed over the implication of making available these sizeable investment funds to governments, and at having them left in the hands of politicians. While I am not suggesting that all politicians are above reproach, at the same time I cannot accept the argument that all elected representatives in Canada today, aided by their civil service advisers, are generally speaking any less responsible or sound in their judgments than business executives, among whom have been found some who have made decisions which led not only to loss of money on the part of their firms but to actual bankruptcy.

I now see, Mr. Speaker, that the clock has at last caught up with me, so I suppose I can legitimately call it ten o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the house leader, if this debate is concluded tomorrow and if there is any time left, whether we will go on with the smaller items he mentioned yesterday. Then may I ask a second question. Which estimates may we expect to take up in the house on Thursday and Friday?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we propose continuing with the present debate on the second reading of the Canada pension plan. If it is finished before the end of the day we will take up the three bills I mentioned last night, as set out at page 10151 of *Hansard*. On Thursday it is my understanding that the chairman of the special committee on the Canadian flag proposes to move concurrence in the report of the flag committee.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the importance of the business that has been mentioned but I was wondering whether the house leader has given consideration to the fact that perhaps a few more days uninterrupted on the main estimates would ease him quite a bit in the onerous duties he is performing in this house. Because I am sure he would not want to ask for interim supply again, having received nine twelfths of the fiscal year already.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would care to be very specific and tell us just how many days is "a few" in that context and how many estimates would be through at the end of that period, I would certainly give the matter very urgent consideration.

Mr. Winkler: Let us start with justice.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, the house leader has asked me a question. My survey of the situation leads me to say that I think the main estimates, if discussion is continued without interruption, can be completed by the 30th of November.

Mr. Leboe: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that if we can get these estimates before the house I think we can dispose of them all by the end of the month and the government would then have control of the house. As long as they have to come back for interim supply they have not got control of the house and I think it is in the interests of parliament—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. My understanding is that it is irregular to have a debate on the announcement of government business. It is the duty of the government house leader to announce the business. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre wants to ask a question—

Mr. Knowles: Yes, I should like to ask a question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the discussion that has taken place, will the government house leader consider calling a meeting of the party representatives to discuss the program for the immediate future?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, before the leader of the house answers the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), I must say that, in my opinion, we have had enough meetings of the party leaders and that we must accept the house leader's suggestion to the effect that on Thursday we take up at last, consideration of the report of the special committee which had the responsibility of choosing a distinctive Canadian flag model.

We are anxious to settle this issue in order that we can consider after that all the programs which our friends the Conservatives might want to suggest to the government.

[*Text*]

Mr. Olson: May I ask the house leader a question? When the motion is moved for concurrence in the report of the flag committee, will any special provision be made for the question period on the days when that motion is being discussed?

Mr. McIlraith: There has been no request for any such special condition to be made applicable. The motion for concurrence is a routine proceeding and would take precedence over all other business. I will look into the possibility of doing something about this matter. If it became apparent that there was some need for a question period perhaps we could use the hour from 10 to 10.30 for that purpose.

Mr. Douglas: Does this mean that the government intends to proceed with the discussion of the flag committee's report and continue with it until it is completed? Does this mean that the labour standards act will not be dealt with until after that report has been approved?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, we are getting into a debate—

An hon. Member: Let us have an answer.

Mr. McIlraith: —but may I say I did not put any such negative proposition at all. I was asked, very properly, by the house leader of the official opposition to announce the business. I announced it for the next three days, as I thought was proper, and it must be evident to all hon. members, of course, that we can only discuss one item of business at a time in the house although sometimes I wonder if that is what we actually do.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

INDIAN AFFAIRS—REQUEST FOR EQUALIZATION OF WELFARE PAYMENTS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, today I asked the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration if he would allay the fears of many native Indian people across the country by announcing the government's policy with respect to the amounts of welfare benefit payments to these people in order that the Indian people of Canada will not be enticed into the field of provincial jurisdiction by higher welfare payments when they may not want to participate in the provincial plan.

On November 2, the minister answered a number of questions posed by myself and other members of the house about the procedure to be followed after the dominion-provincial conference on Indian affairs was held. The minister stated, as reported on page 9652 of *Hansard*:

[Mr. Olson.]

> Firstly, in every province of Canada, there shall be held a conference to which all Indians will be invited so they can express their wishes and their suggestions on the very principle of extending provincial services to the Indians in every province.

The first thing these native people would like to know, Mr. Speaker, is who is going to arrange for this conference? How are the native people going to get there? Who is going to pay the costs of the conference, the costs of transportation and the like, of the native people to attend this particular conference? They would like to know that. However, that is incidental to the main point.

I continue to quote from the minister's statement:

> After this consultation and provided the Indians agree that such provincial services would be desirable, there shall be a second method consultation; the bands will be consulted. Every band in Canada or in every province will be consulted—

Then he went on to say that every band in Canada or in every province would be consulted, that is the councils of those bands would be consulted, in order to ascertain if they wished to take advantage of a program to be established in a province, and every band which did not wish to take advantage of provincial services would be free to reject such services. Under those circumstances, the federal services would remain in force.

We do know that there are native Indian people in different parts of Canada who strenuously object to having jurisdiction over their affairs dealt with in any way by provincial governments. There are Indian people in other parts of Canada who believe it would be desirable to have jurisdiction over their affairs dealt with in the same way as everybody else, and that there be equality of application of the law. This situation is likely to develop. A native Indian or a group of native Indians may not want, for the sake of argument, to have jurisdiction over welfare services dealt with by the provincial government. It may well be that the provincial government is paying welfare payments greatly in excess of the niggardly amounts paid by the Indian affairs branch. What they would like to know is if the government will declare that welfare payments payable to native Indian people will be on a par with those made by the various provinces so that this monetary enticement will not be held out to them by the provinces in order to entice the Indian people to come under provincial jurisdiction. This is a serious matter.

Recently, for instance, in British Columbia one of the Indian superintendents, speaking

at a conference of the Nishga tribal council on January 1, said the Indian affairs branch would make welfare payments on the same basis as those payments are made by the provincial authorities. This is a welcome announcement. It should have been made many years ago. We would like to know if this is the policy of the government in all of these provinces. Will they treat the Indian people on a basis of equality in so far as the various services are concerned which might be provided by the provinces, and which they might accept at this conference which is about to be arranged? They want to know where they stand. They do not want to be bought off or have it look as if they are being bought into provincial jurisdiction. If this were to be the case, it would be a most disgraceful state of affairs, to have a province offer money to the native people to get them to come under their jurisdiction and relinquish what they feel in their hearts are their rights under the crown, and under the jurisdiction of the government of Canada.

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, when speaking on his estimates on August 14 the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration made the following statement, as recorded at page 6864 of *Hansard* for that date:

> Concern has been expressed about the apparent disparities between the amount of public assistance provided to Indians as compared to that received by other residents of the various provinces. On the surface there appear to be such disparities. However, they are more apparent than real. Indian assistance rates cover food only. Fuel, shelter, clothing and other forms of assistance are provided to Indians as extra items on the basis of need. On the other hand, provincial scales, though varying greatly from province to province, generally include a lump sum payment for food, shelter, clothing, fuel and other needs.

From the minister's statement it can readily be seen that the difference between the welfare rates used by the Indian affairs branch and the rates used by the provinces are more apparent than real. The Indian affairs branch rates cover food only, with clothing and other necessities provided separately, as required, while provincial rates cover all items including food.

However, I want to assure the hon. member that the department has decided to adjust its welfare rates to conform with those of the provinces concerned, and this will be done as quickly as possible or as soon as the details can be worked out. Indians will not be brought under the jurisdiction of the provinces without their own consent.

I think that, Mr. Speaker, answers the questions asked by the hon. member for Skeena and I am sure that so far as this government is concerned he need not fear about the treatment of Indians. In other words, they will be treated fairly.

Mr. Howard: In other words, there is no difference but you are going to adjust it anyway.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE—INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT OF APPEAL BOARD

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, on July 27 I asked the Minister of Justice, who I am disappointed not to see in his seat tonight particularly because of the gravity with which I view the situation, to provide an answer to this question. On that date I suggested that the minister give consideration to setting up an appeal board procedure similar to that which is used in the armed forces court martial appeal board, so that there could be impartial and rapid disposal of charges which have been brought against members of the R.C.M.P. under rules which at best can be described as rather archaic.

The minister said he would consider the matter as one for government policy. I presume the parliamentary secretary will be answering for him tonight and I wish to suggest it is a matter of great urgency, as pointed out by the recent developments in Montreal with respect to two highly placed officers, one the commanding officer of the whole subdivision, who have been dealt with by a trial procedure and convicted.

An appeal was brought before three other officers, as is the procedure under the act. The appeal was dismissed and a recommendation was made by the commissioner of the mounted police, which the minister has not yet dealt with, notwithstanding the fact that it was made shortly before Labour day. For two and a half months these officers and their families have been kept in suspense waiting upon the minister's decision. The minister has to decide, of course, whether or not to recommend to his cabinet colleagues that the recommendation of the commissioner be carried out. I put it to the parliamentary secretary that this procedure is archaic. It is time it was changed. Justice delayed is justice denied and no further delay can be justified in this particular case.

It has not been my intention to jeopardize the individuals concerned or the good reputation which the R.C.M.P. enjoys not only in

this country but throughout the world. But national press stories, particularly one which appeared on November 13 in the Toronto *Star*, have now publicized details of the case and it is time the minister or someone in authority spoke up. Any further delay would amount to a complete neglect of the responsibility which the minister has for making a decision. Since the recommendation was made, two and a half months have gone by and the individual officers concerned should not, in my opinion, be held any longer in suspense with regard to the unfortunate developments which have placed them in the position in which they now find themselves and their families. An impartial appeal procedure similar to that available to the armed forces would do away with this kind of injustice.

My purpose in raising this matter on July 17 continues to be my purpose. As matters have developed there appears to be a need for the minister to say something which will restore morale which has deteriorated seriously within the force. I see the parliamentary secretary laughing at that, but I am serious when I say to him that the morale of the force has been jeopardized by this delay. The minister has a responsibility to restore it. It does not take two and a half months for all the surrounding circumstances to be investigated so that the minister can reach a decision. I know I shall probably be told that all the surrounding circumstances are being investigated and that when this investigation has been completed an announcement will be made. But even if only two months had elapsed there would have been ample time for the minister to have acted responsibly.

The delay is having a serious effect also on the confidence placed by the minister in the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. who made the recommendation based on the advice of four senior officers of the force. Either the minister has confidence in the commissioner or he has not. It is time this house and the public knew. It would also be good for the morale of individuals in the force if they, too, knew how the minister stands in this regard.

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): It seems to me there are two things to be said with respect to the hon. member's observations tonight. The first is that it is a sad and grave misfortune both for the individuals involved in this particular situation and for the proud service to which they belong that these incidents should have arisen. I know all right thinking people would agree that the fact these circumstances have come to pass should not be the basis for any type of unfair yellow journalism or for any type of political exaggeration.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

It comes as a surprise to me that the hon. member should have described the rules as archaic and the procedure as being out of date, because he should know that the statute which governs this situation was enacted by parliament in 1959, at a time when the hon. member was a member of this house and a supporter of the government of the day and if, indeed, the rules are as fraught with injustice as he maintains, it is extraordinary he should have sat through that debate so supinely and done nothing to assert what seems to him now to be a basic principle. If this was not evident to the hon. member in 1959 it should certainly have been evident to him and to the government he supported in 1961.

I would refer the house to the case of re Walsh and Jordan, reported in volume 31 Dominion Law Reports, second series, 1962, at page 88, a justice of the Ontario high court held that the Canadian Bill of Rights had no application to the procedure which was involved in that case, which also related to disciplinary action against an officer of the R.C.M.P. It was held that this much-vaunted statute was here again just a dead letter and had no application. If indeed the government which the hon. gentleman supported felt at that time that there was a question of justice involved here, one would have expected they would have taken some action on it. However, I think a further important characteristic here is that you are involved in the cases of two men with, respectively, 34 years and 15 years service in this force. I do not think any member present who stops to reflect on these matters would want any kind of drumhead justice—would want them to lose, for example, the pension rights which they have accrued—without a full consideration of their cases.

AGRICULTURE—OTTAWA VALLEY—EMERGENCY LEGISLATION RESPECTING DROUGHT CONDITIONS

Mr. J. J. Greene (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, today I asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays) and, in his absence, the parliamentary secretary with regard to the very serious situation of drought which exists in eastern Ontario generally and in Renfrew county in particular. Yesterday the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue (Mr. Martineau) asked a question with regard to a similar situation which apparently exists

in Pontiac, in the province of Quebec. At that time the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé), who replied to the question, felt that some action should be taken in this regard by the province of Quebec.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that this matter is of some national moment as well as of great importance to the farmers of Renfrew county, by reason of the statement of the hon. member for Battle River-Camrose (Mr. Smallwood), who indicated that the forcible sale of cattle by farmers of eastern Ontario, and in particular Renfrew county where the drought is most severe, might result in affecting cattle prices across the nation as a whole. I think, therefore, the problem is one which affects not only the particular area of drought, which is largely in Renfrew and Lanark counties, but possibly the national economy in so far as it pertains to the sale and price of cattle across the country. I would point out that I appreciate there is a constitutional difficulty in these matters; that unfortunately national legislation pertaining to crises in various provinces where, through no fault of their own the farmers of this country are very hard hit by drought or other disasters of this nature which stem from an act of God, is possibly lacking in this parliament by reason of the fact that to date no national policy has been evolved with the co-operation of the provinces.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do submit that in a situation such as this, which affects not only the economic well-being of these farmers but even involves the possibility of the wells being dry and the water tables being extremely low, and which might affect the question of health and welfare in these areas, surely when a crisis of this kind occurs some action can be taken under the federal powers to remedy it. This is a very serious situation which exists in the counties of Renfrew and Lanark by reason of the very serious drought existing at the present time and the very bad conditions with regard to the wells and water tables. I would point out that the entire season has been dry to the extent that the hay crop has been short, so that at the present time feed is extremely short. Accordingly these farmers have to sell cattle at below their market value almost on a forced sale basis. Not only will this create very serious economic difficulties for them but it will possibly depress the market generally.

I would also point out the serious emergency situation existing not only with respect to cattle but with regard to the tobacco growers of the area. Theirs is very nearly a total loss this year by reason of the drought, and I suggest that some action should be taken by the department not only to remedy the situation regarding the shortage of hay, but to enable these unfortunate tobacco farmers to recover from the blow they have suffered. I may say that tobacco farming in this area is in its infancy. I think it is well known that this area is not a rich economic area. It is an economic area where any industry, such as tobacco farming, which is beginning to show some signs of good prospects, should be encouraged. Total loss in one of the early years could prove fatal to this burgeoning industry.

The Minister of Agriculture has displayed, I think, a dynamism and capacity for action. I think he has come to be known as the farmers' C. D. Howe, and it is to be hoped that in a situation such as this some action will be forthcoming along the lines we have become accustomed to from the dynamic Minister of Agriculture who is in office at the present time.

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member for Renfrew South for bringing this important matter to the attention of all hon. members. I wish to offer him my congratulations for his very deep concern for the farmers of his constituency. This provides me with an opportunity to restate the policy of the government and also to relate some first hand experiences which I had with you, Mr. Speaker, in the county of Stormont, where I had the opportunity of viewing some of the serious conditions existing in your county, which I know are typical of the problem areas of eastern Canada.

The policy of the government, as was the policy of previous governments, has been that the federal government should not interfere unless requested to do so by the province concerned. A province would not normally ask for federal assistance unless it felt that any loss occasioned was beyond their financial capacity to absorb. But the federal government has recognized that many of these problem areas do present a serious drain on the finances of the provinces and therefore the government has been only too willing to enter into consultations with the provinces and to reach agreement on a policy whereby federal assistance can be made available, provided the province concerned initiates the request. The policy is simply that the federal government and the province concerned

would enter into an agreement whereby they would pay collectively 75 per cent of the cost of transportation of fodder into these areas up to a maximum of $10 per ton. In addition, the federal government would assist the provinces in paying the transportation of livestock back to the market. This, of course, clearly places a responsibility for initiating any measure of assistance in drought stricken areas on the province.

I think there is also one other responsibility here and I make this statement entirely on my own. I believe that where there is dire need, and hardship has occurred, it is the responsibility of the municipality to take some action and to give some leadership in assessing the over-all needs of the municipality. It should also give some leadership in seeing to it that the policies of the province and of the federal government are clearly understood and used by the farmers in the area.

The hon. member of Renfrew South has referred to tobacco. I think he is probably aware, as are other hon. members, that this government has instituted a policy of crop reinsurance whereby the principle of crop insurance has been broadened. This would offer some degree of protection for specialized crops in specific areas such as he has mentioned. This could also apply to other crops in a similar way. In concluding I wish to thank the hon. member again for bringing this matter to the attention of the house.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.33 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 18, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

CHANGE IN SEATING ARRANGEMENTS OF NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, and I may say it is a very pleasant one. I should like to express the thanks of our party to the hon. member for Chicoutimi and to his party for the kindness they have shown in making available a seat in our area of the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: One of my hon. friends is asking me to express my thanks to the Progressive Conservative party, too, but that was not part of what I intended to say.

In the light of all this may I ask that the following changes of seating be noted: the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway to seat No. 214; the hon. member for Winnipeg North to seat No. 239; the hon. member for Danforth to seat No. 240; the hon. member for New Westminster to seat No. 241; the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond to seat No. 267, and the hon. member for Hamilton South to seat No. 268. This will leave seat No. 269 available for the new member for Waterloo South, Mr. Max Saltsman.

Mr. Speaker: Will the Clerk please take note of the seating changes.

PRIVILEGE

MR. COWAN—REMARKS IN DEBATE BY PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO JUSTICE MINISTER

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): I rise on a question of privilege at this time on behalf of myself personally and of other newspapermen in the house to protest against the language used by the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice last night in endeavouring to answer a question raised by the hon. member for Yukon.

It is bad enough to have a newspaper accused of yellow journalism when it practices deceit, but when a newspaper gives a straightforward, honest statement of the facts as was the case in the report regarding those two high ranking R.C.M.P. officers in Montreal, no one in the Department of Justice has any right to refer to it as yellow journalism. The hon. gentleman also suggested that no member of this house would want any kind of drumhead justice considered, since the Department of Justice has been studying the pension rights of the two men who have been tried and convicted. I should like to ask the parliamentary secretary whether arrangements are being made for pensions for printers who are on strike at *La Presse,* Montreal and at the *Telegram,* the *Star* and the *Globe and Mail* in Toronto. These men have forsworn their pension rights though they never stole anything from anybody.

WATER RESOURCES

ELLIOT LAKE—STATEMENT ON REPORTED RADIOACTIVE POLLUTION

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): As minister through whom the atomic energy control board reports to parliament, I should like to make a statement on radioactive contamination in waters in the Elliot Lake area and to reiterate the assurance given last Friday by the Prime Minister that there is no immediate hazard to the public and that adequate steps are being taken.

The question of pollution in provincial waters is of course one primarily of provincial jurisdiction, and to this end the province of Ontario has given the Ontario water resources commission the task of monitoring pollution in provincial waters. To safeguard the health of the public, the commission works in close co-operation with the Ontario department of health. Because, however, of the radioactive element in the present case the atomic energy control board has a direct interest.

Since 1957 the Ontario water resources commission has been actively engaged in carrying out investigations in the Elliot Lake area directed primarily toward minimizing the chemical and physical effects of uranium ore waste on the Serpent river watershed, and during this period has kept the atomic energy control board informed as to the

presence and levels of radioactive elements in the waters of the area.

In order to rectify the existing situation, which has some long term dangers but no immediate hazards, the commission has been discussing with the mining companies concerned the taking of measures necessary, both in their view and in the view of the atomic energy control board, to bring about an abatement of the existing pollution. I am advised that the steps taken by the Ontario water resources commission to date and the future plans to deal with this situation are fully supported by the atomic energy control board, and further that the atomic energy control board endorses the conclusions reached by the commission and the Ontario department of health, namely that there is no immediate hazard to persons in the affected area; rather, these agencies are concerned with the possibilities of a long term—that is, many years—hazard that could develop should the situation not be brought under control at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to table, for the information of hon. members, an official statement by the Ontario water resources commission outlining the steps being taken in this regard and their plans for the future.

In so far as other areas in Canada are concerned where uranium mining is being carried on, I am advised that radioactive contamination of water supplies as a consequence of these mining operations is not a problem. A recent report regarding the spreading of dust from the piles of tailings is also unduly alarmist. I am advised by the atomic energy control board that the concentration of radioactive material in this dust is so low as not to constitute a hazard to health.

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct two questions to the Minister of Industry regarding the report he made to the house this afternoon, which to my mind was far from reassuring.

First, how does it come about that the atomic energy control board, which has some measure of responsibility, has allowed this situation with reference to radiation pollution to go as far as it has without more effective measures being taken? Second, has his attention been drawn to the statement which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of November 17 by Mr. Frank Wright, former health inspector in that area, who said that he drew the situation to the attention of the mining companies and the health authorities and was told to mind his own business, and was able to get no action whatsoever? I want to ask the minister whether any machinery is being set up to tighten inspection so the situation will not become worse.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam will take the time to read the statement on the situation which I have tabled, I think a number of his doubts will probably be resolved. In regard to his question as to how come this situation has been allowed to arise, I might say that a situation has arisen which does present a long term hazard to health if nothing is done. It does not present a short term hazard to health today. The long term hazard has been some time in arising, and it is being dealt with in time and adequately.

In so far as the statement of the health inspector is concerned, as I recollect the report it was to the effect that he had left that particular job last June and was entirely unfamiliar with what has happened in the Elliot lake area since June. If both he and the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam will read the statement I have tabled I think both he and the hon. member will be satisfied.

Mr. Douglas: I listened to the statement very carefully, and all I could gather was that the minister was sure the danger had not reached serious proportions. Will he tell the house what has happened since June in the Elliot Lake area which makes the situation any different from that described by Mr. Wright.

Mr. Drury: In the paper I have tabled the steps which have been taken or which are being taken are outlined, steps which are designed to lead and which will in fact lead to the abatement of this pollution.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

VACANT POSITIONS FOR PSYCHOLOGISTS, KINGSTON PENITENTIARY

Question No. 1,926—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Regarding the three positions for psychologists now vacant at the federal penitentiary in Kingston (a) how long has each position been vacant (b) what are the qualifications required for each position (c) what is the salary offered for each position (d) is the government engaged in active efforts to fill these positions?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): (a) These positions have been vacant as follows:

(i) One vacancy since 15 April 1959; (ii) one vacancy since 1 April 1962; (iii) one vacancy since 26 June 1962. An appointment has been made to this vacancy which will take effect on the 1st October 1964.

(b) and (c) The qualifications and relative salary ranges for these positions are as follows:

(i) Psychologist 4, $7,540-$8,040, graduation from a university of recognized standing with a Ph.D. in psychology or a master's degree in psychology plus five years' responsible professional experience; (ii) psychologist 3, $6,940-$7,840, graduation from a university of recognized standing with a master's degree in psychology plus two years' responsible professional experience or completion of all requirements for a Ph.D. in psychology less thesis; (iii) psychologist 2, $6,340-$7,240, graduation from a university of recognized standing with a master's degree in psychology; (iv) psychologist 1, $6,140-$6,940, graduation from a university of recognized standing with a bachelor's degree in psychology, plus three years' suitable experience. Candidates with all requirements for an M.A. degree in psychology less thesis are eligible for appointment to this grade without the experience requirement.

In all cases efforts are made to procure the employment of qualified candidates meeting the highest standard. However, if no qualified candidates are available for employment at the highest rates, appointments are made at the appropriate rates corresponding to the candidates' qualifications.

(d) Yes, these positions have been advertised extensively in the press and in professional periodicals.

Questions

DEATHS OF R.C.M.P. PERSONNEL

Question No. 1,975—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. How many members of the R.C.M.P. died during the last ten years?
2. How many of those deceased officers were in service, and how many were superannuated?
3. How many members of the R.C.M.P. in service or superannuated have committed suicide during the last ten years?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): 1. During the period October 1, 1954 to September 30, 1964, 123 serving members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and 397 pensioners died. Of the 123 serving members, 61 died of natural causes, 41 by accidental death, two by misadventure, five were murdered and 14 committed suicide. Of the pensioners, 391 died of natural causes, four by accidental death and two by suicide. It is not known how many former members who were not on pension died.

2. Of the 520 deceased members, 123 were in service and 397 were superannuated.

3. During the period October 1, 1954 to September 30, 1964, 14 serving members and two pensioners committed suicide.

R.C.M.P. AIR DIVISION

Question No. 2,026—**Mr. Rhéaume:**

1. What is the total capital investment of the R.C.M.P. air division under each of the headings, buildings, aircraft, vehicles, parts, at each of the following locations (a) Churchill, Manitoba (b) Fort Smith, N.W.T. (c) Inuvik, N.W.T. (d) Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.
2. What staff establishment does the R.C.M.P. air division have at each of the abovementioned locations?
3. What were the total maintenance and operating expenditures for the R.C.M.P. air division for the 1961-62 and 1962-63 fiscal years, at each of the above locations under each of these headings (a) staff wages, including isolation allowances (b) travel and removal expenditures for staff (c) net costs of crown housing supplied to staff (d) total operating costs of aircraft, vehicles and other equipment?
4. What was the total mileage flown by R.C.M.P. aircraft based at each of the above locations during fiscal years 1961-62 and 1962-63?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): 1. Total capital investment

Location	Buildings	Aircraft	Vehicles	Parts
(a) Churchill, Man.	$ 58,881.00	$118,000.00	Nil	$2,800.00
(b) Fort Smith, N.W.T.	61,032.00	128,023.00	Nil	2,300.00
(c) Inuvik, N.W.T.	156,900.24	130,635.50	Nil	1,200.00
(d) Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.	Nil	132,309.60	Nil	1,700.00

2. Staff establishment: Churchill Manitoba, 1 staff sergeant and 1 special constable; Fort Smith, N.W.T., 1 staff sergeant and 1 special constable; Inuvik, N.W.T., 1 staff sergeant and 1 special constable; Frobisher Bay, N.W.T., 1 staff sergeant and 1 special constable.

Questions

3. Total maintenance and operating expenditures

	1961-62 $	1962-63 $
Churchill, Manitoba		
(a)	16,116	16,222
(b)	3,061	2,352
(c)	4,353	1,201
(d)	14,150	29,307
Fort Smith, N.W.T.		
(a)	16,516	17,825
(b)	2,107	2,632
(c)	2,013	2,417
(d)	22,655	14,832
Inuvik, N.W.T.		
(a)	16,076	16,397
(b)	1,498	2,281
(c)	2,856	2,856
(d)	15,772	28,229
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.		
(a)	16,586	16,626
(b)	1,772	1,072
(c)	3,280	3,280
(d)	14,494	13,798
4. Total mileage flown		
Churchill, Manitoba	62,639	44,860
Fort Smith, N.W.T.	26,260	69,219
Inuvik, N.W.T.	59,455	77,381
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.	46,760	61,916

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY STAFF

Question No. 2,032—**Mr. Bell:**

1. What is the ratio of staff to inmates at Dorchester penitentiary, New Brunswick, and how does this compare with the other Canadian penitentiaries?

2. Were any complaints received from staff organizations about understaffing or related problems at Dorchester penitentiary during the past few years and, if so, what action was taken?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1. The ratio of staff to inmates at the Dorchester penitentiary, New Brunswick, and its relation to the ratio of staff to inmates with other Canadian penitentiaries is as follows:

Dorchester, 1 officer per 2.1 inmates; St. Vincent de Paul, 1 officer per 2.04 inmates; Federal training centre, 1 officer per 1.8 inmates; Leclerc, 1 officer per 2.2 inmates; Kingston, 1 officer per 2.7 inmates; Joyceville, 1 officer per 2.2 inmates; Collin's Bay, 1 officer per 1.9 inmates; Prison for women, 1 officer per 2.3 inmates; Manitoba, 1 officer per 2.3 inmates; Saskatchewan, 1 officer per 2.7 inmates; British Columbia, 1 officer per 2.6 inmates.

[Mr. Favreau.]

2. In December 1961, the civil service association of Canada complained of the shortage of staff at the Dorchester penitentiary. Since, there have been 31 additions to the staff establishment.

SUBSIDY TO CANADIAN RAILWAYS

Question No. 2,055—**Mr. Woolliams:**

1. What subsidy was paid in 1963 out of the federal treasury to the Canadian railways?

2. What subsidy has been promised for 1964 and/or paid?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Payments made subject to order number 96300, dated November 17, 1958, of the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada, which provides for payments to companies of an aggregate amount of $20,000,000 in respect of the period April 1, 1963, to March 31, 1964, to be paid in instalments at such times as may be determined by the said board for the purpose of reimbursing the said companies for such diminution in their aggregate gross revenues during the said period as in the opinion of the said board is attributable to such companies maintaining the rate level for freight traffic at an 8 per cent increase instead of 17 per cent as authorized by the said order; and to provide payments to the said companies of an aggregate amount in respect of the calendar year 1963 of $50,000,000 to be paid in instalments at such times and in accordance with such methods of allocation as may be determined by the said board for the maintenance by such companies of the rates of freight traffic at the said reduced level, $68,086,164.

Further payments in respect of the period from April 30, 1962, to March 31, 1963, to companies as defined in the Freight Rates Reduction Act in the manner and subject to the same terms and conditions as payments made pursuant to that act in previous fiscal years, $14,761.

Payments to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian National Railways Company, equal to the annual cost of maintaining the trackage between specified points in Ontario on the transcontinental lines of the said railways, $7,000,000.

2. No action has yet been taken on interim payments for 1964-1965; $7,000,000 has been provided in the main estimates for 1964-1965 for payments to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian National Railways Company in respect of the annual cost of maintaining the trackage between specified

points in Ontario on the transcontinental lines of the said railways.

FAILURE TO PROSECUTE UNDER INCOME TAX ACT

Question No. 2,074—**Mr. Smith:**

Since April 8, 1963, have there been any instances when the government has not initiated, or continued, prosecutions under the Income Tax Act when such action had been recommended to the government prior to that date and, if so, how many such instances?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): There have been three instances since April 8, 1963 when the government has not initiated, or continued, prosecution under the Income Tax Act when such action has been recommended to the government prior to that date. In one instance, through a misunderstanding of instructions, the taxpayer was led to believe that the payment of a penalty would conclude the case; in another instance, the evidence was reconsidered on the advice of counsel and it was determined to indicate a civil matter rather than fraud; and in the other instance, key witnesses died and before alternative evidence could be obtained, the time within which a prosecution could be initiated had expired.

R.C.M.P. SHIPS, WEST COAST

Question No. 2,081—**Mr. Basford:**

What are the names, sizes, headquarters port and intended purpose, or use, of all R.C.M. Police motorized ships of 20 feet over-all length or more, stationed on the west coast?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): There are 14 R.C.M. Police motorized ships of 20 feet over-all length or more stationed on the west coast as follows:

Name of vessel	Size	Headquarters port
M/L *Victoria*	92′	Esquimalt, B.C.
P/B *Tofino*	65′	Ocean Falls, B.C.
P/B *Nanaimo*	65′	Prince Rupert, B.C.
P/B *Masset*	65′	Campbell River, B.C.
P/B *Ganges*	65′	Port Alberni, B.C.
P/B *Alert*	65′	Alert Bay, B.C.
P/B *Sidney*	55′	Ganges, B.C.
P/B *Little Bow II*	55′	Powell River, B.C.
P/B *Advance*	35′	Vancouver, B.C.
P/B *Westview*	35′	Gibsons, B.C.
P/B *Tahsis*	35′	Tahsis, B.C.
M/B *Fort St. James*	29′	Fort St. James, B.C.
M/B *Port Alice*	26′	Port Alice, B.C.
M/B *Fraser*	26′	Vancouver, B.C.

These vessels are used for the enforcement of the federal and provincial statutes in Pacific coastal waters, and in addition, as floating police detachments in isolated areas not accessible to regular land detachments. They also provide transportation for police personnel where other means of transportation are not available. These vessels assist the Royal Canadian Air Force air search and rescue operations as required. They also render assistance to other government departments and, when required, transport seriously ill persons from isolated areas to hospital centres, if no other means of transportation are available.

R.C.M.P. BARRACKS CONSTRUCTION, MAYERTHORPE, ALTA.

Question No. 2,136—**Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson):**

Is it the intention of the government to build a new R.C.M.P. barracks at Mayerthorpe, Alberta and, if so, when?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): It is intended to provide new accommodation for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police at Mayerthorpe, Alberta within the next two years. The building will either be constructed by the government or built by private contract for lease to the force.

PENITENTIARY OFFICERS PROVIDED WITH WEAPONS

Question No. 2,145—**Mr. Howard:**

Since January 1, 1964, has any officer in any penitentiary in Canada been provided with a blackjack or other similar weapon and, if so, how many such officers (by penitentiaries) have been so provided?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Since January 1, 1964, blackjacks or other similar weapons have been issued to officers of the Canadian penitentiary service as follows:

Dorchester penitentiary 7; St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, 7; Manitoba penitentiary, 1; Saskatchewan penitentiary, 3; British Columbia penitentiary, 11.

*FIRE IN OLD POST OFFICE BUILDING, QUEBEC CITY

Question No. 2,150—**Mr. Marcoux:**

1. Did a fire take place on September 3, 1964, in the old Henderson street post office building, in Quebec city, now occupied by the Department of National Health and Welfare?

2. Were employees of the department hospitalized as a result of being overcome by smoke?

3. Was this building fireproof?

4. Are the exits sufficient in number, in accordance with regulations laid down by the federal and provincial departments of public works and, if not, will the Minister of Public Works take the necessary steps to correct any breaches of the regulations?

[*Translation*]

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is: Yes; the answer to the second question is: Yes; the answer to the third question is: No.

This is the answer to the fourth question: At the time of the fire, the number of exits was in accordance with federal standards but, on the sixth and seventh floors, they were not connected by a passage. The Department of Public Works is rectifying this deficiency and, as an added precaution, will build an outside fire escape to ensure the safety of the occupants of the building.

[*Text*]

ALGERIAN IMMIGRANTS

Question No. 2,207—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. How many Algerian families settled on farms in (a) Quebec (b) in Canada, during the year 1963 and to date in 1964?

2. How many Algerians have held jobs in industry and services in (a) Quebec (b) Canada, since 1963?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. Two French families repatriated from Algeria to France were settled on farms in Canada in 1963 and two more so far in 1964. All four families were settled in Quebec.

2. This information is not available.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS ON BEHALF OF FISHERMEN

Question No. 2,233—**Mr. Crouse:**

Will the government give consideration to amending the unemployment insurance regulations which specify that a fisherman may have a contribution of unemployment insurance stamps paid on his behalf by a buyer only in respect of a catch which is delivered to that buyer in a face to face transaction?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): In those cases where fishermen have no actual employer, the buyer of their catch is responsible for the payment and recording of unemployment insurance contributions on their behalf, but only if he is dealing with the fishermen face to face.

This limitation is considered essential in the absence of a real employer-employee relationship. In order that the buyer may make the proper contributions for self employed fishermen, he must know what persons actually participated in making the catch, he must obtain their names and insurance numbers, he must ascertain that no other person is legally acting as their employer in respect of that catch, and he must verify several other particulars specified in the regulations. This can only be done adequately when one of the fishermen who has made the catch delivers it in person to the buyer. It is not considered practicable to maintain control over the plan without this restriction.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND

Question No. 2,235—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. As of October 31, 1964, what is the financial state of the unemployment insurance fund?

2. What are its future prospects?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): 1. On October 31, 1964, the unemployment insurance fund showed a credit balance of $56,750,970.82.

2. It is expected that the contributions to the unemployment insurance fund will continue to increase the financial state of the fund until some time in December 1964. From approximately January 1965, during the heavy claims season, it is expected that the outgo from the fund will exceed its income.

TENDERS FOR POST OFFICE PAINTING, KINCARDINE, ONT.

Question No. 2,238—**Mr. Loney:**

1. Were tenders invited from competent contractors for the painting of the post office at Kincardine, Ontario and, if so, on what date and from whom were the tenders invited?

2. What were the names, addresses and prices submitted for this contract?

3. What is the name of the successful tenderer?

4. At what date was the work to commence?

5. Did the successful tenderer commence work at that date?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. Tenders were invited by public notice posted in the post office lobby on September 3, 1964.

2. One tender was received from Wessels Painting & Decorating, Kincardine, Ont., $893.

3. Wessels Painting & Decorating.

4. No definite date was specified for the commencement of the work.

5. Work commenced on October 26, 1964, and was completed on November 10, 1964.

NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT SERVICE REGISTRATIONS

Question No. 2,241—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. How many people have registered with the national employment service in each two week period in 1964?

2. What proportion of the unemployed workforce is this estimated to represent in each two week period?

3. How many people have successfully been placed in jobs by the national employment service in each two week period?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour):

1. Data are not available by two week periods nor is information available for number of persons registered. The number of applications for employment at N.E.S. offices during calendar months of 1964 including workers who may have made more than one application is as follows: January, 398,043; February, 293,408; March, 290,283; April, 325,655; May, 296,023; June, 344,310; July, 349,349; August, 296,775; September, 316,718.

2. Data are not comparable. N.E.S. data represent number of applications for employment during calendar months while labour force data represent estimates of persons unemployed and seeking work during a particular week of each month. Also N.E.S. data do not represent unemployed persons by labour force definition.

Labour force estimates of persons unemployed and seeking work during survey weeks indicated in 1964 are as follows:

January 18, 466,000; February 22, 467,000; March 21, 456,000; April 18, 403,000; May 23, 293,000; June 20, 282,000; July 18, 265,000; August 22, 247,000; September 19, 218,000.

3. Data are not available for two week periods nor is information available for number of persons placed. The number of placements in employment during calendar months in 1964 including workers who may have been placed more than once is as follows:

January, 73,471; February, 66,673; March, 74,756; April, 104,380; May, 109,669; June, 109,134; July, 123,827; August, 111,407; September, 133,281.

AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES, MOOSE JAW R.C.A.F. STATION

Question No. 2,247—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

1. What was the total cost of the contract to cultivate, fertilize, sow to oats, sow to grass, harvest the oats, and bale straw at the Moose Jaw R.C.A.F. station, Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan?

2. What was the total number of acres to be cultivated and grassed?

3. How many tons of fertilizer were used on this project?

4. Were public tenders called and, if so, how was it advertised?

5. How many tenders were received and the tender prices of each?

6. To whom was this contract awarded and for what amount?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): In so far as Defence Construction (1951) Limited is concerned, the answer is as follows:

1. A contract was awarded for the aerodrome fencing, grading and seeding at R.C.A.F. station, Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, on May 29, 1964, at an estimated cost of $123,919.55 based on unit prices and estimated quantities.

A portion of this contract was let by the prime contractor to a subcontractor for the field seeding. This included cultivating, fertilizing, sowing to oats, sowing to grass, harvesting the oats and baling straw. The amount of this subcontract is not known.

2. 1,121 acres for the entire project of which 850 acres were cultivated and grassed by the subcontractor.

3. Approximately 280 tons.

4. Yes. A tender call for the entire project was advertised in daily and weekly newspapers.

5. Six, $123,919.55; $148,465.76; $152,530.45; $139,929.45; $152,158; $155,841.

6. Sprayturf Limited, Delaware, Ontario, $123,919.55.

ONTARIO—FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO EXPANSION OF MEDICAL TRAINING FACILITIES

Question No. 2,252—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Does the government plan to contribute financially to the recently announced expansion of medical, dental and nursing training facilities in Ontario and, if so, what will be the extent of their contribution?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The federal government has not been officially informed on the details of the Ontario proposals for the expansion of medical, dental and nursing training facilities. However, officers of the Department of National Health and Welfare have been working closely with Ontario officials in a careful study of health needs. This is part of a continuing program of appraisal.

As far as the federal government is concerned, it is hoped to be able to establish a nation-wide picture of needs in this area, and this forms part of the analysis of the royal commission report on health services. This analysis is nearing completion and, as mentioned earlier in the House of Commons, it should be possible to make proposals to the provinces early next year.

POSTAL INFRACTIONS OBSERVED UNDER SURVEILLANCE

Question No. 2,254—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Since the Post Office Department began its policy of peepholes for observing postal employees while at work, or in washrooms, have any postal employees been charged either by the department or in the courts with being guilty of theft and, if so, how many and in what cities?

Questions

2. Have any postal employees been charged and penalized by the Post Office Department for any other offences such as smoking, as a result of infractions observed from the peepholes and, if so, how many and where?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): 1. Observation galleries were installed in post offices many years ago. Since their installation, employees have been charged with theft but there is no record of the number of charges and the cities involved.

2. The Post Office Department cannot recall any cases where as a result of observation from galleries postal employees have been charged and penalized for such infractions as smoking in the prohibited areas of post offices. Normal supervisory steps are taken where regulations of this type are violated.

ENLISTED AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL, ARMED FORCES

Question No. 2,260—**Mr. Doucett:**

1. What is the total number of enlisted personnel serving in our military service as of October 31, 1964?
2. What is the total number of enlisted personnel serving in the Canadian army as of October 31, 1964 (a) in Canada (b) out of Canada?
3. What is the total number of enlisted personnel serving in the Canadian air force as of October 31, 1964 (a) in Canada (b) out of Canada?
4. What is the total number of enlisted personnel serving in the Canadian navy as of October 31, 1964 (a) in Canada (b) out of Canada?
5. What is the total number of civilian personnel employed as of October 31, 1964 (a) in Canada (b) out of Canada, in the (i) Canadian army (ii) Canadian air force (iii) Canadian navy?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1. 98,779.

2. (a) 33,876; (b) 7,784.

3. (a) 35,044; (b) 5,038.

4. (a) 16,834; (b) 203.

5. (a) (i) 15,706; (ii) 13,807; (iii) 11,148; (b) (i) 94; (ii) 33; (iii) 43.

The above strengths are as of September 30, 1964, and do not include commissioned officers.

OPERATION OF EXPERIMENTAL FARM, NAPPAN, N.S.

Question No. 2,268—**Mr. Coates:**

Is it the intention of the Department of Agriculture to close out the operations of the experimental farm at Nappan, N.S. and, if not, will operations of the Nappan experimental farm in any way be curtailed?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): It is not the intention of the Department of Agriculture to close out the operations of the experimental farm at Nappan, N.S.

The operations of the Nappan experimental farm will not be curtailed with respect to work of practical importance to the area which it serves directly. As a general policy it proposed to concentrate basic research at fewer stations. Over a period of time this will involve the transfer of certain basic research studies from Nappan in the interests of providing a better and more efficient research service to the entire Atlantic region.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

EXPENSES OF OBSERVER AT OLYMPIC GAMES

Question No. 2,284—**Mr. Coates:**

Did the government pay the expenses of any person who accompanied Canada's representative to the recent Olympic games in Tokyo and, if so, of whom and what expenses were paid and for what reason?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No.

FIRE PROTECTION, CANADIAN ARSENALS CHERRIER PLANT

Question No. 2,298—**Mr. Pigeon:**

1. Is the Cherrier plant fire protection system at Canadian Arsenals at St-Paul-l'Ermite, county of l'Assomption, adequate?
2. In what year was the fire-pump system purchased?
3. Have the fire hoses ever been replaced?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. Yes.

2. 1942.

3. Yes.

CHERRIER PLANT, CANADIAN ARSENALS

Question No. 2,299—**Mr. Pigeon:**

1. How many employees are presently working at the Cherrier plant of Canadian Arsenals at St-Paul-l'Ermite, l'Assomption county?
2. Since May 1, 1963, how many employees have lost their jobs?
3. Are there any important contracts forthcoming for the Cherrier plant?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. 299.

2. 120.

3. No; work load dependant on requirements of the Department of National Defence.

ADVERTISING FOR GOVERNMENT ANNUITIES

Question No. 2,301—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

In advertising for Canadian government annuities (a) do advertisements say that contributions to annuities are tax deductible (b) do advertisements say that annuity benefits are taxable, and (c) do advertisements include the phrase "Want to save on your income tax?"

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): (a) Yes. The advertisement also explains that the annuity must be registered as a retirement savings plan and that within certain

limits the cost of the annuity can be added to deductions and so lower the taxable income.

(b) No.

(c) The coupon accompanying the advertisement contains the phrase "Want to save on your income tax?".

TRANSFER OF BLUEBERRY EXPERIMENTAL STATION, NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 2,315—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Is it the intention of the Department of Agriculture to transfer their blueberry experimental station from Tower Hill, N.B., to the experimental farm at Kentville, N.S.?

2. What county in Nova Scotia produces a majority of the blueberry crop in Nova Scotia and is there an experimental farm located in that county and, if so, where is it located?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): 1. No decision has been made to transfer any of the blueberry work from Tower Hill, N.B.

2. The majority of the Nova Scotia production of low bush blueberries is in Cumberland county. An experimental farm is located in that county at Nappan.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

AIR CANADA PASSENGER TRAFFIC, NORTHERN ONTARIO

Question No. 2,281—**Mr. Martin (Timmins):**

1. How many Air Canada passengers have (a) embarked, and (b) disembarked at Sudbury, North Bay and Timmins, Ontario, in each month between January 1, 1963 and October 31, 1964?

2. What has been the revenue in Air Canada ticket sales at Sudbury, North Bay and Timmins, Ontario, in each month between January 1, 1963 and October 31, 1964?

3. What was the monthly revenue from Air Canada flight 241 (Ottawa to Toronto) between January 1, 1963 and October 31, 1964?

Return tabled.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, motions 185, 186 and 188 are acceptable to the government. I ask that motions 183, 184 and 187 be allowed to stand.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, as far as motions 183 and 184 are concerned, that is acceptable only in anticipation of getting a favourable response to them next week.

Inquiries of the Ministry

COPIES OF FINAL FLAG DESIGNS

Motion No. 185—**Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton):**

That an order of the house do issue for copies of the final flag designs, in categories A, B and C as voted upon by the special committee on a Canadian flag and listed in detail in the committee's report, page 834, *Votes and Proceedings*, dated October 29, 1964.

Motion agreed to.

CHEQUES ISSUED BY HAL BANKS

Motion No. 186—**Mr. Simpson:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all cheques or photostats thereof connected with Harold Chamberland Banks, esquire, (otherwise known as Hal Banks) and referred to in an article published in the issue of November 6, 1964 of the Toronto *Daily Star*, and which are in the custody of the Department of Labour and/or the maritime board of trustees, or elsewhere under government control.

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESSES AND PRESS RELEASES BY CHAIRMAN OF ECONOMIC COUNCIL

Motion No. 188—**Mr. Fisher:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all public addresses given, and press releases issued, by John J. Deutsch, chairman of the economic council of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

REMOVAL FROM CITIZENSHIP COURTS OF PORTRAITS OF QUEEN

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration whether he will now answer the question I asked yesterday, in addition to tabling the directive to which I drew attention, concerning his instruction to remove the portraits of Her Majesty the Queen from the citizenship courts.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): I see that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) has not yet been successful in reaching the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, but I will be glad—

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Monteith: Who do you think you are?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: —when the Leader of the Opposition is in the house, to give a complete answer to the question asked by the hon. member.

[*Text*]

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question. Using the words of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration himself, has he the courage to answer the question I asked yesterday?

Some hon. Members: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to table the directive given to the citizenship courts in Canada by the citizenship registrar. I reserve the right to answer later the right hon. Leader of the Opposition.

[*Text*]

Mr. Churchill: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the minister would reply to the members of this house rather than trying to dodge the issue. May I ask him this question. Is he accepting full responsibility for the directive which he has now tabled, or is he shifting the burden to a civil servant who is not here in this house to answer for himself?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I assume full responsibility for a decision which was made without my consent but which I find in accordance with protocol instructions.

Mr. Jean-Pierre Côté (Longueuil): Could the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration tell us who is responsible for the protocol, as far as this matter is concerned?

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, those instructions are transmitted from one department to another. I do not think that the minister should reveal who gave advice in this instance.

[*Text*]

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): A further supplementary question. I wonder whether the minister in a few words would tell us the reason these pictures were removed from these courtrooms.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member insists, I have no objection whatsoever to explaining the matter fully. Since the right hon. Leader of the Opposition raised this matter, I thought it was proper to wait for his return. However, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection at all to give all the facts in this matter.

When the right hon. Leader of the Opposition gave his press conference, accusing the government of having ordered citizenship courts to remove portraits of the Queen, he knew very well that no such instruction had been given either by myself or by the government, since I had informed him by telephone that this instruction had been given by the citizenship registrar.

It is customary for the citizenship branch of my department to supply citizenship courts with coats of arms of Canada, flags and portraits of Her Majesty the Queen.

In reply to questions asked by judges of citizenship courts to ascertain where those items should be placed, officials of my department obtained the advice of experts on the matter who said that the coat of arms and flags should be placed in the courtroom while it would be more appropriate to place the portrait of Her Majesty in the judge's chamber, where applicants for Canadian citizenship are interviewed and where the judge can more adequately explain the role of Her Majesty.

May I also add that in our federal courts, such as the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada, only the coat of arms of Canada is placed in the courtrooms.

It is most unfortunate that such unfounded accusations were made by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, which is affecting national unity.

[*Text*]

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Would the minister indicate to this house the department to which these specialists belong?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I answered this question before. I do not think that a minister has the prerogative to reveal from what other department advice was received with regard to a decision made, in full responsibility by the officials of my department, even if advice was sought and received from other departments.

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Starr: I have a further supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We started off this afternoon on a happy note, and I do hope that we can continue in that vein.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question. Did the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration not receive some objections from the officers of these courts in reference to this matter?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: No, Mr. Speaker. To my knowledge no objections were addressed to me. Anyway, as I said before, the decision was not my own, but was made by an official in the discharge of his duties as citizenship registrar. But I now assume full responsibility for this decision.

[*Text*]

Mr. Woolliams: No responsibility.

Mr. Smallwood: Get a new minister. You should resign.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister to indicate the portions of his department for which he is responsible.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Until further notice, the whole department, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is becoming a debate, and I do not see any purpose in continuing it.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

HULL, QUEBEC—INQUIRY AS TO CONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Public Works.

Several weeks ago I asked the minister if his department was contemplating the possibility or opportunity to build public buildings in Hull, Ottawa's neighbour on the other side of the river. The minister told me then that the matter had been agreed to in principle and that we should get an answer within a few days or a few weeks.

Well, several weeks have elapsed since the minister told us that the principle had been accepted. Is he in a position today to tell us what his department or the government intends to do in this respect?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I think I will be in a position to make a statement on that matter any time now.

[*Text*]

TRADE

OIL—PRESSURE TO REDUCE EXPORTS FROM CANADA TO U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Has the minister or the government received any representations or communications from the United States government with regard to oil imports into the United States from Canada, to the effect that the pressure is on to have the quantities reduced?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): No, Mr. Speaker, the only reference I have seen to this matter recently has been the same newspaper report which I am sure the hon. gentleman saw this morning.

AGRICULTURE

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—MAINTENANCE OF FARM CREDIT CORPORATION OFFICE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): In the absence of the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question—

An hon. Member: He is here.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I am sorry; the Minister of Agriculture—I should like to address a question to the acting minister or to the minister's parliamentary secretary. Can he assure the farmers of Prince Edward Island that the supervisory zone office of the Farm Credit Corporation for the province is not being moved to Moncton, New Brunswick?

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for giving notice of his intention to ask this question. I am advised as follows. In February, 1961, the Farm Credit Corporation centralized control of its operations in the Atlantic provinces in a branch office located in Moncton. However, the corporation retained a sub-office in Charlottetown, with a supervisor for the province who also performed the function of assistant branch manager for the Atlantic provinces. In order to improve the operations of the corporation within the Atlantic provinces, the assistant branch manager has been moved to the branch office at Moncton. The supervision office will be retained in Charlottetown

and a new supervisor will be appointed, whose sole responsibility will be to supervise the corporation's services to farmers in Prince Edward Island.

PROPOSED MARCH ON OTTAWA BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC FARMERS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry, in his capacity as minister responsible for eastern agriculture.

Has the minister been informed of the proposed march of 10,000 farmers on Ottawa to be organized by the Ontario farmers' union and the Quebec farmers' union, to protest against the government's inaction with regard to their problems and especially the water shortage and the cattle they are forced to sell?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): No, Mr. Speaker, but together with the Minister of Agriculture, I shall be glad to welcome them in Ottawa.

[*Text*]

Mr. Peters: Will he be here?

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL STUDY CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Inasmuch as a committee of the Quebec legislature is well advanced in its study of the Canadian constitution and proposed changes thereto, is it the intention of the federal government to initiate proposals in the near future to set up a constitutional study conference on a national basis, designed to propose positive suggestions which will result in a modern constitution suited to modern times?

Mr. Speaker: Surely this is a question for the order paper, important though it is.

Mr. Grafftey: May I rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker. The urgency of the question is based on the fact that the province of Quebec is the only province at the moment that is carrying out such a study. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether any other province or provinces have indicated to him that they intend to initiate studies of the constitution, as Quebec is doing at the present time.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps this question also could be put on the order paper.

Mr. Grafftey: I have no intention of putting it on the order paper or debating it at ten o'clock, but I felt it was an important question at the moment.

CONSIDERATION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE OF AMENDMENT FORMULA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Prime Minister a question. On Friday, November 6 he assured me that he hoped to be able to make a statement "next week" in regard to the setting up of a parliamentary committee to deal with the amendment formula and the whole procedure as to amending the British North America Act. The week has passed and the Prime Minister has not been able to make a statement. Does he anticipate that he will be able to make it in the near future?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I apologize to my hon. friend; I had the statement ready last Friday and unfortunately he was not in the house that day. I meant to make it yesterday but I forgot about it. The question was asked, as my hon. friend said, on November 6 whether the house will be enabled to make a detailed examination of the proposed white paper on constitutional amendment and whether there is to be a parliamentary committee to look into the subject. Similar suggestions have been made to me by some other hon. members.

The situation is that a white paper is in the course of preparation, and it is hoped that a draft will be ready for consideration by the government next week. Also, Mr. Speaker, the final text of the amending formula as settled at the conference just held has been sent formally to the governments of all the provinces requesting their formal concurrence in the terms of the text.

It is felt, Mr. Speaker, that it would not be desirable to make a final decision on the procedure to be followed in dealing with the white paper or the amending formula in the house until the replies that have been requested from the provinces have been received.

INQUIRIES OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Could he arrange for every member of the Conservative party to receive a copy of the editorial published in the December 2 issue of *Maclean's,* which is entitled:

This isn't opposition, Mr. Diefenbaker, this is sabotage.

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Surely the hon. gentleman does not wish me to use my frank for that purpose.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In the past, questions which have been asked about the welfare of unemployed workers in my own particular constituency have not been allowed. This afternoon we have had examples of facetious questions being put which, before they were completed, the Chair must have realized were definitely out of order, yet the Chair permitted such questions to be asked.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. Did the Prime Minister in making his most recent appointment to the Senate receive any advice or suggestions from the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who I understand promised several people in the Windsor area that this appointment would be theirs?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should not worry about these matters.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport.

Could the minister tell me if he will soon table document No. 180, as he promised on October 28 last?

[*Text*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that I was not able to hear what the hon. gentleman said, but perhaps he would allow me to read it in *Hansard* and answer tomorrow.

FINANCE

RENEWAL OF U.K.-CANADA TAX AGREEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Are negotiations now going on seeking renewal of the Canada-United Kingdom tax agreement, and will they be concluded satisfactorily in time so there will be no interruption of the situation in regard to that treaty?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, negotiations were being carried on with the government of the United Kingdom and, as sometimes happens, an election intervened. They are now being renewed with the new government of the United Kingdom. I have no reason to think they will not be concluded with reasonable dispatch.

BANK OF CANADA HOLDINGS OF BONDS TO BE REDEEMED

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply to a guestion asked me yesterday by the hon. member for Cariboo having to do with Bank of Canada holdings of certain issues of securities.

I find on inquiry that details by issues of Bank of Canada holdings are not a matter of public record; therefore I am not in a position to provide details of the bank's holdings of the issues maturing on December 1 and December 15. The Bank of Canada does provide on its weekly and monthly balance sheets broad category classifications of its holdings of government of Canada securities. I might point out that, as I indicated in my public announcement of the new government financing last Friday, the Bank of Canada has agreed to acquire a minimum of $125 million of the new issue.

Mr. Bert Leboe (Cariboo): A supplementary question Mr. Speaker. Could the minister tell me whether there is any reason in the public interest why the Bank of Canada does not keep these records or supply this information?

Mr. Gordon: In the operation of monetary policy, which is conducted on a day to day basis by the bank, it is not thought desirable to give full details of the securities which the bank is buying and selling from time to time.

Inquiries of the Ministry

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

CONSIDERATION OF LABOUR AND FLAG LEGISLATION, ESTIMATES, ETC.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister regarding the labour standards act, which is a piece of legislation in which more than 500,000 workers in Canada are vitally interested. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether we can be given some assurance that this legislation will be proceeded with before the flag debate is recommenced, in order that we may be sure it will be passed before Christmas.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I can give the hon. gentleman no such assurance.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, in the event the amendments which are being prepared are ready, will the Prime Minister assure this house that he is prepared to interrupt the flag debate, if it takes up a great deal of time, in order to make sure that this legislation is dealt with prior to Christmas. I am assuming that the Prime Minister is genuine in wanting this legislation passed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, there should be no necessity of interrupting the flag debate in order to get this important legislation through before Christmas.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I should like to direct a question to the government house leader and ask him, in view of the statement made a moment ago by the right hon. Prime Minister that the flag debate is of prime importance between now and Christmas, whether he thinks there is any purpose in holding additional meetings of house leaders to try to arrange the business of the house.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): I do not agree with the hon. member's statement concerning what has been said here today. I thought it was made quite clear that there are two matters of prime importance to the government which we expect to have done before Christmas. One of these is the flag question and the other is the labour standards bill.

An hon. Member: How about the Canada pension plan?

[Mr. Gordon.]

Mr. McIlraith: Well, the pension plan is moving very precisely and very well. I hope the estimates are moving very well also. I do not accept the hon. member's statement or interpretation of what has been placed on the record. Since I do not accept it, I cannot answer the question.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask a supplementary question. In view of the fact there has been no agreement about a limitation of time on the flag debate, we can only assume that if the government decides to put the flag debate first there can be no guarantee that the labour standards bill will be passed before Christmas. Is this the interpretation we are to take from the statement of the minister and the statement of the Prime Minister?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is trying to interpret things in a particular way to suit his own purposes. There has never been at any time an indication by the government that the house will do certain things. The responsibility of the government is to submit legislation to the House of Commons, and the House of Commons disposes of it. All the government can do is submit legislation in the order that it thinks is the most appropriate way in dealing with its responsibilities of office.

When agreement can be reached on the limitation of debate, that is very acceptable. I feel it is common knowledge that the Prime Minister has been on record for at least two years, when these things were the proper subject of debate, as saying he thought there should be limitation of debate on the items of business coming before parliament. However, be that as it may, we have obtained limitation of debate rather successfully, I think, in the eyes of all hon. members, in the last couple of weeks on some subjects. I personally hope we might get it in the future. We cannot give any commitment at the moment as to what the House of Commons will do with the items of business that are submitted.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the house leader's statement that the government's responsibility is to introduce items in their order of importance, am I to take it from his statement and that of the Prime Minister that the flag debate is now much more important than the labour standards act?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has no right to draw such conclusions. The remarks I made will appear in *Hansard*

and they can be analysed and deductions drawn from them, but the hon. member has no right to put such an interpretation on them. The government has consistently made it very clear that it regards these items as of major importance.

Mr. Howard: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has no right to place a particular interpretation upon what the Prime Minister said, neither has the President of the Privy Council any right to do the same thing.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of his statement a few moments ago that he recognized no necessity for interrupting the flag debate in order to ensure the passage of legislation that many members feel is more important, are we to assume that he has had firm assurances there will not be a prolonged debate on the flag issue when it comes up?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should not inadvertently misrepresent what I said. I did not say there would be no necessity; I said there should be no necessity to interrupt the flag debate.

[*Later:*]

Mr. McIlraith: If I may have the indulgence of the house I wish to make a short announcement which I think will be of interest to hon. members. It concerns the business before us.

Following the discussion in the house last night when I announced the business of the house as reported at page 10203 of *Hansard,* and after consultation with the Prime Minister, I called a meeting of the house leaders of the various parties to discuss house business. I am happy to advise hon. members that agreement has now been reached among the parties that there be an order of the house to the effect that starting tomorrow we shall consider estimates, that they shall be considered each sitting day, and that not later than November 27, all estimates, that is the main estimates and supplementary estimates A, B and C, shall be dealt with, as well as the necessary appropriation bill at all stages. It was understood that the Speaker would be able to leave the chair without question put on Monday and Tuesday of next week, and that private members' hours would be waived during this period.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, whether you would so order.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house in agreement?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

The time for the question period has expired, but through a lapse of memory on my part I forgot to call the hon. member for York-Humber, who spoke to me some time ago and who would like to pose a question. So, with the consent of the house, I propose we have one more question.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Howard: I rise on a point of order. When the proposal was made by the President of the Privy Council with respect to the business of the house for the remainder of this week and next week, both the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and I rose to make some comment about it, but you did not offer either of us the opportunity to make that comment indicating whether or not there was agreement with that proposal.

Mr. Mandziuk: But didn't you?

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I might be heard on the point, namely the suggestion that the house agree to the order which has been proposed by the leader of the house.

The statement that there was a meeting of the house leaders of the various parties this morning and that we gave favourable consideration to the program as outlined in the statement just made by the leader of the house is correct. Our party was concerned about one point, and I reported this back to the leader of the house. This one point had to do with the order of priority, after the estimates have been disposed of, as between the flag debate and the Canada labour code. An assurance was given to me that no decision was being taken on that question, that all we were agreeing to was the order of business until a week from Friday. There was no assurance that the Canada labour code would be brought forward, but neither was there any exclusion of the possibility of our still discussing with the government the fact that we might have it ahead of the flag debate. It was on the understanding that this matter was left open that I reported our agreement back to the house leader.

Obviously there is some concern in this party this afternoon because of the exchanges which have taken place. I can only say our agreement was conditional on there not being a decision at this point beyond what is actually set out in the statement made by

the President of the Privy Council, namely that all we are agreeing to at this point is to spend the next seven days on estimates. The business for the rest of the session is left for further discussion.

Mr. McIlraith: That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Howard: The Prime Minister made some comments today bearing on the priority to be accorded to the other two items, and I do not think we should proceed now to make an agreement when it is only a half-hearted agreement and when the Prime Minister has in effect destroyed it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Howard: It would be far better, in my opinion, if the President of the Privy Council were to withhold his proposal until later in the day and allow further discussion to take place.

Mr. Speaker: As the Chair understands the situation, it is this. The President of the Privy Council read a statement which had been agreed to by the different parties and their representatives, a statement which I have in my hand. At the request of the leader of the house I asked whether it should be so ordered, and it was ordered.

An hon. Member: It was not ordered.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: As far as I understand it, that is the situation.

Mr. Knowles: May I have confirmation from the Prime Minister that the statement I made a moment ago is correct, namely that no decision has been made as to the priority of house business beyond a week from Friday?

Mr. Pearson: Of course it is. The order covers only the business for next week. That is clear. No decision has been made as to what will be done after next week, one way or the other.

Mr. Howard: I do not want to be obstinate about it.

Some hon. Members: You are.

Mr. Howard: But it is quite obvious that the government, because of its concern about this rag of a flag, is trying to make a sucker out of parliament.

Mr. Hellyer: On a point of order, may I ask whether the order was passed by the house?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, the order was passed. I said so twice.

[Mr. Knowles.]

AIRPORTS

WINNIPEG—INQUIRY AS TO PROSECUTION OF TAXI DRIVER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): I have a question I should like to put to the Minister of Transport. Can the minister advise the house what progress is being made by the government in its prosecution of Gabriel Robert Johnson, the taxicab driver who has been accused of picking up a fare at Stevenson field, Winnipeg, despite a monopoly contract given to Moore's taxi service in that city.

Mr. Speaker: This is a question for the order paper.

PENSIONS

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTRIBUTORY PROGRAM

The house resumed, from Tuesday, November 17, consideration of the motion of Miss LaMarsh for the second reading of Bill No. C-136, to establish a comprehensive program of old age pensions and supplementary benefits in Canada payable to and in respect of contributors.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich.

Mr. H. E. Gray (Essex West): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I had the floor at ten o'clock last evening, and my remarks will take a few minutes to complete.

Mr. Speaker: That is so. It was a mistake of the Chair. The hon. member for Essex West had the floor. The Chair will recognize the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich next.

Mr. Gray: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will only take a minute or so more and then I will be happy to yield the floor to the hon. member.

I find it strange that some of the business executives to whom I was referring last evening as expressing concern over the possible effect of the decisions of politicians on the funds of the Canada pension plan should regularly invest large amounts of the money of their firms and the money of other people in government bonds whose soundness is based on the decisions of those same politicians.

Of course a somewhat different type of criticism, and perhaps a more substantial one, has been made, and it arises out of the possibility that the provinces in using their share of the pension fund may make investments

in a way which could be at cross purposes with the investment policies of the federal government aimed at influencing the entire economy on a national basis. However, because of the present freedom of the provinces to borrow for their own purposes, this possibility already exists and would continue to exist even if a portion of the Canada pension plan fund was not available to them.

I for one feel that the trends of economics, social welfare and technology call for the continued existence of a strong federal government capable of dealing with these matters on a national basis in the interests of all Canadians, and I certainly do not rule out the possibility of constitutional changes to enable our federal government to carry out effectively the role required of it by existing and future circumstances. However, so long as our country continues to be of a federal nature a certain portion of the central government's efforts to deal with the economy on a national basis will have to be made through the continuing use of improved techniques of consultation and discussion with the provinces. The proper use of these techniques through bodies such as the economic council of Canada and a federal secretariat for federal-provincial affairs will enable a cohesiveness in economic and social policies to develop and exist in such a way that we should be able largely to eliminate this risk that the federal government will not be able to act effectively as required to maintain the national economy at a high level.

Fears have also been expressed that the plan would remove savings otherwise available for private investment; but I think it has been made clear that in other countries where similar social welfare plans have been in existence there have not been declining rates of private savings. It cannot be overlooked that the money paid out in pension benefits will be quickly spent on consumer goods and services; it will add to the effective demand which is needed for an active and buoyant economy. The firms that receive the money for these goods and services will thereby have it available to meet some of their own private investment needs. As the Windsor *Star* put it in an editorial in its edition of November 11:

> It is not by chance that the countries with the most advanced social security systems generally are also the most prosperous and with the highest standards of living. These two facts are associated.
>
> Money spent on social security measures does not disappear; it quickly and continuously is placed back in the economic bloodstream of the country.

I think the same can be applied to what happens to money invested as social capital. Also the Canada pension plan will help workers to meet the possible threat of displacement by automation in several important ways. Since the pensions will be completely portable, it will be easier for workers to seek out new job opportunities wherever they may be, and it will make it easier for employers to hire employees who may be close to but not yet of pensionable age. Also by making it possible to take a pension between the ages of 65 and 70 it will in fact encourage earlier retirement, and not the reverse, thereby increasing job opportunities for younger workers.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, this Canada pension plan will enable steps to be taken for the provision of reasonable standards of income for the retired, the disabled, orphans and widows all across this country. I am therefore pleased to be able to support the second reading of this bill as a measure serving the interests of all Canadians.

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I will not be as fluent as the hon. member for Essex West (Mr. Gray) because I will not be reading my speech word for word. However, I will not take up too much of the time of the house. I am very pleased to have this chance of saying a few words on the fourth Liberal Canada pension plan. It is obvious that the government and its supporters on the other side of the house are preparing the people of Canada for an election within the next few months. It is obvious, by the travels of the treasury bench members across the country, making partisan, political speeches and attacking the one man they are afraid of, that it will not be too long before we have an election.

We know what happened in the last election campaign with regard to the promises the Liberals made; and being Liberals, they cannot change and will do the same thing in the next election campaign. But I think it is our duty to point out to the people in advance that they should not trust the promises that the Liberals are going to make. To convey this message, Mr. Speaker, I want to read from the Victoria *Daily Colonist* of March 31, 1963. This is a full page advertisement; they obviously have a lot of money. It is headed, "The policies of the Liberal party". As I say, it is a full page ad with a large number of items that the Liberal government promised to put into effect. I could spend possibly 20 minutes reading off items here that they have promised, have not fulfilled and which of

course they have no intention of fulfilling. For example, there are municipal loans for schools; national housing loans for existing houses—there are a great number. However, I will refer only to the promises pertinent to the question we are discussing today. Under the subheading "Pensions" there is another heading that says, "Make possible retirement at half pay at 65". This was the first Canada pension plan the Liberals proposed. I ask hon. members to just compare that with the proposal that is now before us. This advertisement also mentions a maximum pension of $296 per month for a couple. It goes on to say that the Liberal party would establish a new national minimum of a $75 a month pension. In this regard the advertisement says that the pension will not be a tax on the people, in effect, because it will come out of contributions.

I would ask the house to remember what actually happened to the $10. On July 18, when the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) introduced the second Liberal plan into the house, we moved that the $10 be paid immediately. At that time, of course, every Liberal member in the house voted against it; but in due course, because of constant pressure from members on this side, the government finally gave in and on September 30 last they brought in an amendment to the Old Age Security Act. However, that increase which we all supported cost the taxpayers of Canada $116 million a year; in other words, it was not paid out of contributions, as was promised by the Liberals.

There has been a great deal of bungling on the part of the government—that is of course no surprise; it is quite common with it—particularly with regard to the Canada pension plan. As I said, the first plan was introduced by the minister on July 18, 1963. Last night the hon. member for Essex West tried to justify all these convolutions the government has gone through in arriving at the present plan by saying that all this was necessary in order to arrive at the best plan possible. But this of course is not what the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) said at the time she introduced the first plan. I quote from page 2343 of *Hansard* for 1963, where the minister is reported as having said:

> This government has taken three months.

She had said before that it would normally take other governments that are not as smart as the present government two years to prepare a plan.

[Mr. Chatterton.]

> I say without partisan taint that the exact time of payment is dependant upon the speed with which this chamber adopts the plan.

In other words, according to the minister it was entirely a matter for the house as to how soon this offspring of theirs would be given life. Again I quote from page 2346 of *Hansard*, where the minister is reported as having said:

> Since taking office, we have been working steadily to explore the best type of scheme for Canada. We believe that the scheme now placed before parliament will commend itself to the house—

That was what the minister said at the time; this was the ultimate creation and test of the ingenuity of the Liberal government. Then of course the second attempt was made on March 17 this year, when the minister introduced another resolution for the Canada pension plan, and then the bill, Bill No. C-75. Right up to the very end there has been bungling and fumbling on the part of the government, because even as of now the appendices to the actuarial report are not available to us. We did not get a copy of the actuarial report until the night before last, and at the time of first reading only 100 copies of the bill were available. This brings to mind the fact that during September last the government was obviously anxious for us to continue the flag debate. At that time we demanded that it discontinue the flag debate and bring on the Canada pension plan. As a matter of fact, on two occasions—September 3 and September 8—there was a motion before the house to adjourn the flag debate, presumably so that we could go on with the Canada pension plan. On both these occasions every Liberal in the house voted against the motion, and of course every Conservative voted for it. It is now obvious that the real reason the government wanted to continue the flag debate at that time was because the legislation was not ready.

I will now refer to some of the provisions of Bill No. C-136. We are at second reading stage, which means we are dealing with the principle of the bill. I want to outline for the government what I consider are some weaknesses in the bill as presented. However, I will start by saying that in spite of what the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) tried to imply last night no member on this side has opposed a contributory pension plan. We have tried to show up weaknesses, we have tried to suggest improvements and we have asked questions. I repeat that we are in favour of a contributory pension plan, but we feel that the proposal made by the government can be improved.

The first weakness which I note in the plan —I have spent a fair amount of time studying not only Bill No. C-75 but the two white papers and Bill No. C-136—is that there is nothing in this proposal for those who perhaps need it the most, namely the people who are already retired. Shortly after the second white paper was released, which I think was around August 10, I was invited by an old age pensioners association in my riding to explain to them the Canada pension plan. I did this, basing my explanation on the white paper which was issued at that time. When I had gone through my explanation of the plan they said to me, in effect: "Is there nothing in this for us?" I said: "That is the way it is." I am sure that since the white paper was released this kind of reaction must have been received by the government.

Then again, last week I was home for Remembrance day, and on the Tuesday morning when I saw the morning papers they carried a headline to the effect that a new departure in the Canada pension plan was that the old age security pension would from now on be tagged on to the cost of living index. There was great jubilation at this; it sounded wonderful. While I was travelling back from British Columbia by plane I read many papers from right across the country, and it was significant that every one of those papers had almost the same verbatim release, obviously emanating from the public relations branch of the department.

Then when I got back to the house and read the provisions of Bill No. C-136 dealing with the amendment to the Old Age Security Act it immediately became obvious to me—and I would use the words of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas)—that this is an absolute, complete, cruel hoax on these older people. In the first place, this particular proposal is not part of the Canada pension plan. It was a very clever trick to include in Bill No. C-136 the amendment to the Old Age Security Act so that the government could say that they had done everything for those already retired. But it is actually an amendment to the Old Age Security Act, in the first place, and in the second place the assistance it gives to these old people is negligible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how can this proposal in Bill No. C-136 be changed so as to do something for these people who need it most? I should like to refer here to the fund which is being built up. The fund, according to the actuarial report, will build up to $8.4 billion in 1985. It is true that from then on, unless the contributions are increased there may be a reduction in the fund. According to the forecasts there undoubtedly will be a reduction in the fund.

These old people to whom I spoke said to me: "Why not use some of the fund built up to give us something? Is it necessary to have as large a fund?" According to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh)—she has now changed her mind, or perhaps, had it changed for her, I do not know—when the first masterpiece was presented, and when talking about whether or not there should be a fund, she said, as reported at page 2342 of *Hansard* for July 18, 1963:

> These were the arguments balanced by the government in coming to its conclusion that this plan should not be funded; thus the plan is framed on a pay as you go basis.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, if that was the position at the time when the first pension plan was presented some amendment can be made to the present plan so that the fund does not build up as quickly and some of the money can be diverted to help those who are already retired.

Yesterday I received a letter from a lady in my riding who is just over 60. She has a small pension which is just enough to disqualify her from local social welfare. She wrote to me and asked me what was in the pension plan for her, and I had to reply regretfully that under the present government proposal there was nothing in it for her, at least until she reached the age of 70. Even at age 65, with the little income she has—it is barely subsistence income—she cannot qualify for old age assistance, so she has to wait until she is 70 before she gets anything at all. That is the type of person who needs it most, along with widows, aged 60 and many others aged 65 who do not quite qualify for old age assistance. They are the people who need help most.

I should also like to refer to one other group of those already retired, and I am thinking of the superannuates, the ex-employees of the government. The government recently released on November 10 last a bulletin which clearly indicates to the superannuates association that they have no hope of getting any help. The government refuse to accept its position as an ex-employer of these superannuates, and the superannuates' proposal has been turned down by the government on the basis of a principle.

What did the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) say on December 27, 1963, in a letter which

he wrote to Mr. Whitehouse, the secretary-treasurer of the federal superannuates national association? He said this:

> With reference to your letter of November 18, as I indicated in my letter of October 4, 1963, the government was not prepared to make any basic change in the Public Service Pension Adjustment Act while the ultimate form of the Canada pension plan has not been decided by parliament following consultation with the provinces.
>
> The Canada pension plan, as explained in the House of Commons and to the public, contained no provision for the adjustment of pensions payable under it once those pensions commenced. This was a point of considerable interest to all concerned and the government was not prepared to propose the introduction of any automatic pension adjustment factor in legislation dealing with the pensions of retired civil servants when none was provided under the proposed Canada pension plan. This, I would say, was the basic amendment most frequently proposed for the Public Service Pension Adjustment Act in the representations which had been received by the government and were under review when I wrote to you in October.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said, in effect, that since there was no provision in the Canada pension plan for automatic pension adjustment according to the cost of living index the government could therefore not amend the Public Service Pension Adjustment Act. This Canada pension plan does provide for such automatic adjustment by way of a pension index; yet the Prime Minister refuses to help these people who are already retired and in great need.

As I understand it, Bill No. C-136 includes civil servants. The example I am going to quote now is not by way of criticism. At least I am not trying to take anything away from the civil servants. What I am trying to do is to compare the amount with which the present civil servant will retire with that received by those who have already retired. For example, if the Canada pension plan is created as it is now proposed, and if the superannuation act is not amended, it could happen quite frequently that a civil servant will retire with a combined pension greater than his salary. I will give two examples of this situation.

Assuming that a civil servant, who is 55 years of age when the pension plan begins operating, retires at age 65, and assuming that his average salary for his best six years, on which his superannuation is based, was $5,000, he would receive from his superannuation $3,500 per year and from the Canada pension plan, $1,860, or a combined pension of $5,360, which is $360 more than his salary.

The second example is of a man who continues to work in the civil service to age 70, and this is possible because the minister has the authority to extend employment beyond age 65. This happens quite frequently. Assuming that man had 35 years of service and retired at age 70, he would receive $3,500 in superannuation, and $2,148 from the Canada pension plan, giving him a combined total of $5,648, or $648 more than his salary.

This is the kind of thing that might happen in the case of civil servants who retire in future, as compared with those who retired some years ago; and I have used the example of a principal clerk who retired in 1953 with 35 years service. The figures I intend to give are approximate only. His pension from superannuation would be $2,660 per annum. Another civil servant occupying that same position as principal clerk, with the same period of service to the people of Canada, retiring some time in the future, say 1976, would receive $3,650 in superannuation, and in addition, having contributed ten years to the Canada pension plan, would receive a Canada pension of $1,200. In other words, he would have a combined pension of $4,850, as compared to the individual who had the same job but retired in 1953 with a pension of $2,660—a difference of over $2,000. Those are the individuals who need assistance but for whom the Canada pension plan does absolutely nothing. The first weakness I see in this plan is that it does nothing for the old people.

The second weakness, in my opinion, is that great discrepancy between pensions payable to people who have only paid in for ten years, and pensions paid to those individuals who have paid in for up to 52 years, the maximum time. As I read the bill, an individual who pays in for ten years receives exactly the same pension as the man who has paid in for 52 years, provided of course their average annual salaries were the same. There will be many modifying factors which will creep in during the 52 year period, but that is the situation.

Let us consider the example of two men, one from each of the two categories, the man who has paid in for ten years and the man who has paid in for 52 years. Let us call the ten year man Mr. Abel and the 52 year man Mr. Baker. In each case I am comparing only the related earnings part of the pension, because of course they would both be eligible for old age security at age 70. Assuming that Mr. Abel and Mr. Baker had an average annual earnings of $5,000, Mr. Abel during the ten year period would pay in a total of approximately $800 and receive a pension of $104 per month. Mr. Baker during his 52

years would pay in approximately $4,100, which is more than five times as much, and he would receive the same pension as Mr. Abel.

If Mr. Abel purchased a government annuity with his $800 he would receive at age 70 a pension of $9.90 per month. If Mr. Baker purchased a government annuity with his $4,100, he would receive a pension of $136 per month. Yet under the Canada pension plan they would both receive the same pension.

Just as a matter of interest, if Mr. Baker, the 52 year man, purchased a private annuity with his $4,100, he would receive a pension of $175 per month, or if he purchased a private annuity worth $2,500 in life insurance, he would receive a pension of $152 per month. If Mr. Abel at age 60 purchased a government annuity which would give him the same benefit he would receive under the Canada pension plan, namely $104 per month, it would cost him $10,700 instead of the $800 under the Canada pension plan.

Surely the minister should consider changing this proposal so that some of the fund could be used to help those individuals who have already retired. Why not stretch out the transitional period a little more, say to 15 years or longer, or whatever is required, so that some of the revenue can be used to help those who have already retired?

Another weakness I see in this plan, which I think should be considered, is that those people who are earning $10,000 per year or more are also covered by the Canada pension plan. It is true that they will pay only up to the first $5,000, but in order to help those individuals already retired, why not increase the upper limit, with a greater variation in contributions, so the additional revenue could be used in this way?

The fourth weakness I see in this plan is the method of disposition of the fund moneys. The minister has indicated that this money will be lent to the provinces. Last evening the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) indicated that there is a great need for social capital. He suggested these provinces would use this money for technical and vocational schools, hospitals, urban redevelopment, university buildings, transportation and so on. In other words, the fund money which will be advanced to the provinces could be used for these purposes. However, what assurance is there that it will be used for these purposes? I think the lack of such an assurance is another weakness in this plan.

It seems to me that some of these problems, for example urban renewal and growth of our metropolitan areas, have become national in scope, and will continue to be so in Canada in the future. The central government must accept a certain measure of responsibility. If the government insists on establishing this fund, and lending some of it to the provinces, surely they should tie certain tags to the moneys so that solutions may be found to these problems which are national in scope. That is not the case under this proposal. Some provinces may use the money for higher educational purposes, by building additions to universities, while other provinces may not, and again a situation of inequality will develop throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have certain questions I should like to put to the minister, and I hope when she replies in closing the debate she will give some answers. If the minister is not in a position to give answers to some of these questions in her closing remarks, perhaps at the committee stage she will be able to give them.

The first question is related to portability. The minister indicated that there will be agreements with the opting out provinces providing for portability, so that if an individual moves from the province of Quebec to another province his pension will be completely portable. My question is, will these agreements also ensure that the opting out provinces will not materially change their plans, thereby destroying or disrupting this portability? Will these agreements cover that situation?

Clause 115 requires that, by order of the lieutenant governors of the provinces, two thirds of the provinces having two thirds of the population must agree to all changes in rates and benefits. What will be the position if in 25 years this plan goes into the red—in other words, if expenditures are greater than receipts so that the fund is used up? What is the position then of the federal government if one province, for instance Ontario, vetoes an increase in the contributions?

Another question I should like to ask relates to the R.C.M.P. and the armed forces. Can the minister indicate to us what were the government's reasons for including civil servants but excluding the R.C.M.P. and armed forces? This is the way I understand the bill, but I do not know if I am right. If I am right, why is that so? Incidentally, when it comes to the civil servants, yesterday the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) was speaking about the integration of private

plans and the Canada pension plan, and he indicated that plans have already been worked out for the integration of the civil service superannuation plan. If that is so, it seems to me that this house or the committee should be given a fairly detailed accounting of how the superannuation act is going to be amended, since Bill No. C-136 now includes civil servants. As I explained earlier, it could happen that a civil servant could retire with a greater pension than his earnings. I believe therefore the minister should advise the house or the committee as to the changes proposed in the superannuation act in order to integrate the civil service pension plan with the Canada pension plan.

Yesterday the Minister of National Revenue referred to clause 87 of the pension bill and said that the pension appeal board would hear disputed cases if the provincial law provided for that. In this way a common jurisprudence could be developed. My question is, if a province that opts out does not pass such a law, will the appeal board then not have jurisdiction in those disputed cases and will we then lose this common jurisprudence? I would appreciate an answer to that question.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, the minister will give these questions consideration. In closing my remarks I again appeal to the government and to the minister to seriously consider amendments to this plan so that those people who need it most, the retired people, will get some benefit from the plan.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, the motion for second reading of Bill No. C-136, to establish a comprehensive program of various pensions in Canada, is rather interesting, and the bill is particularly fat.

The Canadian people will get their money's worth trying to find their way in this hodgepodge nobody seems to understand. Since people on all sides are asking the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) for explanations, the bill must be confusing.

But if you study the schedule which deals with the monthly pension which varies according to age, you see that at 65 the amount of pension will be $51 and that it will be increased by 40 cents each month until 70, that is over five years, when the pension will reach $75 a month.

Mr. Speaker, we sincerely believe that the Canadian social legislation should be improved considerably. We believe that the Canadian people could benefit more from Canada's economic development. That is what we have been maintaining for the past 20 years. Now, this pension plan introduced by the minister would have the Canadian people and parliament believe that the government is prepared to help elderly persons in Canada. We are told that this plan will improve social legislation, social benefits, when the main purpose of Bill No. C-136 is to permit the government to find the necessary funds to administer its social legislation, and nothing else.

The purpose of this pension plan is to permit the government to force the ordinary Canadian citizen to give money to the government all his life, money which the government will probably never return to that Canadian citizen.

As a matter of fact, this is a glaring example. The Canadian who is 25 or 30 years old and who works in a factory or in an industry will start paying, because this is a compulsory plan. He will start to make his contributions to the government in order to get a pension at 65 or 70. All his life, that is for 40 years, this Canadian worker will be making contributions to the government and when he will have reached 65 or 70 he will not then get back the money he is now contributing, because the government will then be taxing the children of this chap who, today, is 25 years old, in order that a pension may be paid their father when he reaches 65.

We could call that a sort of national "barbotte". Pay now, and you will not be reimbursed the money you will have paid in; instead we will give you the money that your children will contribute for 40 or 50 years. That is what we will use to give you pensions of $51 to $75—in between, there is an increase of 40 cents a month.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I listened to the hon. member for St. Maurice-Laflèche (Mr. Chrétien) commending the government for wanting to impose a plan on all, in order to create a fund for the economic development of the country.

It is taxing workers today in order to create a fund for the future economic development of Canada, by promising a pension to those workers when they are 65 or 70 years of age.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the whole thing means an allotment of poverty that is being collected today under this Bill No. C-136. That is the kind of proposal which is put to us today in this bill: to tax the earnings of workers who can hardly meet their obligations and whose salary is mortgaged for three, four and five years; to

mortgage their salary further and to deduct from this salary the contributions required to give them a pension in 30 or 40 years hence.

This is indeed to collect, today, poverty from people who cannot possibly pay anything more, in order to redistribute this poverty in 30 or 40 years hence.

We have also other cases where the pension plan is not too clear. In my riding, there is the Noranda company where miners have been working for 25 or even 30 years. At Noranda mines, there is a pension plan to which the employee contributes $1; the company agrees to contribute the same amount. At this point, many Noranda miners have a pension of $7,000 to $8,000. These people are wondering whether this pension plan will be involved in this accumulated fund. They do not know where they stand.

Even if the national pension plan does not affect the pension plan to be adopted in Quebec, it remains that the principle of the two plans is the same. They are worth approximately the same thing. And I maintain that this pension plan proposed by the government is far from being as advantageous as the plans provided today by private enterprise for workers, labourers, all classes of society in Canada. Insurance companies, other types of companies, industries, have pension plans for their employees. I just mentioned the Noranda mine. I worked in an industry in the northwestern part of the province where we contributed a weekly amount of $1, and the company was pledged to double that amount, that is to add another $1. I believe that plan was more advantageous than the one which the government is offering us today.

Before the government intervenes in such a matter, why did it not transact with those who at the moment have pension plans? Then we could see what plans are the most advantageous and the less expensive for the population as a whole. That was not taken into consideration. The government wishes to justify Bill No. C-136 by saying that private enterprise failed miserably in an area where the government had not yet intervened.

Mr. Speaker, let us beware of the government and of the promoters of government interference in this social legislation, because I am convinced that private enterprise can better help human beings and the Canadian society than the government or the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

At present, there exist all kinds of plans on a national basis or joint plans on the national-provincial level. Those plans cost the Canadian citizens and taxpayers twice what they would pay if we turned to private enterprise instead of applying measures with an ever-increasing socialistic character. In a country like ours, where we can guarantee economic security and personal freedom to every citizen, why, Mr. Speaker, do we need a bill like this one which states: You shall pay all your life and, when you reach the age of 65, we will give you $51?

What will we do with the 45 year old men who will lose their jobs at that age?

At the present time the government is faced with the problem of people over that age. Employers are being offered, especially in the winter in a period of unemployment, $75 a month to hire a man over 45. What will the government do with these men between 45 and 65 and its pension plan established under Bill No. C-136?

What security is there for the men replaced by machines, for instance? Does this bill provide a measure of security for the worker who will be put out of a job by automation? No, Mr. Speaker, we fail to see anything in it.

What we see is a pension at 65 or 70. Mr. Speaker, Social Credit has been saying for a long time that all those government measures, all those plans are absolutely powerless to solve the problem.

To reach into the pockets of a group of citizens to redistribute their poverty to another group who need it still more is not a solution. To take from those who have something and give it to those who have nothing is not an answer: the government is not a public charity agency. What the government should do is to balance the Canadian monetary system according to our large physical possibilities, instead of setting up a plan to pay pensions at age 65, and to establish immediately a national dividend for all the citizens who build and make this country. That would be a solution. They are afraid to consider it.

Yesterday I read in the *Canadian Labour* magazine the statement of an economist which appeared in a publication of the federal government:

> Report of a conference by Robert Theobald, a British economist in the employ of the American government, before the International Association of Employment Security Personnel.
>
> This report was published in the September 1964 issue of the *Labour Gazette*, which is a federal publication.
>
> This is what the article says:
>
> "A guaranteed annual income for each child and each adult, as well as the payment of a salary to university students were the main recommenda-

tions of Robert Theobald, a British economist, who is now adviser to the American government.

Mr. Theobald said that we are on the threshold of an era with demands as different from those of the previous industrial revolution as the exigencies of the industrial era were from those of the agricultural age."

Today, in Bill No. C-136 we are still thinking in terms of the agricultural age, or even in medieval terms.

Speaking of the consequences of automation and cybernetics, Robert Theobald stated:

—their consequences will be so deep and will happen so fast that full employment will be impossible.

And I am asking my friends of the New Democratic party to think about this:

—in other words, will the combined production system of machines and cybernetics be so effective that employers, governments in their capacity of private contractors, will prefer, from an economic point of view, to purchase or rent machines instead of hiring workers.

Mr. Speaker, we have come to that point and the government is taking steps to the contrary. We are doing away with the machine in order to hire workers under the winter works program. The pension plan provides also that a person has to work hard for 40 or 50 years of his life in order to receive a pittance at 65 or 70 years of age.

And Mr. Theobald continues:

—full employment will never be attained and even if it were, certain groups of people should have a guaranteed revenue: those who are too old or too young to work; those whose responsibilities prevent them from working, such as widows with children and young people in schools or universities.

Concerning minimum income, Mr. Theobald states—note that the suggestion does not come from Social Credit members but from an economist who does not suggest a monthly pension of $50 or the distribution of misery among the poor people—that this minimum income should be $1,000 per annum for each adult and $600 for each child. That is what an economist suggests for the rehabilitation or the improvement of the economic situation in the United States.

With respect to a salary for students, Mr. Theobald said:

We must admit that the student already works at least as much as the factory worker. The time has come to introduce the new concept of a salary for students, possibly starting at the age of 14, with increases until students finish their university studies.

That is perhaps a revolution along the lines of the social legislation we must contemplate here in Canada.

Let them stop introducing bills which reduce or minimize the economic importance

[Mr. Caouette.]

in our country, bills which suggest absolutely nothing new, bills which tend only to levy taxes in order to distribute what is left after paying the administration costs. Millions of dollars, even billions are at stake and the people will get nothing out of it, because tremendous administrative costs will have to be paid to apply this pension plan under Bill No. C-136. Now, we are fed up with all that.

A while ago, I heard the previous speaker say that the government stated it needs social capital. Does the government not recognize that the Canadian worker also needs social capital? Do not the farmers, white collar workers, professional men, also need a personal capital, although it is not social nor supplied by society? Why, under the pretence that social capital is required for Canada, as I said a while ago, take away from one group, while trying to persuade them that we must act in this way to help another group?

Private enterprise is generally attacked, but Bill No. C-136 does not recognize it. It will be said that private enterprise and insurance companies exploit the public, etc. What difference is there between exploitation of the public by a private company and exploitation by a government which does not know where it is going with its pension plan?

Fantastic amounts are obtained in an attempt to alleviate poverty among the Canadian people. When these people are taxed less, they do not spend their time accumulating money in the banks or institutions here and there, or hiding money in the corners of their bedrooms and in basements or vaults. These people work, expand their industries, their private enterprise, and, often enough, they allow other private enterprises to appear here and there.

The government will keep this money from circulation among the population, by accumulating that money itself and trying to socialize us further, by all possible and imaginable means.

When I see bills like that, which spread hardship in Canada, I wonder why the government and the Minister of National Health and Welfare do not take into consideration the economic realities of our country? We are told—the economists, with statistical data in support of their case—that Canada's gross national product will be over $46 billion this year, while the total national income will amount to about $32 billion. Are the minister and the government not aware that Canada will be short $14 billion in purchasing power? While the government prepares to levy more

taxes, instead of giving impetus to the Canadian economy with new credits—not credits bearing interest and forcing us to pay twice the amount in 20 years—why is the government not making use of the Bank of Canada, which is a Canadian institution, which belongs to the Canadian people, which has the authority to create the necessary credits in order to distribute, not a pension at the age of 65, but a dividend from birth to death? The government and parliament would then respect all the human beings which constitute our Canadian nation.

We, in this corner of the house, have had enough of these starvation bills in the midst of plenty. This is not a bill increasing the old age pension by $10. This is a bill providing for a pension at 65 years of age which it will be compulsory for workers, farmers and everyone to pay for 30, 40 or 55 years of their life, in a rich country like ours.

Did we not hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) say, recently, that the Bank of Canada was authorized to grant loans to England to reinforce her financial position or to give some kind of guarantee to the pound sterling? The Bank of Canada must create funds for that, and it would not have the right to create funds to give to the Canadian people an adequate pension system and free dividends? Let the minister give us an answer on that.

Once again we may be called utopians, people chasing after the moon, but the two old political parties in Canada have been on the moon for a long time and are no longer able to produce results for the Canadian people. We hear promise after promise, but when the time comes to take some action we are presented with concrete results of $51 a month.

I wonder whether the Minister of National Health and Welfare could live on $51 a month at the age of 65? And what are they going to do with those aged between 45 and 65 and who do not have any job?

Those are the considerations I wanted to bring forward respecting Bill No. C-136 which, I know, will not interfere with the pension plan to be introduced in the province of Quebec.

If I take part in the debate on this bill, it is because I am not entitled to speak in the Quebec legislature, and I want them also to know what we think, we of the Ralliement Créditiste, about those programs of poverty amidst plenty. What we want for our Canadians is that production should be used for the Canadian people, that the financial system should no longer be the master, but rather that Canadians should be the masters of their own destinies from an economic, political and social standpoint.

[*Text*]

Mr. Lawrence T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): It is not my purpose to intervene in order to debate the merits of the legislation now before the house. That aspect has been extensively dealt with in the course of many able contributions from both sides of the house including, if I may say so, the admirable address of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh). I rise for the purpose of giving such assistance as I can by explaining some of the technical matters which may arise in relation to the integration of other plans, in particular the Public Service Superannuation Act, with the Canada pension plan.

It goes without saying that all persons covered by pension plans, either private or those for which the government is responsible, have a special interest in the development of the legislation now before us. The proposals contained in Bill C-136 leave untouched the question whether private plans will be adjusted so as to integrate or co-ordinate with the Canada pension plan.

Those responsible for each of the private plans are left free to decide according to their particular needs whether and in what way modification should be made in their plans. This bill does not affect the control of private plans in this respect, and indeed it is open to question whether parliament has constitutional authority to regulate private plans in this way.

There are two basic situations that most readily come to mind in any discussion regarding the integration or co-ordination of private plans. In cases where the rates of contribution are already relatively high it may be felt that the over-all rates of employer-employee contributions should not be increased and that benefits under private plans should be adjusted accordingly, but not in such a way that the combination of the two plans would lead to an over-all reduction in benefits. I understand it may be possible in some circumstances that integration could lead to a modest increase in the total benefit without an increase in the total contributions. In other circumstances it may be felt not unreasonable to completely superimpose the Canada pension plan on the existing private plan.

Canada Pension Plan

I now turn by natural transition to the nature of the adjustments which will have to be applied to the numerous existing plans for which the government is responsible. The largest of these is the Public Service Superannuation Act, which covers some 175,000 employees. It would perhaps be convenient if I outlined in a very summary fashion the scope of this act. Males working in the public service pay 6½ per cent of their salaries into the superannuation fund, and female employees pay 5 per cent. The government matches these contributions regularly and from time to time contributes additional amounts which are required in respect of the liabilities created by pay increases which are not covered by the ordinary matching contributions. Subject to certain detailed conditions, pensions are calculated by multiplying the average salary over the best six years by 2 per cent for every year of service up to 35 years. In other words, the act provides an employee with an opportunity to secure a generous pension as high as 70 per cent of his average annual salary over the best six years.

Bearing in mind the substantial existing plan, and with a desire to deal equitably with the legitimate interests of the civil service, the government decided to apply two principles in adjusting the superannuation act to the Canada pension plan. The first principle is that the total contributions paid by the employee and the government should not be increased, but instead a portion of the contribution should be diverted away from the superannuation fund in each case to the Canada pension plan. To balance this diversion, the benefits earned under the superannuation act after the Canada pension plan goes into effect will be reduced. The second principle is that this reduction in benefits under the superannuation act would not bring the total level of benefits below the level that would have prevailed under the superannuation act before adjustments.

At the risk of oversimplification, I would point out that the total contributions by the employees would not increase, and their total benefits would not decrease. So far from decreasing the total benefits, the relationship between benefits, contributions and the funding under the Public Service Superannuation Act and the Canada pension plan are such that if the combined rates of current contributions for the two plans are the same as the present rates under the Public Service Superannuation Act—that is, 6½ per cent for male employees and 5 per cent for female employees—then a formula might be devised whereby the combined benefits in some cases would exceed modestly the benefits, and at no time fall below the benefits, which the present superannuation act will provide.

As a result of these relationships the government has decided to recommend to parliament at the appropriate time that the Public Service Superannuation Act be amended so that the following method of co-ordination could be applied: First, the combined contributions under the Public Service Superannuation Act and the Canada pension plan should be equal to the present contribution rates under the Public Service Superannuation Act, but the contributions paid into the public service superannuation account would be reduced by the amount of the contributions required under the Canada pension plan. It follows that the government's matching contribution into the superannuation account would be correspondingly reduced by the amount the government pays into the Canada pension plan.

In the second place, superannuation benefits paid before age 65 to persons retiring between the ages 60 and 64 will be the same as is now paid under the Public Service Superannuation Act; that is, by multiplying the average salary for the best six years by 2 per cent for each year of service. In the third place, superannuation benefits paid to persons who become eligible for a pension under the Canada pension plan at age 65 or on subsequent retirement will be determined by a formula which I shall shortly attempt to explain to the house. I apologize for resorting to a tedious formula method of explanation but I find myself unable to deal adequately with the matter in any other way. The formula divides itself into two parts:

(a) A portion of the public service superannuation pension would be calculated at the rate of 1.3 per cent instead of 2 per cent on the average salary for the best six years up to the earnings ceiling of the Canada pension plan for each year of service after the Canada pension plan commences, while

(b) the portion of the superannuation pension benefit based on that part of the salary above the earnings ceiling of the Canada pension plan would be calculated at 2 per cent for each year of service as is presently determined under the Public Service Superannuation Act. It would be entirely wrong to suppose that the formula I have outlined to the house for the co-ordination of the Public Service Superannuation Act and the Canada pension plan could be applied without alteration or refinement to other existing pension

plans. I wish to make it abundantly clear that the full 2 per cent will be paid in respect of services rendered prior to the start of the Canada pension plan, since there is to be no reduction in the pension rights which have already accrued to a contributor.

Perhaps I may be allowed to say a word about disability benefits. The method by which the superannuation pension benefits are calculated in the case of ordinary retirement would be applied immediately in the case of a disability retirement where the disabled person was entitled to disability benefits both under the Canada pension plan and the Public Service Superannuation Act. In other words, a person becoming disabled would be dealt with in the same manner as a person reaching age 65. I am also concerned to make it clear that there would be no reduction in widows' and children's benefits under the Public Service Superannuation Act following the co-ordination of the two plans.

Mr. Speaker, may I sum up by stating that the co-ordination of the two plans will provide civil servants retiring on immediate pension with at least equal, and probably slightly higher, over-all benefits for some years at no extra cost to them. I should also add at this juncture that the approach I have attempted to explain to the house was recommended to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) by the advisory committee under the Public Service Superannuation Act, representing the official and the staff side of the public service.

Before concluding there is one other point which I might bring to the notice of the house. A similar review will be carried out wherever this question of double participation comes up under pension plans for which the government is responsible.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I can usefully employ the time of the house any further on this subject. I hope that my few remarks may have been of some help to all hon. members.

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm): Mr. Speaker, I found the remarks made by the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Pennell) most interesting. They have brought some enlightenment on the bill now before us. As last speaker of the official opposition, I should like, at this stage of the business of the house, to make a few observations concerning this very important measure.

Several hon. members criticized, so to speak, the government of the province of Quebec for wanting to secure the full and complete control of the large amount of money which will accumulate through the contributions paid in the province of Quebec.

May I point out to the house that the British North America Act gives full and complete jurisdiction to the provinces in the field of social security, and if the province of Quebec wishes to administer the fund and distribute it as it sees fit, this is consistent with the constitution, it is its concern. Furthermore, there is nothing to prevent any other province from doing the same, from following the example set by the province of Quebec.

Instead of borrowing $200 million from British Columbia as it did recently, the government of the province of Quebec will be able to draw from this fund the money required to meet the educational, material and economic needs of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, the province of Quebec, perhaps more than all the others, needs funds to stimulate its economy, for it is now in a rather unfavourable economic situation, especially considering the fact that somehow Quebec seems to have the unemployment monopoly.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it might not be important for the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) and the committee to which the bill will be sent to study certain details of this very important measure. There is some fear with regard to this pension plan, and I am of the opinion that it will constitute too heavy a burden for the farmers of Canada, especially those of eastern Canada and the province of Quebec, whose annual income is $1,200 or less.

Under this bill workers will pay a contribution of 1.8 per cent of their earnings and the employer will pay the same amount. But what happens to the farmer? He will have to pay 3.6 per cent, that is twice as much as the worker; the married farmer will pay 7.2 per cent, while the married worker will pay only 3.6 per cent.

In my opinion, it would only be fair and reasonable for the farmer in this country to be on equal terms with the worker and to pay only 1.8 per cent of his income as his contribution. Moreover, the Canadian people as a whole should absorb the 1.8 per cent contribution that would have to be paid by the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, one must also take into account the fact that, with this pension plan, contributions may increase from year to year. No provision in the act provides that contributions must be static or remain at the

level established in the bill. They can increase by 1, 2 or even 3 per cent, over a four- or five-year period. Then, the farmer will have a double burden to carry, because he does not have the protection enjoyed by other social classes.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would only be fair and equitable if the farmer, like the worker, paid a contribution of 1.8 per cent of his income in order to be on an equal footing with the latter.

I hope, when the legislation has been referred to the committee, that the representatives of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, of the catholic farmers' union and of the co-operatives will come and express the views of the farmers, in order that the latter be treated fairly and on the same footing as the other classes of citizens as far as contributions are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I also wonder if it would not be possible to amend section 66, in order that the pension be paid when one becomes 60 years old. The hon. members know very well the problem which arises presently for the workers aged 45 years and over. Besides, it is practically impossible for those who have already reached the age of 60 to obtain employment.

Therefore, I think the pension age should be reduced to 60 years, in order to give social security to this class of citizens, who, at the present time, face a serious problem when they want to find employment.

Such are, Mr. Speaker, the remarks I wanted to make, and I believe it would be very important that the farmer be treated on the same footing as the worker and that the contribution he will have to pay be the same as the one paid by the worker, in brief, that the extra assessment of 1.8 per cent which the farmer has to pay be paid altogether by the Canadian taxpayers at large.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. Pigeon: Yes.

Mr. Pepin: The hon. member mentioned that certain members were opposed to Quebec having its own pension plan. Could he identify these members?

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to indulge in personalities in this house. Some members were opposed to this, and I said so quite frankly; whether they are from the government or the opposition, it does not matter. I said what I thought, according to my conscience and, as I said, the provinces have priority in the field of social security. In fact, the provinces have no lesson to receive from the federal government and from members of the house whoever they are, from whatever side of the house they are.

[*Text*]

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian public have waited many years for a change in the system of social security welfare. In the area I come from the adoption of a portable pension plan operated by the government will provide security for the elderly, and many employees who under no circumstances would have been able to receive this type of benefit. I refer mainly to people such as miners, woodworkers and in many cases farmers.

In the area I represent we have been suffering from the disadvantage that persons working on a particular contract are not eligible for a pension because the operation does not continue for the minimum required length of time to permit the establishment of a pension plan. Second, governments over the years have been plagued with regulations made by the federal Department of Finance, which were set up to provide for vesting, so as to allow the carrying forward of employers' contributions into a pension plan for retiring employees. The fact that this government has decided to implement a social security system not unlike those of many other countries is, I think, a very good thing.

I hope that what was said by the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Whelan), and the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Pennell), will be taken into consideration by those who read about the pension plan in the records of parliament. The hon. member speaking for the Minister of Finance did add considerable detail, and further confused my understanding of the supplementary benefits of this plan. However, upon further study of what he said I am quite sure it will prove to clarify some of the points that previously were confusing.

On the other hand, the hon. member for Essex South, who probably took some direction from the political pundits of his party, wrote a purely political pension speech. That speech should be examined by the members of this house, because it is probably the type of election propaganda we will hear during the forthcoming election campaign, whenever that may take place.

Mr. Whelan: Thank you for the compliment.

Mr. Peters: The hon. member has thanked me for the compliment. I should indicate that it was a compliment. I think both speeches have enlightened the members of this house and have clarified what was a confusing situation.

Mr. Speaker, I think the reputation which parliament has established during this session, and the attitude of the government in particular toward the business of this house, and the disrepute this country generally feels toward this parliament, has been reflected in the presentation of the Canada pension plan. That is a regrettable situation. It is a shame that a limitation has been suggested for the debate on second reading. Second reading is actually the stage during which a bill is accepted in principle. With such a limitation many contributions which might be made will not be made.

I am also disappointed because this Canada pension plan is not nearly good enough for Canada. Had we adopted a pension plan years ago when the Unemployment Insurance Act was passed, we would at that time have gone to the provinces, held federal-provincial conferences, and come to some kind of a compromise on the part of all governments, including the government of that province which was least willing to accept unemployment insurance, and found a solution to the unemployment problem of much greater advantage to the Canadian worker than would have been possible in any other way. What is being done today by the Liberal government, is adopting legislation as a result of provincial-federal conferences, followed by a request that parliament rubber stamp what that conference has decided.

I give the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) full credit for the additional plan she introduced, and while we may or may not agree with its terms, the plan was being offered to all the provinces. On the other hand, the bill now before us does not qualify as either fish or fowl, but is a plan developed at federal-provincial conferences, after taking into consideration the wishes of a province which has decided not to participate. I have heard many members who represent that province stand in their place and attempt to make some contribution to this debate, just as though they were going to participate in this plan.

Miss LaMarsh: They are.

Mr. Peters: The minister says they are going to participate. They are going to participate only because the federal government has agreed that provinces can develop similar comprehensive plans, but I suggest that one province has already put into effect the plan which the federal government is going to adopt.

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would remind the hon. member that all members of this House of Commons will become contributors in respect of their indemnities in this place.

Mr. Peters: The members from Quebec may be able to do that, and that creates another round of arguments as to who is going to make contributions, and to whom.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the government of Canada should have been prepared to propose a plan to be administered in a manner similar to the Unemployment Insurance Act, even though the development of such a plan would require more time and effort. The government should establish an act, even though requiring an amendment to the British North America Act, which amalgamates old age security and old age pensions. Such a plan would provide basic pensions, and all provinces would have to participate, or would not receive any old age security or old age pension.

I see the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) shaking his head. He probably will not agree with my suggestion because such a plan would not involve negotiation with the provinces, and the provinces would have to accept it or reject it. I think that situation will eventually exist.

Many people in this country are becoming tired of this parliament rubber stamping the agreements negotiated at federal-provincial conferences. It seems impossible for the federal government to stand up and say, this is the legislation we are presenting and Quebec can either like it or lump it. This government is afraid to say that what it proposes must be accepted and participated in by all provinces, and that it could not care less which course the provinces followed, but that if a province did not wish to participate, that is its prerogative, and it would receive nothing. Someone else I am sure will say that such a proposal would involve an amendment to the British North America Act. This bill now before us involves two amendments to the B.N.A. Act, in order to provide for some of the supplementary benefits.

This social security scheme has certain benefits, advantages and disadvantages. I believe the main advantage is its portability. That is

a very important aspect of any national pension scheme. It will allow Canadians to take their pensions from one job to another job, and from one province to another province. This involves a significant step forward, and is a step which no federal-provincial plan could neglect.

This aspect of the proposed plan will provide mobility of the working force of this nation. This mobility has not existed in recent years, even in government agencies, because applicants over 40 years of age have been turned down on the basis that if they at that age began to contribute to existing pension plans, this would throw out the actuarial studies already being made by those agencies. This plan will allow individuals to take their pensions from one job to another and remove the disadvantage to older employees, who are unable to obtain new jobs.

Many individuals, including one Créditiste who spoke yesterday, have suggested that we should share our responsibilities toward poverty stricken areas. I would not suggest that pensions of $104 per month, plus old age security, would represent abject poverty, if this plan were put into operation immediately; but I do believe that greater contributions would be welcomed by employees if suitable and graduated increases in benefits were made applicable.

In Germany for instance you are able to retire on at least half of the amount you earn in the highest five year period of earnings. They are much more advanced than we are. If you examine some of the pension plans in Europe you will find that for 50 or 60 years there has been portability between provinces, as we are suggesting here, and between other countries as well. I think the door should be left open in this regard in our pension plan so that there will be portability of sections of our social security system. Then those who wish to return to their homes will be able to carry their pensions with them. This scheme of course involves a great deal of negotiation by the external affairs department with other countries in order to make this interchange possible. Perhaps the minister is going to be able to do it; I hope she does. She probably has in mind the Geneva conventions as a possible means. I strongly urge her to consider it. I know that I, personally, have received a number of letters from persons in sunny Florida, England and other places to the effect that these persons have been prevented from receiving even their old age pensions under the terms of our legislation.

[Mr. Peters.]

There is no interchange between Canada and other countries that would allow portability of pensions at the present time.

Mr. Gray: It is in the bill.

Mr. Peters: It is partly in the bill; this mobility is only partial. Our pensions are not portable to the extent that pensions are portable in Germany, Luxembourg, Denmark and so on, where it is 100 per cent. They are referring of course to the employees pension plan and not to the whole social security system. I understand, however, that in recent times there has been a move in these countries toward portability of all of their social security.

Mr. Gray: Would the hon. member accept a question?

Mr. Peters: Yes.

Mr. Gray: Is he not aware that there are provisions in the bill permitting the government to make agreements with other countries regarding this international portability to which he is referring?

Mr. Peters: I am in agreement that there are such provision. When the minister nodded her head, I assumed some steps would be taken in this direction by her department, I would assume through some of the existing agencies. I am not saying we have closed the door on this possibility. I am saying that I strongly urge the minister to proceed with these arrangements as quickly as possible so there will be portability with other countries. This has been a drawback of the plans we have had in Canada so far.

I am quite pleased with the fact that this plan is available, when it goes into effect, to those who are less than 65 years of age. We have been plagued with many persons who are not able to find employment after they reach the age of 50, sometimes even less. It is going to be absolutely necessary to provide them with assistance, either in the form of welfare payments through provincial governments as we are doing now, or through some form of contributory pension. I know that if we can reduce the pensionable age to 65, as we have done in this bill, it is quite possible that when the plan is fully in operation adjustments will be made to reduce the age still farther. I suggest that this be considered as soon as it is feasible.

One of the disadvantages of this plan, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that it is not universal. It is compulsory for some categories, but it is not universal. Many persons who are self-

employed, whether they be farmers or businessmen, will have to make a decision. I know many businessmen who say: I can look after myself; I could use this money to better advantage in my business today. Some of these people will find when they reach retirement age they are not able to make contributions to their retirement. They are not all going to be in the favoured position of the member of the Liberal party who received an old age pension the other day, calculated at about half a million dollars, by being appointed to the other place. Some of these people are going to have to make their own arrangements under this plan. I suggest the plan should have been made universal, and that the government should have arranged for everybody to contribute to the plan.

I notice there is great consternation about this. I believe that it is the right of a farmer to contribute to the plan if he wishes. This is the right of the self-employed. Arrangements can be made whereby they can do so, but it is not compulsory.

There has been considerable discussion, and I think it is worth-while discussion, about whether or not we should have a fully funded plan or the semi-funded plan that we have. I am not really committed to either side because I feel there should have been a great deal more consideration given to the point and more information available to members of parliament about it. I know there are many who say that in 20 years this plan will have $8 billion in it, and that this is a sizeable amount of money that can be used to advantage in the development of our nation. There are of course those, and I share their view, who say this money should have remained with the federal government, and that the federal government should have used it for the development of new industries. One such development which I hope will come into being in my lifetime is the Grand canal, which it has been indicated will cost about $2 billion. The indications are that this will be a self-liquidating plan in 50 years. It seems to me this is the type of development that a fully funded plan would have made possible for the federal government. However this money has now been allotted to the provincial governments. I believe this will cause some consternation. There will be provinces that will use it and other provinces that will leave the money with the federal government to invest in federal bonds and other securities.

I am of the opinion that we are not really qualified, as members of parliament, with the information available, to decide whether or not this should have been a funded plan. I know the minister's department has considered this matter at great length, but I believe that she had to consider it in the light of the discussions that had taken place with the provinces and the fact that the provinces themselves said they would only participate in this type of plan if they were allowed to invest the money that was raised in their own provinces. I feel that our hands were bound before we faced a decision as to whether or not to accept the principle of this bill as a result of the discussions that took place between the federal and provincial governments.

There are many other parts of the bill, Mr. Speaker, upon which I feel the minister is to be congratulated. I am not completely in agreement that they should all have been brought into one bill. I am not sure that the Canada pension plan should not have stood on its own two feet without taking into account all these other things. If I had been the minister I would have kept the pension plan separate and distinct. I would not have referred to it as a social security system but would have called it a Canada pension plan.

However, I am not in disagreement with the additions that have been made. I think the minister is to be congratulated on making provision for survivor benefits in the Canada pension plan. In my opinion this is something that would normally have been included in a straight pension plan. However, in my view supplementary benefits do not really fall within the jurisdiction of what I would consider to be a pension plan. So far as disabled persons, widows, dependants of widows, and widowers in some cases are concerned, we have had joint federal-provincial plans which have been highly unsuccessful. They have provided very limited benefits to people who are totally dependant on such contributions for their very welfare.

I know that the Speaker should have some knowledge of this matter. I deal continually with a member of his family who is responsible for a very large area of this supplementary field at the provincial level and has to do with disabled persons allowances, mothers allowances and so on which are administered by the provincial government. Recently there has been a terrific deterioration in this field. These matters are now back in the provincial office rather than being dealt with regionally, and inasmuch as the law says a person must be totally and permanently disabled the

administrator has not in the past been able to exercise any leniency. The matter now comes before a board. A person may say, "I am totally and permanently disabled, I have lost a leg and I am crippled with arthritis and can hardly move around". The doctors' reports all indicate this is the case, but the board says, "Well, you got here, didn't you?".

I am happy that under this new social security scheme the federal government will give consideration to such cases. Certainly all you have to do is to read the new provision and you will see the difference. I congratulate the minister on this because I have seen a great hardship and abuse under the present federal-provincial plan. The controlling words up to now have been "totally and permanently disabled" but in the white paper these are the words used:

> —if an examination reveals a medically determinable impairment in which physical or mental disability is so severe and prolonged that he is unable to secure regular, substantially gainful employment.

Then he is considered to be disabled. Let me tell the minister that there will be thousands of persons throughout the nation who will be found to be disabled to the extent that they are not able to earn a living, not able to look after their families and in many cases not able to look after themselves. It would seem that with this change thoroughly fair and reasonable treatment will be accorded to them, and the minister is to be congratulated. I do not want to take the time to go into the other changes in these federal-provincial shared plans but I think that all the changes are advantageous.

I wish that parliament and the government had been strong enough to develop a completely federal plan because I believe that when we take into consideration the whims, the wishes and sometimes the eccentricities of ten provincial governments we cannot end up with the best plan possible. In my opinion the federal government should have had the audacity and the guts to introduce a completely federal plan and to tell the provinces that they could either participate in it or not but that the federal government intended to provide for those who wished the best plan possible for the money available from every Canadian who wanted to subscribe to the plan. If the government had done this I believe that the disagreement with the province of Ontario in particular would not have arisen.

But I was particularly surprised to find at the time of the second plan or possibly even the third plan that the province of Quebec had developed a much more humane and advantageous pension plan that the federal government was providing. When I found this out I agreed that the government of Ontario should also say "me too". I think the minister should have disregarded the pressures that were being exerted by the insurance companies, pressures that do not appear to be evident at all today because members of the Conservative party have not risen in their seats to oppose the plan in any organized fashion. Therefore I presume that the insurance companies have abandoned their opposition to the plan. But as a Canadian I do wish that sooner or later the government would have the guts to present a plan on a national basis for the money that is available to them at that time. I also wish that they would then say to the provinces: You are welcome to participate in this plan if you wish, but this plan will be provided for every person in the country who wants it and we are not going to make any other arrangements. We will provide the right for you to opt out if you wish, but that will be final. You will not be allowed to come in and opt out as is the case with this plan.

Surely one day, Mr. Speaker, we will have a federal plan that every Canadian in every part of the country will be proud of and that we can brag about throughout the rest of the world as being the best pension plan in the world. I am sure we cannot do so today with the plan we have before us, but I believe that we have the facilities and the growth in productivity that should have enabled us to say that about the present plan.

Mr. Gray: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Peters: Certainly.

Mr. Gray: Is the hon. member not aware that the bill before us provides for compulsory coverage of the self-employed and the farmers? Perhaps the hon. member's speech was founded on the previous bill.

Mr. Peters: Well, there have been so many of them. I agree there is a clause with regard to limitation of income but having regard to the incomes that most farmers report under the Income Tax Act I do not believe they will meet the compulsory requirement and therefore they will not be covered.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare also wanted to speak, but

as I did not see him rise I will proceed to make a few remarks with respect to the bill before us. In the first instance I want to indicate that because there are a number of bad features in the bill, because, as the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) and others have pointed out, it is not really adequate enough for the people of Canada, my support of the bill is conditional at this stage. I say "conditional" because this bill is to be referred to a committee where presumably there will be an extensive presentation of briefs and arguments for or against either the bill itself or with respect to particular provisions in it and I would hope that as a result of the work of this committee and the examination given to this legislation the bill will be reported back in a better form than the one in which we see it now. It is with this in mind that I say the support I give to it is conditional and qualified.

A number of people have indicated—I will not name them at the moment—that because we have raised doubts about the efficacy of certain provisions in this measure, because we have sought to point out where the bill fails and the extent to which it fails, we are really opposed to the bill itself. In order to prevent any attempt at misrepresentation of this sort we hope at the conclusion of the debate when the vote is taken to have a recorded vote so that everyone in the house may have an opportunity to stand and be counted either for or against this measure, because we know from past experience that politicians, being what they are, tend to take a position and misrepresent and distort it for their own political advantage. We would not like that sort of thing to occur with respect to the particular item before us.

A number of members have spoken about this bill as though they really believe in their hearts that it will finally be enacted as the law of Canada. There is some doubt, at least in my mind, that this bill will ever get on the statute books of this country. It is one of the most important that parliament has had before it for many, many years. It is also one of the most complex. It affects, or will affect, every person in Canada. It affects too a great number of organizations, companies and corporations across this country to a far greater extent than has any other single bill in recent years. Millions of people are concerned with the legislation and will be involved in it. There is the relationship between the plan proposed and private plans. While at the moment there seems to be some solution to this problem there will, nevertheless, in the future be continuing concern about this relationship. There is the possibility of provinces enacting their own plans. There is the influence of the attitude of the various insurance companies of Canada, and there are the billions upon billions of dollars involved as well as the way in which this money will be used during the time it is contained within the fund.

Because we are at this particular point of our proceedings approaching, perhaps, a Christmas recess; because we are approaching, perhaps, the prorogation of this session in anticipation of the start of another, and because a number of Liberal cabinet ministers in recent weeks have been making noises at public gatherings about the possibility of an election in the early months of next year, we could be facing the dissolution of this parliament. We all know what would happen to any piece of legislation before parliament or before a committee should dissolution take place. It would be the end of it. In accordance with our normal practice should even the prorogation of this session take place in readiness for the start of a new session in the early part of the year, this too would mean the death of the bill now before us—it would have to be started all over again. There is a way out—and I commend it to the government—in the report of the committee on procedure submitted a few weeks ago to the effect that we should not have a new session of parliament but merely a recess, in order that the committee charged with the responsibility for considering this bill might have as long as possible in which to carry out its work and hear witnesses, and so that this parliament would still have the bill in existence at the time when the committee reports its proceedings. Failure to make such an arrangement would simply mean that when we do begin another session of parliament we shall have to start all over again from scratch; the bill would have to be preceded by a resolution, given first reading, and we should be back again doing what we are doing today. That seems to me to be a senseless waste of time, especially when one is dealing with a subject as vitally important as is the Canada pension plan presently before us.

If, as is expected, the government intends on its own initiative to ask for the dissolution of this parliament some time in the early months of next year with the result,

of course, that an election must follow, and the committee has not completed its hearings by that time, it would mean the death of the Canada pension plan, and this would be a regrettable state of affairs. But past experience of the Liberal party both here in Ottawa and in various provinces leads me to suspect that this may happen. In that way the Liberal party would be able to sell the idea of the Canada pension plan to the contributors, or potential contributors, in this nation in exchange for votes and support while at the same time allaying the fears of the insurance companies that the plan would actually be put into effect. If what I am suggesting does take place it would be another blot on the record of the Liberal party, a record which is filled with instances of chicanery and double dealing in such affairs as this.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Howard: Hon. members opposite may chortle but they need only read a little of the history of their party to realize that this is the case.

An hon. Member: What about the C.C.F. party?

Mr. Howard: Occasionally we hear these bleatings from the other side when they feel their honour is pricked and wounded, but I am merely telling them something which is a fact. I do not have any great expectations at the moment that this bill will finally get on to the statute books of Canada, if it is correct that the government is doing all it can to engineer an election this spring, and my doubts will not be allayed unless steps are taken to guarantee that this committee which is already established will be able to continue sitting continuously from now until its hearings are completed, and find itself in the position to be able to report to this present session of parliament. This would mean having to forgo the usual arrangements for dissolution and the calling of a new session of parliament. The present session would have to continue, and if we arranged for this to happen only because of the pension plan it would be a worth-while undertaking. It would mean we should have to continue the present session of parliament, even though it might extend into the middle of next year. By agreement—and agreement appears to be available any time the leader of the house wants it, these days—arrangements could be made for the resumption of private members' hours on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays, and for the putting forward of the various supply motions so that we could consider the estimates of the next fiscal year and so on. Some agreement could be reached about arranging for a speech from the throne, if we really needed to have one, as well as about those other proceedings in parliament which normally follow the calling of a new session.

I submit that the only course open to the government at the moment is to attempt to keep this session of parliament in being until such time as the committee which is studying this bill has an opportunity to report back to us. We can thus guarantee that at least it will not die on the order paper as a result of prorogation, and can hope that dissolution will not take place until such time as we have the law on the statute books. Unless the government are willing to do this, I think we are quite justified in making the accusation against them that they are not really sincere about proceeding with even this watered down version of a pension plan. Mr. Speaker, I had other remarks that I would have made, but these in essence were made by my colleague the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) and others in this party who have spoken; therefore I will not take the time of the house to repeat those contentions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Marvin Gelber (York South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce my few remarks on the Canada pension plan with a quotation from Psalms which has been chanted through the ages:

> Cast me not off in the time of old age: forsake me not when my strength faileth.

Provision for old age through the social welfare state expresses not alone our social conscience but reflects the transformation of our society from a rural to an urban one. The patriarchal society which was historic presented no special problem as long as the moral responsibility for old people was recognized. The aged and the young lived together and respect for the fathers was the norm of the civilized community. On the other hand we must provide through these present special measures, partly because of our growing individualism. We no longer think in family terms to the extent that our ancestors did. The young wish to be free and the old do not wish to be dependant. In the patriarchal society and in rural society, the older members of the family participated as of right and not by grace of the good will of their

children. We have moved away from that and we think ourselves advanced. In fact, we have created many problems and only in the last decades are we really beginning to face them. The generations live apart. The filial bond is at something of a discount. To many of the young, it is a burden; to some of the old the toleration of their children is itself intolerable. One of the great problems of the aged is loneliness. This is a real challenge. Age itself has not fashioned this yoke; it is our society that is lacking—and this is a comment on an age that prides itself on its social consciousness.

We in this parliament and particularly in this generation must do something for a group of Canadians who reached their prime in the great depression of the 1930's. As late as 1935, one out of every seven Canadians was on relief. We hear appeals for self-reliance and advice to all to provide in advance for unhappy vicissitudes, and particularly for years of declining economic productivity. But how could a generation condemned to idleness through forces much larger than its own capabilities provide for the future when the impoverished present was so very terrible? Now in its later years we must take measures for those who were the victims of the economic holocaust that swept so much of the western world 30 years ago. This gives special urgency to enacting an additional measure at this time to provide for people in their older years.

There is another special problem which is most compelling. Our economy and our society is in the throes of a great revolution. It is a revolution based on the most sophisticated techniques of production and control. It goes by the name of automation. Automation is transforming not only our industrial and distributive processes but forces us to examine our concept of the value of work and the place of work in society since the dawn of history. We have glorified the biblical dictum that "by the sweat of thy brow shalt thou earn thy bread". One of the great humane values of the social revolution that swept Europe commencing with the middle years of the 19th century was the idea of the dignity of labour. This was not only a great egalitarian doctrine but held aloft a moral precept which is central to the highest ethical ideals of our civilization from its beginnings thousands of years ago. Now hyper-efficiency is forcing us to examine this central thesis of our society. It is forcing us to look to our directions and to prepare for results that we never really anticipated.

Some months ago in this house I mentioned the fact that 14 glassblower operators tend machines that produce all the glass bulbs and all the radio and television tubes, excepting picture tubes, for the United States. With that one exception, 14 tend machines which produce 90 per cent of the total. Some weeks later a colleague in the house, who apparently was paying careful attention to my remarks, was discussing this information with friends and they found it unbelievable. What was my authority? I told him I was quoting the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacEachen).

In point of fact, this is the core of the problem. The direct relationship of commodities to labour expended fascinated the classical economists. It provided ideas for Adam Smith and David Ricardo, and inspired the revolutionary and evangelical economic theory of Karl Marx, who stood the labour theory of value on its head. Tomorrow we may not be relating directly commodities to labour expended. Fourteen men tend machines that produce 90 per cent of the bulbs and tubes—they might easily produce all that is required, plus a surplus. The measurement of output in terms of labour hours could become an obsolete concept. This is something quite revolutionary and goes to the root of our society, which is so intimately related to our economic processes.

We live in a country of abundance, despite the poverty which is too widespread. The representations made by the Ontario federation of labour on poverty in Ontario in 1964 are a challenge to all. The Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé) has also pinpointed this problem and proposes to do some things about it. The Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury) has special programs to stimulate growth in designated areas, and the over-all economic program of the government has taken certain important steps. It is a paradox that we have these areas of impoverishment in a society of abundance. It is also a most serious consideration that with a great potential in the western world much of the world community lives in abject poverty. Hunger is the first problem for more than half the human race, and our country which has increased its participation in foreign aid must continue to do even more. The fact remains that the new processes are producing great bounties and the problems of automation oblige us to examine with great seriousness the organization of the labour market.

I have been an advocate of more serious programs of industrial training and larger

attempts to upgrade our labour force. However, we are also faced with the necessity to abstract from our labour force aging workers who, through their own efforts and those of all of us, can provide for their older years. This pension plan means that the bounty of automation will not exact too great a price for older workers. We are not as yet really facing the challenge of obsolescence in the skills of our workers. Every day thousands now working are finding their means of livelihood destroyed because the skills that have stood them in good stead for most of their adult lives have become obsolete. In part, this can be met by retraining, but for many of the older workers it will be necessary to withdraw them from the labour market in dignity and with security.

This is the greatest aspect of the Canada pension plan; we are protecting the dignity and the self-respect of our workers. We not only give them a greater mobility by ensuring the portability of pensions, but we are saying: In your declining years it is not to the state which you are looking but to the provisions which through the state you were able to make for yourself, together with the contribution of your employer, to security and well-being.

If we have moved from the patriarchal society to a highly individualized community, the older worker is entitled to all the dignity which his son, who with his skill and his two arms is able to provide for his wife and children and himself, has in his prime. Not through the toleration of his children, but through his own provision, the older worker can hold his head high and face his later years with a sense of dignity and well-being.

Our problems do not end here We shall have to give thought to organizing the leisure which a society of automation affords us. We shall have to make it creative and satisfying. Canada has a challenging present and a great future, and the Canada pension plan is a step towards its realization.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the minister a question before we proceed any further; she can deal with it when she is replying. Can the minister tell us whether she has any assurance from the nine provinces that they will participate in the plan at this stage?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the minister speaks now she would, of course, be closing the debate.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I was seeking to ask the hon. member who has just concluded his speech whether he would permit a question before he took his seat.

Mr. Gelber: Certainly.

Mr. Barnett: I listened with interest to his speech and I noted that earlier in his remarks he made reference to the generation of Canadians who were in the prime of their earning years when they were caught in the holocaust of the great depression. I should like to ask the hon. member whether he would not have to agree that it is precisely that generation of Canadians for whom we are not making provision in this bill, because of the age they have now reached.

Mr. Gelber: I would say it depends how old they were then.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the said motion please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those against the said motion please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five members having risen:

Mr. Scott: Mr. Speaker, I and my colleagues would like to record a vote.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

Mr. Churchill: It is too late.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No; the Chair did not declare the motion carried. I called for yeas and nays, and five members having stood the Chair has to call in the members.

The house divided on the motion (Miss LaMarsh) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Armstrong
Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce)
Badanai
Baldwin
Barnett
Basford
Batten
Beer
Bell
Benidickson
Benson
Berger
Blouin
Boulanger
Brewin
Brown
Byrne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cameron (High Park)
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Cantelon
Cantin
Cardiff

Cardin
Caron
Carter
Chapdelaine
Chatterton
Choquette
Chrétien
Churchill
Clancy
Coates
Cooper
Côté (Chicoutimi)
Cowan
Crossman
Cyr
Danforth
Dinsdale
Doucett
Douglas
Drouin
Drury
Enns
Ethier
Eudes
Fane
Favreau
Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke)
Forest
Forgie
Foy
Frenette
Gelber
Godin
Gordon
Grafftey
Granger
Gray
Guay
Gundlock
Habel
Hahn
Haidasz
Hamilton
Harkness
Harley
Hellyer
Honey
Horner (The Battlefords)
Howard
Howe (Wellington-Huron)
Irvine
Jewett, Miss
Jones, Mrs.
Jorgenson
Kennedy
Kindt
Klein
Knowles
Korchinski
Lachance
Laing
LaMarsh, Miss
Lambert
Laverdière
Leboe
Leduc
Lessard (Lake St. John)
Lloyd
Loiselle
Loney
Legault
Macaluso
Macdonald
MacEachen
MacEwan
MacInnis
Mackasey
MacLean (Queens)
MacNaught
MacRae
McBain
McCutcheon
McIlraith
McIntosh
McLean (Charlotte)
McMillan
McNulty
McWilliam
Madill
Mandziuk
Martin (Essex East)
Martineau
Matheson
Matte
Millar
Mitchell
Monteith
Moore
More
Moreau
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Mullally
Munro
Nesbitt
Nicholson
Nielsen
Nixon
Nugent
O'Keefe
Olson
Orlikow
Ormiston
Otto
Pascoe
Paul
Pearson
Pennell
Pepin
Peters
Pickersgill
Pigeon
Pilon
Prittie
Prud'homme
Pugh
Rapp
Rhéaume
Ricard
Rinfret
Robichaud
Rochon
Rouleau
Roxburgh
Ryan
Scott
Sharp
Simpson
Skoreyko
Smith
Starr
Stefanson
Stenson
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet
Tremblay
Tucker
Turner
Wadds, Mrs.
Wahn
Watson (Assiniboia)
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Webb
Webster
Weichel
Whelan
Willoughby
Winch
Winkler—184.

NAYS

Nil.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the second time and referred to the joint committee established to consider Bill No. C-136.

PERSONNEL OF COMMITTEE

Mr. Maurice Rinfret (St. James): May I have unanimous consent of the house to revert to motions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Rinfret: I move:

That the members of the House of Commons on the joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons to consider Bill No. C-136, approved November 16, 1964, be composed of: Messrs. Aiken, Basford, Cameron (High Park), Cantelon, Cashin, Chatterton, Côté (Longueuil), Francis, Gray, Gundlock, Klein, Knowles, Laverdière, Lloyd, Macaluso, McCutcheon, Monteith, Moreau, Munro, Olson, Paul, Perron, Rhéaume and Scott.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the house leader about the business for tomorrow?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, perhaps before announcing the business for tomorrow I might take the opportunity to thank the house for its co-operation in the last three days in dealing with the important piece of legislation which has just been given second reading. Tomorrow we propose submitting the estimates of the Department of External Affairs for consideration—

Mr. Churchill: Will the member for Red Deer be back tomorrow?

Mr. McIlraith: —and on Monday we propose submitting the estimates of the Department of Justice. There has been a request that time be allocated as between the department proper, the penitentiaries branch and the combines branch, but perhaps that can be dealt with later. I am not able to announce the business to be submitted on Friday. I should like the opportunity to consult with

the house leaders of the other parties before announcing business for that day.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, if I have missed something I am sure I will be corrected, but were we not going to refer Bill No. C-136 to the joint committee, now that it has been appointed?

Mr. McIlraith: That was done just a few minutes ago.

Mr. Knowles: Good.

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

END OF VOLUME IX